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The objectives of this study were to examine the present process of performance appraisal used in Michigan as well as to determine if the participants in that process see any need for change. If change was desired this study sought to determine what direction that change should take. A review of the literature established a background which implied a general pervasive dissatisfaction with the present process and a need for change as well as several directions that change might take. The review of the literature also established a possible link between personnel development within the school setting and that of organizational development in general. Previous research in the areas of professional improvement and evaluation systems both current and advocated is also reviewed. A sample of Michigan school superintendents, principals, and teachers were asked to respond to inquiries regarding present evaluation in their respective districts as well as evaluation processes which they might prefer. Other supportive inquiries were also made. The results of the questionnaires were summarized and data were compiled and examined in the following areas: present versus preferred evaluators; present versus preferred evaluation methods, purposes, and results; preferred committee members for revision of evaluation processes;
adequacy of present processes; length of time present process has been used; length of teacher tenure; number of times evaluated in previous year; length of administrative service; and indication of formal administrative training in the evaluation process. These data include comparisons between present observations and preferences of each group, superintendents, principals, and teachers, as well as comparisons of the data between these groups.

The conclusions indicate that while the literature may imply that school personnel are dissatisfied with present evaluation processes, this is not really clearly the case. It appears that most school personnel find the present processes adequate but in need of improvement. The clear indication is that the practitioners would involve more persons as evaluators, explore more methods of evaluation, and hope for more results, among which would be job satisfaction and personal development.

It further seems clear that the changes appear to be over due and the present processes have not been updated for several years in many school districts. The three groups also seem to be in relatively close agreement in regard to the direction the changes should take as well as the results those changes should produce.

A bibliography, survey forms, maps, school districts surveyed, and supporting documentation are included.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background

The purpose of this study was to discover the present process of performance appraisal used in Michigan as well as to determine if the participants in that process desired change. If change was desired the study sought to determine what direction that change should take.

While the study deals directly with the present versus the preferred processes, it also seeks to answer some related questions as well as perhaps point out some trends which are linked, at least in the mind of the researcher, to the question of development of schools as organizations.

In any organization the task of effective assessment of job performance is crucial to productivity. In the schools the ambiguity of the task has created a problem that many practitioners are unable or unwilling to attempt to solve. The investigation of this problem has been meager in the past, but during the last 5 years, it has increased. All aspects of the school organization have been under closer scrutiny due perhaps to declining enrollment, inadequate financing, student achievement reports, and lowered public confidence. The emphasis on accountability leads inevitably to a closer look at what kind of personnel schools have and what manner of monitoring job performance is being used.
Increasing Responsibilities of Education

It seems to be a societal trend to expect schools to accept more of the responsibilities of the socialization of children. Schools have matured from local extensions of the home to complex organizations. These organizations are now responsible for the academic, social, emotional, and often physical well-being of the client. They are responsible for providing a work force of well adjusted capable citizens who will be ready to accept their place in adult life. Whether this pervasive responsibility should be the job of schools is a question of basic philosophy and the subject of a study in itself. The literature (Boles & Davenport, 1975) suggests, however, that these responsibilities are perceived to be the task of schools. This evaluation and proliferation of the task has accelerated as most processes of civilized life have accelerated, at an ever increasing rate. The time honored traditional ways in which schools operate need to be reviewed and updated to handle the new responsibilities effectively and efficiently. One of the most important areas which needs review is the schools' use of personnel.

How Do We Make Schools More Effective?

To realistically attack the problem of making the schools more effective it must be recognized that they are no longer the traditional "little red schoolhouses" but have become giant organizations. Every organization has a product. One of the problems, or perhaps gray areas, in education seems to be a lack of clear
identification of that product. Many educators, and lay persons as well, seem to act on the premise that "students" are the product. No organization, however, can admit to a product over which it has so little control. There are many other variables acting upon the student. The student is the product of the home, his ancestors, his parents, his siblings, his peers, his environment, the culture, and his own unique personality, to name only the obvious. The school is only one of the variables which combine to produce the adult product. Yet, what the schools do has an impact on that product. The product is not even education. Education, as a word, is nebulous and difficult to define. At best it is a collection of experiences and these experiences are not the sole property of the school organization.

I submit that schools are service organizations. While service is considered part of the process, it is also, in the researcher's opinion, the only defensible product. It is the only product over which the schools have control.

Schools as Service Organizations

Schools are organizations which are expected by society to service the clients, students, with certain definitive kinds of experiences which the society deems valuable. Once stated it must be remembered that part of the problem of a service organization is knowing what kind of services are needed and having personnel and technology available that can deliver the needed services. As observed previously, the demand for services of the school organization is ever increasing and ever changing.
How to continuously update and improve these services becomes an important question for schools to answer. The key here is to take a look at the ways in which other organizations are seeking to improve their product. Just a brief look at the history will reveal that the development of organizations has passed through a series of changes. An important change seems to be occurring at this moment. It is a change from focus on technology as the important input of organizations to a focus on personnel as the important input. This change is apparent in every major industry in one form or another (Ford Motor Company, 1979; Herzberg, 1968; Landen, 1977; Maslow, 1965; McGregor, 1957; Rundell, 1978). The creation of organizational development departments within most major industries, the focus on developing humanistic leadership styles among managers and executives at all levels, concentration on systems communication, team building, personal development programs, and participatory evaluation plans all attest to this focus. Organizations have begun to realize that their product is most affected by the personnel involved.

Increasing the Quality of the Service

The question arises: "What do people need to make them better employees?" The answer to that question is not simple and is the subject of much controversial research. Behavioral scientists such as Herzberg (1968), Maslow (1965), and McGregor (1957) have pointed out to us first that motivation to work well is a complicated matter, individualistic in nature, and second, we cannot depend for long on rewards such as money and working conditions to increase that.
motivation. It seems apparent that, while those needs are important for the individual, in many cases, due to the thrust of modern labor unions, those needs are increasingly satisfied among the work force. When those needs are satisfied, it is pointed out again by the research of Maslow (1965) and Herzberg (1968), workers look to satisfy higher needs such as participation in decision-making and recognition from the organization.

It is indicated by the work of such groups as the Center for the Quality of Work Life and the American Productivity Center that this is where organizations find themselves today, and it is the reason that so many of them have turned to people-focused development. It certainly is becoming more and more apparent in the case of school organizations. The research in education, such as that done by Coleman (1966) and Jencks (1972), has established rather conclusively that the variables which most affect the quality of education attained by our young are out-of-school variables. The economic status of the family seems to be the single most important variable affecting student learning. Family stability and social level also rank high as do educational background of the parents and their attitudes toward learning. The single variable which seems to have some relationship to learning within the school is the personnel. Dalton (1971) observed that "the ability and will to achieve scholastically have a close relationship to a teacher's effectiveness" (p. 478). Unfortunately we have not determined what it is about the teacher that causes him/her to be effective. There is further research which seems to indicate that the effectiveness of the teacher is directly
related to the daily performance of the school principal (Magoon & Linkous, 1979; Maryland State Department of Education, 1978). It appears that it is the attitudes and philosophies of these school persons that effect the difference.

With this background in mind those interested in making the school organization more effective would do well to consider a major change in traditional attitudes toward their most valuable assets, the personnel.

Organizational Output

Organizational development for the schools needs to begin at once and to look at several areas. Schools are at present coming in for their share of criticism. In the past 10 years serious articles and plans such as the voucher system (Lindelow, 1980) have been written questioning the value of schools in today's society. Alternate means of educating our young have been suggested and some of the most promising are rapidly gathering advocates (Adiseshia, 1976; Goodlad, 1976; Gross, 1976; Illich, 1976; Mead, 1976). The schools are in serious trouble financially. It is clear that, if we are to continue in the current role and certainly if expectations increase as they have been, alternate forms of funding must be found. Schools as organizations must be concerned with cost/benefit ratios. Schools must clearly outline their goals. The day of the impressive philosophy without matching behaviors is fast disappearing. Once realistic philosophy and sound general goals are developed the organization can begin to concentrate on product. The service can be improved.
There are typically three areas of output which need to be identified and monitored. They are productivity, in the case of schools—quality of the service; job satisfaction of the producers; and personal development. While industry may consider personal development a positive side effect of good management practice, it is imperative that it be considered of prime importance in a service organization such as the schools. If motivation and job satisfaction can be achieved by recognition and participatory management practices, then it seems that the answer may lie in a positive appraisal system.

What Is the Present Function of Appraisal Systems?

What do appraisal systems look like in most districts today? (Remarks based on investigation of the appraisal systems are listed in Appendix A.) The process in all but a few pioneer school districts relies heavily on administrative classroom and casual observation. Typical is the evaluator who spends one period in a classroom and then returns to his/her office to fill in a trait related checklist. It is rare that the evaluator knows what he/she is looking for in his/her observation. It is not rare that he/she is often making judgments regarding subject areas about which he/she knows little. The checklist usually includes value judgments such as exceptional, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory on such items as teaching techniques, interpersonal relationships, classroom management, and out-of-class behavior. This kind of evaluation relies heavily on the subjective judgment of the supervisor and has served to give the process of evaluation a bad name. Many teachers suggest that it is indeed
threatening.

It is difficult to do any task in this kind of atmosphere, but to deliver the services expected of school personnel while being judged in so superficial a manner is counterproductive. Principals, realizing the threat which accompanies the traditional performance appraisal, often respond by shirking the responsibility for evaluation altogether. They do this by either not evaluating at all or by evaluating everyone the same, a little above average. No evaluation at all denies everyone the encouragement, assistance, and recognition that all employees need. Better than average ratings for poor teachers lull them into a false sense of security while it adds nothing to the development of any teacher. Better than average ratings for poor teachers cannot help but influence the motivation of good teachers.

How Can Positive Appraisal Systems Increase the Quality of the Service?

How can a positive appraisal system help change a negative process into one which can increase productivity, increase job satisfaction, and add to the personal development of school personnel? A positive appraisal system is more than a method or an instrument. The basic philosophy of the school district needs to be involved. This philosophy should recognize that teachers and principals need to work together in an atmosphere of mutual understanding which involves mutual preplanning, goal setting, and suggestions for improvement. The plan may contain several possible methods from which to choose as well as a choice of evaluators. The entire process should be planned
by a group truly representative of all interests in the school district and lines of communication between the planning group and their constituents should be as open as is possible. When a plan is agreed upon, the expected participants should be thoroughly trained in its use as well as in such basics as goal setting, observation techniques, and reporting. It is important that the plan be given support, monetary and endorsement, by the community. The central office support is crucial in that it controls the budget, the training process, and the monitoring process. The building administrator's role is to see that each teacher's plan is following the district expectations and to coordinate the plans in a total picture for the school. The teacher's role is to ascertain that the goals contain what is necessary for the curriculum in their particular classes and to determine what methodology they will employ to carry out their plans.

The communication between the teacher and the administrator during the year should be devised so that progress toward the goals is recognized and recorded and any help, technical or personal, is obtained or obtainable. As the evaluation time draws to a close, teacher and administrator need to decide whether the goals have been achieved. If so, what new goals should be made and if not, why not?

This system, in any of several possible forms, will allow the teacher recognition as a participating professional in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the service. It seems probable that the service would improve over the present system, and it would improve consistently throughout the curriculum. The job satisfaction of teachers would increase both by recognition as a professional
whose input is critical and by participation in the process. Personal development so crucial to teachers would have direction and the backing of administration for the need would be clear and methods for correction available.

Statement of the Problem

Given the above remarks, it is hypothesized that: school personnel as represented by superintendents, principals, and teachers view performance appraisal as an important tool for improvement of instruction in the schools; the present processes of evaluation are viewed as lacking the ability to increase and enrich the quality of the service; those involved see the need for change and have certain preferences for the direction of that change; and the three groups surveyed are relatively close in agreement of this direction.

The problem then to be investigated in this study is which kind of evaluation teachers and administrators, both superintendents and principals, see as valuable; who they see as primary evaluator(s); and what would be the purpose and result of evaluation in their opinion. The research seeks to determine the likenesses as well as the differences in the opinions of these three groups in regard to the above mentioned areas. Under investigation also is the degree to which the three groups agree that a change toward participating decision-making is warranted through the process of positive appraisal.
Summary

This chapter gave the reader the background and framework which compelled this writer's attention to the problem. The problem has been stated in terms of the writer's early suppositions regarding teacher evaluation.

The next chapter represents an in-depth investigation into the personnel appraisal process generally, the school organization process specifically, and an attempt to position the specific within the framework of the general.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The background of research available to the writer was vast. Research in the area of organizational theory, organizational development, personnel development, and appraisal and how each of these are pertinent to schools is to be found in abundance. This very abundance would seem to underwrite the urgency of the problem as well as the obvious absence of an easy solution.

The purpose of this chapter is to review literature related to the investigation of present status of schools as organizations and the possibilities for a positive appraisal system which functions to improve school productivity and personnel job satisfaction and personal development. The review concerns itself with (a) identifying the expectencies for the schools, (b) relating the background for viewing the schools as organizations, (c) establishing the connection between organizational goals and a positive appraisal system, (d) investigating the methods currently in use for the development of personnel in industrial organizations, (e) developing a link between the industrial organization and the school organization, (f) outlining current literature which identifies the suspected current state of the appraisal process in schools, and (g) observing possible directions for change.
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The main purposes of the present study are to identify the state of the art of evaluation and to assess the readiness and the direction of possible change in that art.

Expectancies

It is not necessary to look very far for evidence that expectancies for formal education are increasing daily. Federal and state law, such as Public Law 94-142 (Federal Register, 1981) alone in the area of special education mandates that schools must provide equal opportunity experiences for all students. In the case of special students this takes the form of much unequal effort. The effort necessary to provide equal opportunity experiences to an emotionally disturbed youngster or to one with a learning disability is much greater than the effort necessary to provide the same opportunity to the average student. The effort also requires that the schools become adept at functions which cannot strictly be termed educational. Scott D. Thomson, Deputy Executive Director of NASSP Bulletin, in an article bearing on the needs of the gifted student stated that, "If society is serious about this potential [that of the gifted], then society should make a full and abiding commitment to its development" (Thomson, 1976, p. 1). Shortly after, in the same article, Thomson (1976) equated "society" to schools: "American schools are pledged to the full development of the individual, to the nourishment of personal capabilities. How can this be consumated for the talented when schools practice a form of benign neglect?" (p. 1). If society is responsible then the schools must be the agent.
There are many voices raised in caution of this attitude. Americans, then, expect schools to contribute to national security, economic growth, social mobility and improved citizenship—expectations which tend to thrust education into the national arena and require policy decisions for education at the hands of general government. In all this there is clearly the danger of expecting more than our schools can deliver. Formal education alone cannot solve all of society's pressing problems. (Campbell & Layton, 1976, p. 366)

Morse (1976) stated that the demand for more effective education and training comes from government, parents, the disadvantaged, and students. He remarked that government "sees it [effective education] as essential to the sound solution of key social problems" (p. 336).

In an article aptly titled "What Are Schools For?", Ebel (1976) wrote that we are in the golden age of American education. "Never before was education more highly valued and never before was so much expected of it" (p. 424). He cautioned:

If they [schools] persist in trying to do too many things, things they were not designed and are not equipped to do well, things that in some cases cannot be done at all, they will show up badly when called to account. (p. 428)

The paradox, of course, is that of contradiction. While much is expected from education by government and elsewhere, the school budgets are almost certain to be cut before any others.

Yet, with the obvious problem of system overload, schools continue to add to their responsibilities: career identification and programs, lunch programs, breakfast programs, values clarification, family living, and on and on. They continue to offer more, while their critics complain that they are not doing what they should do as effectively or efficiently as they should.
This study seeks to discover if teachers, principals, and superintendents see the need for change. Is it likely that teachers as well as administrators are feeling the pressure that the multiple expectancies are imposing? It is hypothesized that they will agree that a positive appraisal system can increase job satisfaction and personnel development. Other sections of this review will attempt to establish a link between greater job satisfaction and personnel development on the one hand and a more effective and efficient organization on the other.

Schools as Organizations

This section is concerned with identifying schools as organizations. It is also concerned with the development of the school organization in relationship to current organizational theory.

Hicks (1972) suggested that there are five characteristics common to organizations: (a) they involve people, (b) the people interact, (c) interactions are to some degree ordered and prescribed, (d) each individual sees the organization as in some way helping her or him, and (e) the interactions help to achieve some joint objectives that are related to individual goals.

Boles and Davenport (1975) claimed that "People collect into and work in groups in order to accomplish those things which they cannot do alone, or to accomplish them better than they could do alone" (p. 65). They further claimed that all such groups, even the most informal, have some form of organization. Certainly, society has deemed that the formal education of the children should be
accomplished by a group trained for this purpose. While at one time this organization was loosely knit and attended to by local groups who contracted with individuals to accomplish this task with their children and who oversaw the process themselves, it is obvious that we have long ago outgrown that arrangement. The group has grown, the goals have grown, and the number to be serviced has grown. This has necessitated a new group to oversee and service the process. The combination of groups has resulted in increasingly larger and more formal organizations.

Sergiovanni and Carver (1973) agree that schools are similar to other organizations. They claim uniqueness, however, which also makes them different. The uniqueness exists because, according to these authors:

1) School members are professionals, 2) school clients have no choice of accepting the services or not, 3) financial support for schools is determined by local wealth and numbers of students, 4) schools suffer from goals ambiguity, and 5) students are both clients and organizational members. (p. 135)

This information does not change the fact that schools are organizations, it simply makes it more difficult to structure the organization and poses problems that need solutions. Sergiovanni and Carver recognized this and further acknowledged that schools are perhaps the best existing example of Weberian bureaucracy.

According to Weber's formulation the distinctive characteristics of a bureaucracy are:

1. A well-defined hierarchy of offices. Organizational authority is allocated to and through these offices, which also have specified functions. The organizational chart outlines the hierarchical authority. Position titles, while not specific job descriptions, usually
furnish an important clue as to what "competence" is associated with that office.

2. Selection of office holders on the basis of technical qualifications. Certificates, licenses, and diplomas provide evidence that one has achieved a minimum level of qualification. Incumbents are appointed rather than elected to office.

3. Remuneration received in the form of fixed salaries, with office holders treating the office as the primary, if not sole, occupation and considering it a career. Most educational administrators, in public schools do not moonlight, thus, their administrative position salary is their only income. Most are also considered to be waiting and working for a promotion to a bigger school or a school with more resources.

4. Office holders subject to organizationally developed rules and regulations in the conduct of their offices. Thus, predictability is increased by assuring a reasonable degree of stability.

5. Rules and regulations that are impersonal in nature. That is, office holders are expected to perform their functions quite independently of their personal selves. (pp. 333-335)

These writers while contending that bureaucracy should not evoke a negative connotation do contend that this kind of organizational structure tends to produce "unanticipated side effects." The impersonal nature of characteristic number 5 tends to be viewed by subordinates as minimal standards. Reliance on rules and regulations tends to produce circumvention behavior. Circumventing the rules creates a difference between organizational goals and the achievement of those goals. When this occurs in a bureaucracy it creates a tightening of supervision which leads to a high level of interpersonal tension (Sergiovanni & Carver, 1973).

The above implies that the organization has goals; these are the goals for which the group was gathered together and, of course, they
are important. An organizational goal is usually expressed in terms of the product. The service is to provide learning experiences for children and young people. Certainly the bureaucratic structure can fulfill this function and accomplish these goals. But, organizational goals are not accomplished in a vacuum. There are other input factors to the organization for which we must account.

The organizational goals are formed by expectations from the society. The personnel brought together to accomplish these goals also have expectations; certain expectations which caused them to become one of the group because they felt they could accomplish what they wanted to accomplish by becoming a member. This concept has become the focus of much study. The organization is studied by identifying the needs of the organization and the needs of individuals who comprise the organization and attempting to interlace the two.

Although there are many studies in this area, the most often cited is that of Getzels and Guba (1957). This study discussed the behavior of individuals in response to their role expectancies and their own need-dispositions. The Getzels-Guba model proposes that the social system produces both the institution and the individual. In the case of schools, the institution is the school and the individuals are school personnel. The structure of the school produces certain roles which, because of societal expectations, produces role expectations. In other words, society expects the incumbents in these roles to perform in certain ways and to do specific tasks. The incumbents, however, are individuals with personalities of their own and thus their own reasons for joining the organization. These
personalities have needs of their own. These needs are best dis­
cussed in the work of Maslow (1965).

Maslow (1965) is considered a spokesman for a psychology alter­
native to either Freud on the one hand or the behavioralists on the
other. This alternative psychology is referred to by Sergiovanni and
Carver (1973, p. 45) as "Third Force" psychology. In attempting to
apply this psychology to management, the Maslow movement toward
"Eupsychian Management" was born via a journal in 1972. "Eupsychia"
is defined by Maslow (1965) as "the culture that would be generated
by 1,000 self-actualizing people on some sheltered island where they
would not be interfered with [and it means] moving toward psychologi­
cal health or healthward" (p. 45).

All of the "Eupsychian Management Assumptions" are interesting
and related to this study, but only a few of the most directly re­
lated items are offered:

3. Assume in all your people the impulse to
achieve. . . .

9. Assume an active trend to self-actualiza­
tion. . . .

13. Eupsychian management assumes that people are
improvable.

14. Assume that everyone prefers to feel important,
needed, useful, successful, proud, respected, rather
than unimportant, interchangeable, anonymous, wasted,
unused, expendable, disrespectful. . . .

22. We must assume the wisdom and efficacy of
self-choice.

23. We must assume that everyone likes to be justly
and fairly appreciated, preferably in public.
24. Assume that everyone, but especially the more developed person prefers responsibility to dependency and passivity most of the time. (Maslow, 1965, pp. 45-48)

Perhaps the above may seem a bit unrealistic and impractical in the face of some of the personalities we all know, yet as Sergiovanni and Carver stated, "school executives have not worked diligently to foster, promote, and reward behavior of this sort" (p. 45). It is also the case that, in the development of Eupsychian Management, Maslow is speaking of persons who have or are moving along his needs hierarchy toward self-actualization. Maslow's needs hierarchy, developed in 1954, intimates that once the physiological needs such as survival and protection have been satisfied, an individual moves upward attempting to secure the next need and the next until the highest need, self-actualization, has been accomplished.

A study done by Trusty and Sergiovanni, in 1966, involving 233 educators, administrators, and teachers from a suburban Rochester, New York, school and 1,593 secondary school teachers from high schools in Illinois had some interesting results. It was found, while needs deficiency seemed related to age, the status need was the need most sought after. Boles and Davenport (1975) pointed out that persons at higher needs levels, which would include the status level, have greater concern for the expectations held for her or him.

It is with this status need in mind that this study begins to question whether the school organization provides for the satisfaction of this need. It would seem that the organization needs to be aware of the needs levels of their personnel both in general and,
when possible, individually. This study seeks to illustrate that the need level of teachers is at least at a status level. If teachers choose to be part of the goal setting function, if they see themselves as co-evaluators, and if they see as results of an appraisal system their own job satisfaction and personal development, it would seem to illustrate that they wish professional recognition and appreciation. If these needs levels can be satisfied, maintained, and even increased, the mesh of individual needs to organization role expectations and thus the goals of both can be accomplished. Does the present personnel process consider the individual goals or the individual needs? This writer's attention was drawn to the appraisal system to discover the answer.

**Relationship of Schools as Organizations and Positive Appraisal**

What is really meant when the school is viewed as an organization and how does it relate to positive appraisal? The following section seeks to establish through the literature reviewed that a positive appraisal system, one which is designed to maximize participatory goal setting and recognition through superordinate/subordinate interaction, is necessary, and perhaps the first step, to the healthy development of the school organization.

Boles in his unpublished, at this date, *Leaders, Leading and Leadership: A Dynamic Theory* proposes a theory of leadership which, I believe, can serve as a model for organizational development of the schools with a minimum of stretching. It concerns itself with the
three factors; namely, input, throughput or process, and output. Boles suggested that "individual need-dispositions" and "role-expectations" are input factors. In terms of the school organization the input factors are the same if one includes in individual need-disposition that of the client and that of personnel. In role expectation would be included all of the expectations which society imposes on schools. The process then becomes one of attempting to perform these functions in the schools' facilities which involve "climate, communication, social exchange, perception, and the leadership process itself." The output factors according to Boles are the following:

1. "Want-satisfactors of individuals" (pp. 215-225), and this would include want satisfactors of both clients and internal personnel.

2. "Innovation" (pp. 227-237), the process itself should help us learn to continually improve our methods and upgrade our wants.

3. "Production" (pp. 240-248), the quality of the service that is performed.

4. "Organizational maintenance" (pp. 250-260), if the system is to be of value it must continue and thrive.

5. "Individual growth and development" (pp. 262-272), a by-product.

In schools this by-product is implicit in the "production." If our clients do not grow and develop then the quality of the service is faulty. If our personnel do not grow and develop then the quality of the service will become stagnant and ineffective. This will affect
all other output. Innovation will not occur if the personnel responsible for it are not innovative. Organizational maintenance will suffer if the chief maintainers are not involved and alert to its needs. Boles continued his model by envisioning these outputs as feedback to the system. One can easily see that an inadequate output in any of the areas will create organizational dysfunction.

If the wants of clients are not satisfied, the pressure from society will increase. Alternatives to formal public education may be seen as the answer (Adiseshiah, 1976; Goodlad, 1976; Gross, 1976; Illich, 1976; Mead, 1976). If the wants of the personnel are not satisfied, the personnel may not continue to choose to be members of the organization. This becomes most true as the members move higher on the needs level, therefore, the most competent people may choose to join organizations that do satisfy their needs. In reviewing many (see Appendix A for complete list) appraisal systems it was interesting to find that in most of them the non-tenured teacher is observed and appraised often, as often in some districts as four times per year, while the tenured teacher is observed perhaps once in 3 or 4 years. In many cases the tenured teacher is not observed at all. While this may be wise if the appraisal process is used only for purposes of dismissal or withholding tenure, it does little for the growth of the tenured teacher. It is these teachers who have developed a higher needs level demanding recognition, appreciation, and participation. The existing processes have nowhere built in a recognition of these needs. It is this observation that has led this writer to question the present system which tends to appraise only
the work of non-tenured teachers and to decrease the number of appraisals as the years of tenure increase. This writer also suggests that this practice will lead to the dissatisfaction of teachers in direct proportion to the number of years they have on the job.

If innovation and change are not generated then new ideas and creativity are unavailable to the organization. If organizational maintenance is not accomplished the organization will cease to operate. If there is no personal growth and development of client or personnel none of the above can occur and the system, the schools, will fail. The most important of these is the personal growth and development in the client. It would seem unlikely that school personnel can foster in someone else something that they do not have. This study, it is hoped, may show that while personnel see no results whatsoever of the present appraisal process, they will respond affirmatively in favor of an appraisal process that could increase their job satisfaction and add to their personal development.

The opening question of this section sought to link the development of the school as an organization to a positive appraisal process. It is suggested that a positive appraisal process could favorably affect the output of the school organization and thus influence the feedback. This becomes cyclical, in Boles work, thus affecting the input and the process itself.
An important focus of the hypotheses of this study is to indicate inertia by the school organization in the face of an eagerness for change by personnel. This inertia is viewed as a noncaring attitude and contributes heavily to low morale. If change was not in the environment and the success of this current attitude a given in most industrial and federal organizations, the school's need would not be as great. This section seeks to point out that change to a people-focus is no longer theory but has been put into practice successfully.

Industrial organizations seem to be more and more aware of this need to focus on the development of their personnel. They seem to be recognizing the needs hierarchy of employees. The move toward real, not token, participatory decision-making and recognition of the worth and accomplishments of individuals is apparent in the literature and when industrial organization is viewed first hand. The personal development of the worker seems to be a high priority item in the plans as well as the budget of every major corporation in the land.

The General Motors Corporation is perhaps the largest, most profit-conscious organization in the nation, if not the world. Their commitment of time and money to the personal development of their employees at all levels is impressive (Rundell, 1978). They call their program "The Quality of Work Life" (1978) and they have joined forces with the United Automotile Workers in 1973 to form the GM-UAW National Committee to Improve the Quality of Work Life. The representatives to this committee attest to the strong commitment from
both the organization and the union. Representing the UAW are Owen Bieber, Vice President and Director of the GM Department, and Tom Monaghan, Administrative Assistant to Owen Bieber. General Motors is represented by George B. Morris, Jr., Vice President in charge of the Industrial Relations Staff, and Stephen H. Fuller, Vice President in charge of the Personnel Administrative and Development Staff. A brochure (Quality of Work Life, 1978) which outlines the Quality of Work Life program contains an acknowledgment of the nonprofit American Center for the Quality of Work Life in Washington, D.C. It states:

This brochure has been published and distributed by General Motors as part of its continuing dedication to excellence and to the improvement of organizational effectiveness through the enhancement of the dignity, development and growth of General Motors people. (p. 4)

The forward contains remarks by Richard L. Terrell, Vice Chairman of the Board of General Motors Corporation, and F. James McDonald, Executive Vice President, General Motors Corporation. The latter contains in his remarks the sentence, "It is our responsibility to learn how to develop organizational conditions that more effectively meet the needs of the business and the needs of the employees" (p. 5).

Remarks delivered by C. Reid Rundell, Director of Personnel Development, Personnel Administration and Development Staff, General Motors Corporation, to the American Society for Quality Control, 21st National Automotive Division Conference, Greater Detroit Section Annual Forum of February 7, 1978, back up the commitment of General Motors to this concept. He said, "A corporation has social and human responsibilities, obligations to society at large. It has further
responsibilities to its employees—to treat employees with respect and dignity and recognize their basic human rights" (p. 8). He added, "Providing people the opportunity and means to use their knowledge and skill for the improvement of the business and at the same time increase their satisfaction with work is just sound management" (p. 8). As he brought to a close his remarks involving description of several programs using the Quality of Work Life approach, he remarked, "These new approaches are providing people the opportunity to participate more fully in the decision-making process and influence organizational goals and results" (p. 9).

A statement of General Motors Corporation submitted to the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress of the United States in Washington, D.C., on June 28, 1978, closed with this statement:

but our experience indicates that systems can be developed and managed in such a way that people can contribute more significantly to organizational objectives, that our human resources can be utilized better and that the working lives of men and women can be enriched. (p. 8)

Dr. D. L. Landen (1977), Director of Organizational Research and Development, General Motors Corporation, remarked,

The quality of organizational accomplishment can be no better than the quality of the means by which organizations function. As institutions are created by people to serve their needs, so are the processes of these institutions. Hence, the quality of institutions, the quality of their processes, and the quality of people and of their lives are indivisible. (p. 5)

That powerful statement has serious implications for the educational institutions. As impractical and unrealistic as the assumptions of Maslow's (1965) Eupsychian Management may have seemed, the writer believes that the above remarks of spokesmen from General Motors
Corporation show a distinct movement in that direction.

Neither is General Motors alone in this movement. Many countries, such as Japan, are well ahead of the United States in developing the concept of Quality of Work Life and its resultant effect on productivity. Here, in the United States, we have recognized in the 70's the establishment of several agencies in our society whose interest is directed in the area of improvement of the quality of life at work as well as several attempts by the U.S. Government to recognize the need for such an emphasis. In 1977 alone we observed the establishment of the American Center for the Quality of Work Life; the American Quality of Work Life Association; the American Productivity Center, the Human Resources Development Act; the Community-wide Labor-Management Councils; the QWL-OD Activities, Military Branches; and the Directory of Labor Management Committees (National Center for Productivity and OWL) to name only a few.

Not to be outdone, Ford Motor Company in 1971 instituted a study of supervision. While not a full scale Quality of Work Life program, this study emphasized through a survey aspects of supervision which were anti-bureaucratic and pro-participatory. Included in a management training packet for Ford supervisors is information of the following kind:

1. Description of two-way vs. one-way communication techniques with strong emphasis on developing a two-way system--regardless of cost!

2. A short lesson in decreasing the "psychological size" of the leader and increasing the "psychological size" of the members as a
means to better communication.

3. A reprint from Harvard Business Review titled "How to Choose a Leadership Pattern" strongly emphasizing situational leadership and participatory decision-making.

4. A reprint from Harvard Business Review titled "Job Enrichment lessons from AT&T" which reports incredible increases in productivity when the personnel become involved in designing jobs and feedback. This article includes the following remark in regard to feedback: "knowledge of the results should go directly to where it will nurture motivation - that is, to the employee. People have a great capacity for mid-flight correction when they know where they stand."

5. A reprint of the classic Herzberg (1968) article, "One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees?" which discusses the difference between motivation from outside sources and building motivation into the employee. Herzberg, in discussing successful job enrichment, emphasizes responsibility, recognition, achievement, and growth.

6. A short lesson on "The Psychology of Motivation" which ends with this sentence, "In conclusion, we are saying that the more needs, of all kinds, which a man satisfies in his work, the more involved and productive he will be."

7. The last item in the packet is a reprint of the McGregor (1957) article. "The Human Side of Enterprise" in which McGregor explored the ways "that we must now learn . . . to utilize the social sciences to make our human organizations truly effective." In reference to performance appraisal, McGregor observed that most current appraisal systems are consistent with Theory X, which views the
individual as indolent, lacking ambition, disliking responsibility, preferring to be led, self-centered, resistant to change, gullible, and not very bright. He lists several companies which "have been experimenting with approaches which involve the individual in setting 'targets' or objectives for himself and in a self-evaluation of performance." Of this approach McGregor said, "the individual is encouraged to take a greater responsibility for planning and appraising his own contribution to organizational objectives; and the accompanying effects on egoistic and self-fulfillment needs are substantial."

This surge of activity by industrial organizations seems to be a practical application of the developments in organizational theory over the last 20 years or so. One notices in the industrial literature more and more often names like Maslow, Getzels-Guba, McGregor, and Herzberg, as well as Selznick, Bennis, and Knickenbacker.

Selznick's (1976) idea of coaptation which he stated "is the process of absorbing new elements into the leadership or policy-determining structure of an organization as a means of averting threats to its stability" (p. 72) is reflected in industries' endeavor to include the workers in participatory decision-making when and where the decisions have to do with their jobs. In an article entitled "Successful Management of Change," Endres (1976) discusses organizational development. Endres remarks that "organizations must shift emphasis from concern solely for production toward a concern for the employee" (p. 89). His summary begins,

In order for organizations best to equip themselves to deal with the everyday changes required in today's complex world, they should develop an organizational work
environment that will minimize the conflict between the individual's needs and the organization's goals. In such a work environment the individual is respected by the organization, his needs are recognized, and the organization provides opportunities to satisfy his higher order needs. In turn the individual respects the organization, recognizing and pledging to contribute his efforts toward achievement of organizational goals. (p. 92)

It is the hope of this researcher that this present study will point out the wants of school personnel. It is believed that while, for the most part, teachers are not being allowed participation in setting their own goals and evaluating them they have the wish to do so. It is believed also that the administrators agree that teachers should be recognized as participating decision-makers.

Application of Industrial Organization Theory and Practice to the School Organization

This writer suggests that there is little shift of emphasis toward concern for the employee being done by school organizations at this time. This factor will be evident if, indeed, the evaluation process has been static for 5 years or more and if it is shown that goal setting and evaluation are not shared responsibilities. This section points out several factors which make an adoption of the industrial model an advantageous one as well as some insights into the inertia of change.

Nirenberg (1978) in an article appearing in an NASSP Bulletin neatly pulled together the "Evaluation of Organizational Theory" and applied current theory, which he claimed is moving in business rapidly toward Maslow's Eupsychian model, to public education. He observed that there is a distinct compatibility between the
educational work force and the Eupsychian model. Although the pro-
essionally based school organization is a "natural" for Eupsychian
he seemed to feel that schools are unique. He claimed "three factors
that have contributed to the 'stunted evolution' of organizational
theory into practice in the schools" (p. 8). These factors are the
multiplicity of demands, goals that are obscure and unstable, and the
fact that schools have found it "safe" to remain in the traditionally
accepted bureaucratic model.

Another reason for the schools as organizations to adopt into
practice the modern organizational theory can be found in a concept
called "aero-synergy" developed by Bennis (1976). Bennis described
group "synergy" which, he wrote, includes

flexible and adaptive structure, utilization of individual
talents, clear and agreed upon goals, standards of open-
ness, trust, and cooperation, interdependence, high in-
trinsic rewards, and transactional controls - which means
a lot of individual autonomy and a lot of participation
making key decisions. . . . [Since group synergy is diffi-
cult to achieve] most organizations take the easy way
out - a zero synergy. This means that the organization
operates under the illusion that they can hire the best
individuals in the world, and then adopt a Voltairean
stance of allowing each to "cultivate his own garden."
(PP. 206-207)

If this method of school management were working, one would prob-
ably not find articles such as, "Teacher Burnout," a January 1979
Special Report in the Instructor. This article, which is one of
several read by this researcher on the same general theme, lists poor
organizational structure and supervision, lack of career ladders, and
few opportunities to participate in making decisions as the greatest
contributors to low teacher morale.
Teacher morale is low and public image and confidence are low. A quick look at a recent newspaper can tell us that (Free Press, Detroit, Michigan, September 9, 1979). On the front page two articles nearly side by side proclaim on the one hand that Detroit schools are on strike as well as several nearby suburban schools and on the other hand "Scholastic aptitude test scores dropped again in 1979, continuing a ten year slide." Granted, those in education can cite a multiple of reasons outside of the school's effectiveness and efficiency for both phenomena, but neither phenomenon adds to teacher morale or public image and confidence.

In an article appearing in the NASSP Bulletin (Magoon & Linkous, 1979), the authors recognize the need for high teacher morale and state that this is a function of the building administrator.

The principal holds the key to staff and student morale. His or her actions, the quality of the decisions and the perceptions of associates regarding overall behavior will determine staff morale. Important as teacher morale is, many administrators do not give enough attention to the role it plays in achieving excellence in education. (p. 25)

These authors offer, in their recommendations, several suggestions which could be implemented through a positive appraisal process.

In the face of so much research and literature in the area of organizational development and with the knowledge that industry is beginning to reap rewards from the use of some of the theory, where are the school organizations in this development? A few school systems around the country are attempting to link their performance appraisal systems to the product, quality of instruction, but few are using available information and techniques that seem to be working,
if in the infant state, for industry.

An AASA Executive Handbook points out one possible reason. Olds (1977), the author of this particular handbook, suggested that one of the myths in education seems to be "Any idea from another field is contaminated." He continued, "The chasm between management knowledge in educational administration and other management fields appears to be so great as to be disturbing" (p. 20). He, later in the same section, added, "A quarter of a century of experience and research into methods of management development in business, for example, has largely escaped the notice of large numbers of those who work in educational administration" (p. 20).

The Present Function of Appraisal Systems

The present function of appraisal systems in the state of Michigan is, of course, what this study will try to discover. It would seem, after some attempt to observe evaluation plans in Macomb County, Michigan, in 1978, that the pattern has not changed much over the years. In most districts one person, usually the principal, announces that he or she will be "evaluating." The time and day are suggested or the teacher is allowed to select those which they prefer. The research from teacher surveys (Robinson, 1978) seems to state more often than not the evaluator arrives unannounced. He or she sits for about an hour, pad-in-hand, and takes notes regarding a particular act of teaching, as he or she sees it. He or she then returns to his or her office where he or she attempts to fill in a checklist which often does not allow for the latitude of response
which he or she really requires. He or she attempts to use it, how­
ever, on the basis of his or her notes and his or her casual day-to-
day encounters with the teacher. After he or she has completed the
form, he or she usually, judging again from the survey responses, has
it typed in triplicate directing a copy to the teacher, a copy to
central office, and one to his or her files. In most cases, the
teacher is not called in for a conference. A conference usually
occurs only if the administrator has chosen to criticize some part
of the performance. Since this is in general the condition which
this writer found in most of the school district evaluation plans in
Macomb County, Michigan, this study will seek to support the Robinson
(1978) findings as to the present condition of the appraisal process
in the state of Michigan.

This kind of evaluation can well "conjur up the evil images" in
the minds of the teachers of which Goens and Lange (1976, p. 15)
speak. They point out that "personnel evaluation" as the main goal
of supervision cannot improve instruction when implemented in a
threatening manner. Barth (1978) suggested that evaluation carried
out in the above manner "becomes a meaningless ritual or an anxiety
producing occasion. (p. 75).

In an article titled "Let's Do Away With Teacher Evaluation,"
Ingils (1970), after a review of 70 existing instruments used by
school districts, observed that the questions asked had little to do
with stated purposes. He found the instruments of no value because
there were no goals and objectives, the questionnaires were subjec-
tive, and contained repeated and vague questions.
Shinkfield, in his 1977 study of teachers and principals in Michigan, summarized that "appraising too infrequently, continuing the use of present appraisal instruments, and having principals unilaterally appraising teachers" (p. 126) were factors that contribute to the failure of teacher appraisals. The present study seeks to confirm that observation while also inquiring into preferences.

By far the most pervasive barrier to effective teacher appraisal, in the opinion of several writers, was the problem of criteria.

Klienman (1966) pointed to 50 years of research that has failed to produce a guide to good teaching. She made reference to the fact that there is no common variable which denotes good teaching. She went on to observe that there is little relationship between either intelligence or scholarship and on-the-job performance. Yet, we base much of the teacher reward system on added degrees. She further pointed out that on-the-job effectiveness increases for the first 5 years and then levels off. Longevity is another basis for teacher reward.

Cowle (1978) made statements such as "Hire, keep, and reward the best teachers possible" (p. 42) but did not define best except as talented. Talented also goes undefined.

Current Trends, a National School Public Relations Association Journal ("Evaluating teachers," 1974) called the situation irreconcilable. The journal suggested that administration has the task of "seeing that the needs of teachers and the public are both served and that the ultimate goal is 'improved education'." They cited as irreconcilable (a) the need to make valid judgments regarding
teaching and (b) the ability to make those judgments.

Shinkfield, in his 1977 study, offered teachers and principals a list of 15 competencies to rate. Interestingly enough, he found that the same four competencies made the top of both lists and the same group of four were rated at the bottom of each. While Shinkfield contended that the primary competencies of teachers should contain "realism, humanism, effective communications, learning strategies, comprehensive student development, nurturing environment, and theory" (p. 87), he also contended that specific competencies would vary from district to district. He further commented that teachers should be "collaborators" in the decisions regarding what competencies, the required competencies should be written and should vary with teacher preparation and experience.

How Should Positive Appraisal Proceed?

Perhaps after 50 years of research we need to admit that the act of teaching is very complex. It is not surprising, perhaps, since we already knew that learning was a complex act. Certainly research needs to continue to attempt to discover the variables which distinguish good teaching from bad teaching, or just effective teaching from ineffective teaching. In the meantime, however, the cry for accountability from the outside forces and the cry of reform from those inside education cannot be ignored.

In the absence of firm criteria, many districts are content to show that their teachers are at least competent. According to Sandefur (1980), "29 states, as of October, 1980, have taken some
kind of action relating to competency assessment for teachers" (p. 3). While teachers who fail the tests are proving to be an embarrassment to the profession, it is difficult to see how one could prove that passing the test results in better instruction for students. Knowing that 5% of 1.9 million public school teachers are incompetent (Roy, 1979) cannot help us design an evaluation process for the other 95%.

Many states, most notably California, are rewriting teacher evaluation processes which use the criteria of student learning as the basis. They are stating that the result is proof of effectiveness. The Stull Bill (Popham, 1971) was developed using student progress as the measure of teacher competence. Salt Lake City has adopted a modification of the Stull Bill (Bruck, 1979) and New York and New Jersey are promoting student testing as a measure of teacher competence. While McNeil (1966, 1967) and Stocker (1971) agree that performance objectives should be either written by or approved by teachers they also agree that student gain should be the measure of effectiveness.

In pursuit of this question, Heath and Nielson (1974) were concerned with the difficulty of operationally defining either teaching or achievement. Glass (1974) pointed to the unreliability of the use of standardized tests to measure degree of learning. It is interesting to note that Shinkfield (1977) in his findings reported that "neither teachers nor principals consider that teachers should be appraised solely on the basis of what students learn in class" (p. 122). He cited Heath & Nielson (1974), Moon (1971), Rosenshine (1970),
and Rosenshine and Furst (1971) to support his findings and concluded that a possible explanation for the rejection of student learning as a measure of teacher effectiveness may include "1) limitation in available measurement instruments, 2) systematic differences between students in one situation by comparison with another, and 3) systematic changes in teacher behavior over time" (p. 123).

If we return to our discussion of organizational development, we will recall that the optimum circumstance for an organization is when the needs of its personnel are being met. It is then that they seem to be most able to incorporate the goals of the organization (which in the case of schools are the needs of the students) as their own. What are the needs of the personnel in school organizations? The literature tells us that teachers feel alienated from other teachers and the administrators. A special report in a school journal ("Teacher Burnout") of January 1979 suggested the reasons are "1) the system doesn't reward good teaching, 2) teachers don't feel part of the team, 3) teachers rarely get praise, 4) there is no opportunity to grow" (pp. 57-58). It would appear that teachers range in need from reward and support to recognition, participation, and self-actualization. While the threat of evaluation may cause fear and anxiety in teachers, they seem to be reacting to a process which they view as more involved with the idiosyncrasies of the raters than with their own behavior (Wolf, 1973). It is the present process of evaluation which they mistrust not evaluation itself. The climate of today is held over from a time community leaders made visits to see if teachers were doing their jobs and the negative threat is a result
of procedures not purpose (Withall & Wood, 1979).

Even in the face of this threat, teachers appear to agree that they should be held accountable for their professional conduct. Shinkfield (1977), in his findings, reported that both teachers and principals agreed that teachers should be held accountable. The study further reported that teachers agree that the appraisal process should be continuous. Current Trends ("Evaluating Teachers," 1974) reported that while teachers ranged from strongly opposed to highly accepting, the pendulum was swinging to accepting in view of recent research and the goal of improvement of instruction. The same journal reported, "The National Education Association believes that it is a major responsibility of educators to participate in the evaluation of the quality of their services."

It seems clear from the literature and research that (a) teachers want to be evaluated, (b) teachers are dissatisfied with the present evaluation process, and (c) teachers will respond to an evaluation process which allows for their participation, recognition, and self-growth.

Herman (1973) summed up key factors which contribute to problems of staff evaluation:

1. We have often neglected to tell an employee what, specifically, is his job (detailed job description); and therefore, we are unfair when we hold him responsible for assignments of which he is unaware.

2. We often forget to meet with the employee to identify what is to be achieved (performance goals).

3. We frequently do not state goals in terms which can be measured for evaluation purposes (behavioral objectives).
4. Once we point out a weakness in an employee's performance, we often do not take the responsibility of assisting him in the elimination of the weakness (in-service and job upgrading) . . . and inconsistent follow-up to insure improvement. (p. 6)

These key factors are echoed in articles and in research data. The Shinkfield (1977) study reported a list of factors which were found to contribute positively to the teacher appraisal process:

1. Focusing the process on teacher development.
2. Sharing the process by teachers and principals.
3. Making appraisals formative (with constructive feedback and adjustment of objectives).
4. Informing teachers in advance of the policies and procedures to be followed and expectations of competency performance.
5. Basing appraisals on extensive observations.
6. Allowing teachers the right to comment on appraisal outcomes.
7. Making provision for self evaluation as a valuable component. (p. 127)

These findings are supported by the work of Barth (1978), Beecher (1979), Bodine (1973), Bolton (1973), Hastings (1973), Wagoner and O'Hanlon (1968), Withall and Wood (1979), and Wolf (1973), all of whom agree that teachers must be included in the evaluation process as evaluators themselves as well as co-designers of the goals that will be sought and evaluated.

The need for clear performance objectives that are designed jointly by evaluator and evaluatee is supported by both Herman (1973) and Shinkfield (1977) as well as Barth (1978), Bodine (1973), Bolton (1973), Flanagan and Burns (1955), Hastings (1973), Ingils (1970),

Many also agree that observation is the proper technique for data collecting. Kleinman (1966) stated that "Measurement of behavior by observation appears to be the most promising technique to date for assessing teacher effectiveness" (p. 234). However, who should do that observation and how it should be done, are questions which may need to be answered by future research. At present it seems that the principal is the usual observer. This may continue to be the best method but only, it seems, if principals are taught to observe, know what it is they are looking for, and observe what happens and not what they think is happening nor how they feel about what is happening. McNeil (1967) suggested that "Supervisors must record actual events, not inferences" (p. 73). Anderson (1978) saw the solution to evaluation criteria as lying in the use of pupil-teacher interaction and the interpretation of this interaction by a trained observer. The reporting back of these observations in a non-biased manner has been successful according to those who have tried the process. Flanagan and Burns (1955) pointed out that at the General Motors Delco-Remy plant an Employee Performance Record has proven most successful. The use of such interaction analysis instruments such as Flanders and OSCAR is discussed by Bodine (1973) and Bolton (1973). More current research has been done at Michigan State University and an instrument has been developed there (Bradley, Field, & Gillespie, 1978).
Principals, while as yet seen to be the usual observers even with the new techniques are not the only observers possible. Peers (Withall & Wood, 1979) and the teachers themselves through the use of video tape feedback ("Evaluating Teachers," 1974) are also emerging as possible and perhaps additional sources of objective feedback to the teachers.

Summary

While a wide variety of literature has been recorded here, the perceptions of administrators and teachers in regard to the present process of evaluation and their preferred process of evaluation is not represented. The literature has not sought to discover a perceived need for change in this area by the practitioners. This study seeks to draw conclusions regarding present perceptions, preferences, and thus determine need for change from these sources. It seeks also to view the process from three different points of view and determine similar or dissimilar perceptions and directions.

Statement of Hypotheses

In view of the research and literature presented, two very general hypotheses emerge.

1. It is hypothesized that superintendents, principals, and teachers see a need for change in the focus and process of performance appraisal.

2. It is hypothesized that while little teacher participation in the process is now taking place in Michigan this is the direction
which is preferred.

The following specific hypotheses are parts of the above two overview assumptions.

**The Use of Evaluation Processes Currently**

A study of current evaluation processes (see Appendix A) indicated that non-tenured teachers were formally evaluated often while tenured teachers were evaluated fewer times or not at all. The literature dealing with teacher burnout ("Teacher Burnout," 1979) and worker motivation (Herzberg, 1968) would indicate that the need for recognition and support can often be satisfied by frequent evaluation. Shinkfield's (1977) work indicated that teachers value evaluation.

It is therefore hypothesized that the percentage of school districts in the state of Michigan which use evaluation processes for only non-tenured teachers will be greater than the percentage of school districts which use evaluation processes for both non-tenured and tenured teachers.

**The Present Evaluation Processes Are Outdated**

A review of current literature on worker motivation and, particularly, on teacher needs points to increased productivity when a participatory plan of evaluation is instituted. An evaluation process which is 5 years old or older may indicate a lack of awareness by school districts of recent literature and research findings.

It is therefore hypothesized that the percentage of school districts in the state of Michigan which have used the same evaluation
process for 5 years or longer will be greater than the percentage of school districts which have evaluation processes that have been in use for 4 years or less.

The Evaluation Process as a Means to Improvement of Instruction

While improvement of instruction is most often indicated as the purpose of evaluation the tendency to evaluate teachers less often as they remain on the job would indicate that this is not true. The literature and observations indicate that to function in the areas of improvement of instruction, job satisfaction and personal development evaluation must be continuous throughout the teaching career.

It is therefore hypothesized that there will be an inverse relationship between the number of years a teacher has had tenure and the number of times per year they are evaluated.

The Adequacy of the Present Evaluation System

The literature suggests that participants in present evaluation processes view these processes as inadequate. It indicates that present evaluation systems are of little use to either school districts or the employees.

The following hypotheses form a group. They are concerned with the same variables. The first hypothesis applies these variables to superintendents; the second hypothesis applies the variables to principals; the third hypothesis applies the variables to teachers; and the fourth hypothesis seeks to define agreement between the three
1. It is hypothesized that there will be a greater percentage of superintendents who perceive the present system of evaluation as inadequate than those that perceive the present system as adequate.

2. It is hypothesized that there will be a greater percentage of principals who perceive the present system of evaluation as inadequate than those that perceive the present system as adequate.

3. It is hypothesized that there will be a greater percentage of teachers who perceive the present system of evaluation as inadequate than those that perceive the present system as adequate.

4. It is hypothesized that the above three groups, superintendents, principals, and teachers, will not differ in the manner in which they respond to the categories describing adequacy of the present process.

Who Should Be the Evaluators

The literature reveals that experiments with a wider range of evaluators are proving to be advantageous. The greatest success seems to be enjoyed when the teachers are included in the process as self-evaluators in conjunction with their immediate supervisors, principals, or assistant principals.

The following hypotheses form a group. They are concerned with the same variables. The first hypothesis applies these variables to superintendents; the second hypothesis applies the variables to principals; the third hypothesis applies the variables to teachers; and the fourth hypothesis seeks to define agreement between the three groups.

1. It is hypothesized that there will be a difference between who the superintendents see as present evaluators in the schools and their opinions in regard
to who should be evaluators. It is further hypothesized that they will see as present evaluators those in the following two categories:

a. Principals
b. Other administrators

It is also hypothesized that they will prefer those in the following categories:

a. Principals
b. Other administrators
c. Teachers—self-evaluate

2. It is hypothesized that there will be a difference between who the principals see as present evaluators in the schools and their opinions in regard to who should be evaluators. It is further hypothesized that they will see as present evaluators those in the following two categories:

a. Principals
b. Other administrators

It is also hypothesized that they will prefer those in the following categories:

a. Principals
b. Other administrators
c. Teachers—self-evaluate

3. It is hypothesized that there will be a difference between who the teachers see as present evaluators in the schools and their opinions in regard to who should be evaluators. It is further hypothesized that they will see as present evaluators those in the following two categories:

a. Principals
b. Other administrators

It is also hypothesized that they will prefer those in the following categories:
a. Principals

b. Other administrators

c. Teachers—self-evaluate

4. It is hypothesized that the above three groups, superintendents, principals, and teachers, will not differ in the manner in which they respond to the categories describing evaluators.

What Should Be the Methods of Evaluation

Research indicates that a far wider range of methods of evaluation than those now being employed can be used successfully. The most widely encouraged methods appear to be mutual goal setting, improved and objective observation techniques, self-evaluation techniques, and a consistent follow-up process.

The following hypotheses form a group. They are concerned with the same variables. The first hypothesis applies these variables to superintendents; the second hypothesis applies the variables to principals; the third hypothesis applies the variables to teachers; and the fourth hypothesis seeks to define agreement between the three groups.

1. It is hypothesized that there will be a difference between the observations of superintendents as to the present method of evaluation and their preferred method. It is further hypothesized that this observation of present method will include the following categories:

a. Observation by principal

b. Trait-related instruments
c. Subjective narrative

It is also hypothesized that they will prefer those methods in the following categories:

a. Goal setting by principal and teacher together
b. Observation by the principal
c. Objective narrative
d. Self-evaluation
e. Follow-up process

2. It is hypothesized that there will be a difference between the observations of principals as to the present method of evaluation and their preferred method. It is further hypothesized that this observation of present method will include the following categories:

a. Observation by principal
b. Trait-related instruments
c. Subjective narrative

It is also hypothesized that they will prefer those methods in the following categories:

a. Goal setting by principal and teacher together
b. Observation by the principal
c. Objective narrative
d. Self-evaluation
e. Follow-up process

3. It is hypothesized that there will be a difference between the observations of teachers as to the present method of evaluation and their preferred method. It is further hypothesized that this observation of present method will include the following categories:

a. Observation by principal
b. Trait-related instruments
c. Subjective narrative

It is also hypothesized that they will prefer those methods in the following categories:

a. Goal setting by principal and teacher together
b. Observation by the principal
c. Objective narrative
d. Self-evaluation
e. Follow-up process

4. It is hypothesized that the above three groups, superintendents, principals, and teachers, will not differ in the manner in which they respond to the categories describing methods of evaluation.

What Should Be the Purpose of Evaluation

The literature written from the standpoint of school personnel indicates that the purpose of evaluation should be improvement of instruction. This statement is explicit in most philosophies of the school districts which were investigated.

The following hypotheses form a group. They are concerned with the same variables. The first hypothesis applies the variables to superintendents; the second hypothesis applies the variables to principals; the third hypothesis applies the variables to teachers; and the fourth hypothesis seeks to define agreement between the three groups.

1. It is hypothesized that there will be a difference between what the superintendents observe as the present purpose of evaluation and what their preferred purpose would be. It is further hypothesized that they will observe that the present purpose of evaluation is "contractual agreement" and that they would prefer "improved instruction" as the purpose.
2. It is hypothesized that there will be a difference between what the principals observe as the present purpose of evaluation and what their preferred purpose would be. It is further hypothesized that they will observe that the present purpose of evaluation is "contractual agreement" and that they would prefer "improved instruction" as the purpose.

3. It is hypothesized that there will be a difference between what the teachers observe as the present purpose of evaluation and what their preferred purpose would be. It is further hypothesized that they will observe that the present purpose of evaluation is "contractual agreement" and that they would prefer "improved instruction" as the purpose.

4. It is hypothesized that the above three groups, superintendents, principals, and teachers, will not differ in the manner in which they respond to the categories describing purpose of evaluation.

What Should Be the Result of Evaluation

The literature indicates that there is little result from the evaluation process, except perhaps anxiety, stress, and an occasional grievance. The proper result should be the realization of the purpose, improvement of instruction. The literature reviewed from the behavioral scientists in regard to workers in general indicates that productivity, job satisfaction, and personal development can and should result from the evaluation process.

The following hypotheses form a group. They are concerned with the same variables. The first hypothesis applies the variables to superintendents; the second hypothesis applies the variables to principals; the third hypothesis applies the variables to teachers; and the fourth hypothesis seeks to define agreement between the three groups.
1. It is hypothesized that there will be a difference between what the superintendents observe as the present result of evaluation and what their preferred result would be. It is further hypothesized that they will observe that at present there is no result of the evaluation process and that the preferred result is improved instruction, increased job satisfaction for teachers, and personal development for teachers.

2. It is hypothesized that there will be a difference between what the principals observe as the present result of evaluation and what their preferred result would be. It is further hypothesized that they will observe that at present there is no result of the evaluation process and that the preferred result is improved instruction, increased job satisfaction for teachers, and personal development for teachers.

3. It is hypothesized that there will be a difference between what the teachers observe as the present result of evaluation and what their preferred result would be. It is further hypothesized that they will observe that at present there is no result of the evaluation process and that the preferred result is improved instruction, increased job satisfaction for teachers, and personal development for teachers.

4. It is hypothesized that the above three groups, superintendents, principals, and teachers, will not differ in the manner in which they respond to the categories describing results of evaluation.

Who Should Form the Committees to Revise or Adopt Evaluation Processes

The body of literature which indicates that evaluation should be a participatory process would also imply that the formulation of policy, procedures, and instruments be under the direction of those most closely involved, teachers and administrators.

It is therefore hypothesized that superintendents, principals, and teachers will agree that administrators and teachers should form the committees which adopt and revise evaluation processes. It is
further hypothesized that superintendents, principals, and teachers will not differ in the manner in which they respond to the categories describing potential committee members.

The Adequacy of the Present Process as Viewed by Tenured vs. Non-tenured Teachers

Since the literature suggests that non-tenured teachers are evaluated on a regular formal basis while tenured teachers are not, it would appear that (a) tenured teachers may feel the need of participation and recognition to a greater degree than do teachers without tenure and (b) non-tenured teachers, because they are evaluated more often, feel better about the evaluation process.

It is hypothesized that there is a difference between the perception of the adequacy of the present process of the evaluation system by tenured and non-tenured teachers. It is further hypothesized that non-tenured teachers will perceive the present process as more adequate than tenured teachers.

The Administrators' Perception of the Evaluation Process

The literature would suggest that administrators increasingly feel the evaluation process is inadequate and that it requires a disproportionate amount of time. It would appear that this view becomes more the norm as the years of working with the process increase.

It is therefore hypothesized that there will be an inverse relationship between the number of years as an administrator and the degree of adequacy perceived for the present system.
The Administrator's Training in the Evaluation Process

The research indicates that few administrators are trained in observation or interview technique. It further suggests that there is a feeling of inadequacy because of this lack.

It is therefore hypothesized that the percentage of principals who have not had training in evaluation will be greater than the percentage of principals who have had training.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter will outline the methodology used to conduct the study. The development of the instrument, the population and sample, and the procedures adopted for data collection and analysis will be discussed.

Instrumentation

Since there was no existing instrument to use or to serve as a model, one was designed by the researcher. The format of identical questions which indicated present versus preferred evaluators, methods, purpose, and result was decided on. The choice of items was taken from the literature and reflect processes which are currently used in some part of the country, which are currently being researched for usability, or which are suggested in the literature as possible means to accomplish the goal.

A mailed questionnaire was used to collect data. These were three separate questionnaires: one for superintendents, one for principals, and one for teachers. The questionnaire for superintendents included questions relative to use of evaluation processes for tenured and non-tenured teachers and length of time the present process had been in use. The principal's questionnaire requested number of years as an administrator and whether or not the principal had formal training in the evaluation of personnel. The teacher's
questionnaire included the question of tenure and length of tenure. It also included the number of times evaluated during the past year. The remaining questions on all three instruments were worded identically (see Appendix C).

The questionnaire was designed as a checklist. This allowed for the easiest possible yes/no response. If the item was checked it was considered yes; if not, it was considered no. Questions relative to numbers, such as (a) length of time the present process had been in use, (b) number of years as an administrator, and (c) length of tenure, left open spaces to record actual numbers. The questions regarding perception of adequacy, use of process for tenured or non-tenured teachers, and tenure status of teachers each offered two possible choices.

The items which were included on the instrument are the result of the literature outlined in Chapter II. The items on all three questionnaires in regard to possible evaluators were indicated in recent articles or journals as evaluators in particular school districts at present. In some cases the author or researcher suggested their continued use while in other cases their use was cautioned. An example of caution would be the use of student evaluations when the results would be used by anyone other than the teacher.

The questionnaire items in the section on methods were also the result of readings of various methods now being used or under experiment. Cautions again were often the case for such items as video taping ("Evaluating Teachers for Professional Growth," 1974) and student learning (Glass, 1974; Heath & Nielson, 1974; Moon, 1971;
Rosenshine, 1970; Rosenshine & Furst, 1971). The literature suggested many variations of the goal setting process and this writer made no attempt to clarify how the process would be accomplished. Several writers questioned the possibility of "objective narrative" while several others presented instruments or techniques which they claimed could achieve that goal.

The list of items used in the questionnaire section on purpose of evaluation were all found in existing philosophies of school districts or gleaned in interview with school personnel. The one which appears in all philosophies reviewed was improvement of instruction.

The items in the section on results of teacher evaluation were formulated by the articles and research read, particularly in the area of worker motivation (Herzberg, 1968; McGregor, 1957). Some, such as dismissal of incompetent teachers, were suggested by the literature regarding teacher burn-out and many cautions were cited for this result as well as that of pay adjustment. The item "no result" was included in this section because it appeared often in the literature. It appeared in the sense that evaluation is a meaningless waste of everyone's time as it is not carried out (Ingils, 1970).

The items for the section involving formation of a committee was simply a list of all possible interested parties. The "outside consultant" item was included in view of the many consulting firms, often affiliated with a university, which now offer this service.

For the design of the instrument, Shinkfield (1977) was consulted and, for size and structure, was emulated. Attractiveness and ease of response were sought in the design. For clarity of wording
and intent, colleagues, peers, and dissertation committee members were consulted. Following these consultations, several questions were reworded and the principal's questionnaire included. The questionnaires were submitted to two superintendents, two principals, and five teachers in an attempt to establish content validity for the instrument.

The appropriate questionnaires were sent along with background material to the following: (a) Executive Director of the Michigan Superintendents Association, (b) Executive Director of the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals, and (c) Executive Director of Michigan Education Association. Comments and permission to use their endorsements for respective cover letters were obtained from all three before the questionnaires were mailed (see Appendix B).

Population and Sample

The population to be investigated was identified as superintendents, principals, and teachers in public schools in the state of Michigan.

The superintendent population was taken from the 1979-1980 Michigan Education Directory and Buyer's Guide (Michigan Department of Education, 1980). A sample of 200 was decided on. It was decided to select every other superintendent on the list. When the list of every other name was compiled the yield was greater than the expected 200. It was decided to exclude every fifth name on the compiled list. This yielded a final list of 212.
The same 1979-1980 *Michigan Education Directory and Buyer's Guide* was used to compile a list of principals. A sample size of 300 was decided on. A systematic sampling technique was used (every 11th name) and yielded 311 names.

The teacher sample was less stable. The list of certified personnel is available only on micro-fiche in the office of the Michigan Department of Education Certification. This list is never really up to date and at the point of collection the list for 1979-1980 was not yet compiled. While noting the possible problems with returns from teachers no longer at the same location there was no alternative but to use the 1978-1979 list. The master list consisted of 2,121 pages. By means of dividing 500 (the number of teachers desired) into the 2,121, it was decided to use every fourth page and every fourth name on the page. Since the certification list also includes administrators it was decided to use the next appropriate name on the page if the one selected was an administrator. In this manner 506 names were collected. There was no attempt to arrange percentages between levels of education. When the names and location codes had been obtained, it was necessary to match the location codes to the identification booklets to procure the school addresses of the sample.

Each name on all three lists was assigned a code number for return identification.

**Procedures**

Materials were mailed to 212 superintendents, 311 principals, and 506 teachers. The material included a cover letter, the
appropriate questionnaire, and a self-addressed envelope. The cover letters were written on Western Michigan University, College of Education, letterhead and were signed by the investigator and the Committee Chairperson. Each letter quoted the appropriate endorsement and stressed that confidentiality would be strictly observed.

The survey instruments were numbered to correspond to numbers on each list for follow-up purposes. The confidentiality was insured by the statement that only the researcher would record all returns and that code numbers would be destroyed as they were recorded. A list of returns which included performance appraisal materials was made for personal response at a later date. These materials were filed separate from the questionnaires which accompanied them. A list of respondents who requested a summary of the results was also made. Procedures used to protect the respondents' confidentiality was submitted to and approved by the Department of Educational Leadership, Western Michigan University.

A second mailing was made of follow-up materials. These included a cover letter, a questionnaire, and a self-addressed envelope. On May 16, 1980, the decision was made to accept no further responses. The survey response rates are reported in Chapter IV.

Data Analysis

All information on each questionnaire was coded and sheets were prepared for input by a key tape operator. The responses were input on the Western Michigan University computer. Appendix E is included to show the relationship of the questions on the survey instruments.
to the corresponding hypothesis.

In arranging the data, it was noticed that while most of the questions on all of the usable questionnaires were answered, there were a few who neglected to answer one or two of the questions. It was decided to use these questionnaires and this accounts for the difference in valid cases for several of the questions. In arranging the data for input it was decided to use the numeral "9" to denote missing data. The computer, respecting our wishes, disregarded the numeral "9" when it appeared as a year indication on the question which asked for that response. For example, the question to the superintendents regarding length of time that the evaluation process had been in use and the questions to both principals and teachers regarding length of service. Both questions were, however, refigured.

**Tenured Versus Non-tenured Evaluation**

To discover the percentage of school districts in the state of Michigan which use evaluation procedures for both tenured and non-tenured teachers as opposed to the percentage of those who do not, only the superintendents' responses were used. The recovered data were dichotomized into two distinct categories: (a) non-tenured teachers and (b) tenured teachers. The frequency of response for each category was recorded and a simple percentage of the total response in each category was obtained.
Outdated Evaluation Processes

In regard to the number of years an evaluation process has been in use, the fill-in numeral from the superintendent's questionnaire was dichotomized into two distinct categories: (a) 0-4 years and (b) 5-above years. The frequency of response was noted and the percentage of total responses reported. An inferential test of proportions (Glass & Stanley, 1970, p. 321) was used to determine significance at a level of alpha equal to .05.

Relationship Between Number of Years on Tenure and Times Evaluated in the Past Year

The question of a possible relationship between number of years as a tenured teacher and number of times evaluated was analyzed using teacher responses only. Responses were formed into groups. Each group represented a particular number of times evaluated the previous year. The mean for each group was then calculated and these mean years were compared. These data were calculated and used simply to make an observation in regard to the pattern of change that occurs in the number of times evaluated per year as compared to the number of years of service.

Adequacy of the Present Evaluation System

The question of the degree of adequacy with which each of the groups view the present system was tested by means of observing frequencies of response. The observed frequencies were converted into percentages of the total and reported. Each group was tested.
separately using the proportions test (Glass & Stanley, 1970, pp. 321-324) to determine significance at a level of alpha equal to .05.

A chi-square test for two independent samples (Siegel, 1956, pp. 175-179) was then used to determine likenesses or differences among the groups. The number of cases from each group which fell into the two categories was counted and compared with the proportions of cases falling into the categories from the other groups.

**Evaluators, Methods, Purpose, and Result**

The question of present evaluators, methods, purpose, and result as opposed to preferred evaluators, methods, purpose, and result was analyzed by use of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. The correlation coefficient in each case will represent a relationship between the percentage of response by one group to categories of a question such as present evaluators, as opposed to the percentage of response by another group to the same categories in the same question. In this manner the percentage response of teachers to the question of present evaluators was compared to the percentage response of principals. The correlation coefficient would indicate the degree of likeness or difference between the choices of these two groups for the particular categories offered in the question. The teachers versus the superintendents were compared in this way and then the principals were compared to the superintendents. The same three comparisons were then made using the responses to the questions regarding preferred teacher evaluators as variables.
The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was then used to compare each group internally. The correlation coefficient, which can be expected to be 0, will indicate the degree of likeness or difference of the teacher percentages in the categories for the question regarding present evaluators as opposed to teacher percentages in the categories for the question regarding preferred evaluators. When this was the case, an alpha of .25 was used to hopefully insure that a Type II error does not occur. These two questions were compared in the same way for principals and then superintendents as well. The principals' responses to both of these questions were compared in this manner as were the responses of the superintendents.

Identical comparisons were made by the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient using as variables the percentage responses of each group to the questions regarding present methods as opposed to preferred methods, present purposes as opposed to preferred purposes, and the present results as opposed to preferred results.

Committee Members Preferred

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was again chosen to compare the groups' responses in regard to choices for representatives on committees to adopt or revise evaluation processes. The same set of variables was used to compare teachers' responses to principals' responses, teachers' responses to superintendents' responses, and principals' responses to superintendents' responses.

The percentages were figured for all categories from each of the three groups.
Adequacy of the Present Processes as Viewed by Tenured Versus Non-tenured Teachers

The question of a possible variation between the perceptions of adequacy by tenured versus non-tenured teachers was tested by means of the Corrected Chi-Square Test (Siegel, 1956, p. 65). The responses of the teachers to the question regarding tenured or non-tenured was tested against each respondents' judgment of the perceived adequacy of the evaluation process.

Administrators' Perception of the Evaluation Process

To test for a relationship between the number of years as an administrator and the perception of adequacy of the evaluation process, the mean and standard deviation for the responses both negative and positive to the adequacy of the present process was calculated. These were compared.

Administrators' Training in Evaluation Process

To determine whether principals are being trained in the evaluation process, frequency of response to the categories yes/no were tallied. Significance was determined by use of a proportion test (Glass & Stanley, 1970, pp. 321-324) at an alpha level of .05.
CHAPTER IV

SURVEY RESPONSES AND FINDINGS

The findings presented will follow the pattern of the hypotheses. Specific information regarding questionnaire retrieval also will be reported.

Survey Responses

During the period of March and April 1980, 679 usable questionnaires (66% of the 1,029 questionnaires posted) were returned. Two hundred and twelve questionnaires were sent to superintendents, and 172, which accounted for 81%, were returned within this period. Three hundred and eleven questionnaires were sent to principals and 231, which accounted for 74%, were returned during the period. Five hundred and six questionnaires were mailed to teachers and 276, or 55%, were returned at the first mailing.

Follow-up letters and questionnaires were posted during the week of April 14, 1980. This mailing elicited an additional 133 responses (13% additional). The superintendents responded with 19 additional responses, or 9%; the principals added 29 responses, or 10%; and the teachers added 83 responses, or 16%.

Of the superintendents' original 212 questionnaires, 193, or 91%, were returned; the principals' 311 questionnaires brought 260, or 84%, responses; and the teachers returned 359, or 71%, of the original 506. On May 16, 1980, the last date that questionnaires were accepted, 812, 66
or 79%, of the original 1,029 were returned. Six packets were returned after that date and were destroyed.

The only irregularity encountered was a letter received from the Central Office of the Detroit Public School District suggesting that the study would need prior approval by that office before it could be conducted. Since the mailing was well along before receipt of the letter, it was decided to wait for results. The superintendent of that district did not fall within the sample list but 25 principals and 51 teachers were affected. The returns showed, however, that 14, or 56%, of the principals returned from this area and 26, or 51%, of the teachers returned. While these are lower percentages than might be expected from the totals, they are still high enough to suggest that this office procedure did not affect the sample to any great extent.

Appendix D contains six maps which identify both the location of response and location of nonresponse for each of the three groups: superintendents, principals, and teachers. The maps indicate a similarity in spread of respondents and nonrespondents throughout the state and there seems to be no area where lack of response would indicate a significant problem. Therefore, the results presented in this study were considered to be representative of perceptions about the appraisal function by superintendents, principals, and teachers in the state of Michigan.
The Use of Evaluation Processes Currently

It was hypothesized that the percentage of school districts in the state of Michigan which use evaluation processes for only non-tenured teachers will be greater than the percentage of school districts which use evaluation processes for both non-tenured and tenured teachers.

From the analysis of the survey data the percentages showed that 100% of the school districts in Michigan have evaluation processes for non-tenured teachers. This may not be remarkable due to the Michigan law which mandates such processes for non-tenured teachers. However, the data also showed that 99% of the school districts in Michigan report evaluation processes for tenured teachers. Therefore, only 1% of the school districts have evaluation processes for only non-tenured teachers. There is obviously no support for the hypothesis, but a clear indication that the opposite is true. School districts in Michigan overwhelmingly provide evaluation processes for both non-tenured teachers and tenured teachers.

While a statistical test (Proportion test; Glass & Stanley, 1970, pp. 321-324) was done, the results may serve only to belabor the obvious.

The Present Evaluation Processes Are Outdated

It was hypothesized that the percentage of school districts in the state of Michigan which have used the same evaluation process for 5 years or longer will be greater than the percentage of school
districts which have evaluation processes which have been in use for 4 years or less.

The percentages revealed that 26% of the 193 observations had evaluation processes in use for 4 years or less while 74% of the observations showed evaluation processes in use for 5 years or more. The mean was reported as 10.9 years.

It would appear, as reported by the superintendents, that the percentage of school districts which have evaluation processes which are 5 years old or older is greater than the percentage of school districts which have evaluation processes which are 4 years old or less.

An inferential test of proportions (Glass & Stanley, 1970, p. 321) was applied to the data. It was concluded that $p = .74$ was significantly different from .50 at the alpha level of .05. Evidence exists, therefore, to support the hypothesis.

The Evaluation Process as a Means to Improvement of Instruction

It was hypothesized that there would be an inverse relationship between the number of years a teacher had tenure and the number of times per year he/she was evaluated.

The mean years was figured for progressive number of times evaluated for the previous year. The results are reported in Table 1.

It appears that for those who are evaluated from zero to three times, the mean number of years of service does decrease as the number of times evaluated per year increases, which is suggested in the hypothesis. However, for those who are evaluated four or five times
a year the mean number of years of service suddenly jumps to over 17 years while the number of responses from the group decreases sharply.

Table 1

Mean Years of Service in Relation to Number of Times Evaluated in Previous Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean years</th>
<th>Number of times evaluated</th>
<th>Number of responses by group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Adequacy of the Present Evaluation System

This hypothesis was divided into four subhypotheses. The first three subhypotheses represent responses to the adequacy of the present system as perceived by each of the three groups responding: superintendents, principals, and teachers. The fourth subhypotheses represents a comparison of responses among the three groups involved.

Adequacy as Perceived by the Superintendents

It was hypothesized that there would be a greater percentage of superintendents who perceive the present system of evaluation as
inadequate than those that perceive the present system as adequate.

The data reported that 72% of the superintendents felt that their evaluation system was adequate while 28% said their system was inadequate. The result was in the opposite direction from what was expected, therefore, the hypothesis was not supported. A greater percentage of superintendents perceive the present system of evaluation as adequate.

**Adequacy as Perceived by Principals**

It was hypothesized that there would be a greater percentage of principals who perceive the present system of evaluation as inadequate than those that perceive the present system as adequate.

There were 38% of the 260 principals who felt that the present system of evaluation was inadequate. Also for the principals, as it was for the superintendents, the result is in the opposite direction from what was expected, therefore, the hypothesis is not supported. The greater percentage of principals (62%) perceive the present evaluation process as adequate.

**Adequacy as Perceived by Teachers**

It was hypothesized that there would be a greater percentage of teachers who perceive the present system of evaluation as inadequate than those that perceive the present system as adequate.

Fifty-two percent of the 359 responding teachers felt that the present system of evaluation was inadequate.
The proportion test (Glass & Stanley, 1970, pp. 321-324) revealed that value of .52 is not significantly different from .50 at the .05 level. Evidence does not exist for the support of the hypothesis. There does not appear to be a significantly greater percentage of teachers who perceive the present evaluation process as inadequate.

**Relationship Between the Three Groups:**
*Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers*

It was hypothesized that the above three groups will not differ in the manner in which they respond to the two categories. The simple proportions are reported in Table 2.

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 28.45 \]

\[ df = 2 \]

The chi-square test for independent samples (Siegel, 1956, pp. 104-111) was applied to the data and the findings concluded that the chi square = 28.45 with 2 degrees of freedom. An inferential test
(Glass & Stanley, 1970, pp. 324-326) was applied to the data and the findings indicate that none of the comparisons between the three populations are equal at the alpha level of .25. A large alpha level was used to decrease the probability of committing a Type II error. The hypothesis of no difference is, therefore, not supported.

Who Are and Who Should Be the Evaluators

This hypothesis was divided into four subhypotheses. The first three subhypotheses represent a comparison between the responses to the question regarding present perception of who the evaluators are and opinions regarding who the evaluators should be for each of the three groups involved. The fourth subhypothesis is a comparison between the three groups in regard to responses to both the present perceived evaluators and the opinions regarding preferred evaluators.

Present Evaluators and Preferred Evaluators as Perceived by Superintendents

It was hypothesized that there would be a difference between who the superintendents saw as present evaluators in the schools and their opinions regarding who should be evaluators.

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient test was used to test this difference. This test yielded a coefficient of .963 between the responses to the question regarding present evaluators and the question regarding preferred evaluators (see Tables 3 and 4). This coefficient indicates that there is no support for the difference between the perception of present evaluators and the evaluators
Table 3
Present Evaluators as Perceived by Superintendents
\((n = 193)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other administrators</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers self-evaluate</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Evaluators Preferred by Superintendents
\((n = 193)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other administrators</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers self-evaluate</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that the superintendents wish to see involved. Since the hypothesis suggested that there would be a difference between what is now perceived and what superintendents want, the hypothesis is not supported. It appears that the opposite is true.

This hypothesis also stated that superintendents presently perceive principals and other administrators as the evaluators. Ranking the six categories offered by percentages of response is disclosed in Table 3. The percentages represent a portion of the total responses in each category. The respondents were free to choose as many or as few categories as they wished in every case. The numbers, therefore, will not be expected to total 100%.

In using a proportion test, the "Principals" category was the only one which yielded a proportion over .50 that was significantly different from .50 at the .05 alpha level. It would seem then that this is the only category which a majority of the superintendents see as present evaluator. The premise of the hypothesis, which included "Other administrators," cannot be supported.

A second premise of the hypothesis stated that superintendents would prefer principals, other administrators, and teachers, self-evaluate, to be the evaluators. Again, ranking the responses by order of percentages of total response is reported in Table 4. It is apparent that while the order has remained the same, all of the categories, except "Principals" has increased in percentage of response.

In using the proportion test it was found that the categories of "Principals" and "Other administrators" yielded a proportion over
that was significantly different from .50 at the .05 level. The category "Teachers self-evaluate" was only slightly significant, but was less than .50. It was determined that the evidence does not support this section of the hypothesis. It may be said that while superintendents see only principals as present evaluators they would prefer to see principals as well as other administrators in that role.

Present Evaluators and Preferred Evaluators as Perceived by Principals

It was hypothesized that there would be a difference between who the principals see as present evaluators in the schools and their opinions in regard to who should be evaluators.

In using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient test, a coefficient of .892 between the two sets of responses was established (see Tables 5 and 6). This coefficient indicates no support for the difference between the set of responses for present evaluators and the set of responses for preferred evaluators. The hypothesis suggested that there would be a difference between these two lists. It appears, since the opposite is true, that the hypothesis is not supported.

The hypothesis also stated that principals presently perceive principals and other administrators as evaluators. Ranking of the responses for this set of percentages is reported in Table 5.

It seems obvious that the only category which shows a proportion above .50 is that of "Principals." It appears that principals see only themselves as evaluators presently. This premise of the
Table 5

Present Evaluators as Perceived by Principals
(n = 260)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other administrators</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers self-evaluate</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

Evaluators Preferred by Principals
(n = 260)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers self-evaluate</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other administrators</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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hypothesis, which included other administrators, is not supported.

The hypothesis stated also that principals would prefer to include principals, other administrators, and teachers self-evaluate as evaluators. Ranking this set of responses by percentage of total responses is revealed in Table 6.

It is apparent that the order has changed slightly, but the percentages have increased except for the "Principals" category.

In using the proportions test it was discovered that the three categories, "Principals," "Teachers self-evaluate," and "Other administrators," all yield proportions above .50 which were significantly different from .50 at the .05 alpha level. There is evidence, then, to support this section of the hypothesis. It appears that at present principals view only themselves as evaluators, but they would prefer some assistance.

**Present Evaluators and Preferred Evaluators as Perceived by Teachers**

It was hypothesized that there would be a difference between who the teachers see as present evaluators in the schools and their opinion in regard to who should be evaluators.

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient test was employed between the set of responses to the question (see Tables 7 and 8) regarding perceived present evaluators and the set of responses to the question regarding preferred evaluators and yielded a coefficient of .771. This coefficient, at the .05 alpha level, indicates support for the difference between the two sets of responses.
### Table 7
Present Evaluators as Perceived by Teachers  
(n = 359)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other administrators</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers self-evaluate</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8
Evaluators Preferred by Teachers  
(n = 359)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers self-evaluate</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other administrators</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is evidence to support the hypothesis.

The hypothesis also stated that teachers now perceive principals and other administrators as present evaluators. Ranking the responses, in percentages of the total response, to this set of categories is reported in Table 7.

It seems obvious that the only category which shows a proportion above .50 is that of "Principals." The majority of teachers, like principals and superintendents, see only principals as present evaluators. This premise of the hypothesis is not supported.

The hypothesis further stated that teachers would prefer principals, other administrators, and teachers self-evaluate to be involved as evaluators. Ranking this set of responses by percentages of the total responses is reported in Table 8.

It is apparent that the order has changed and that the percentages, except in the case of "Principals" and "Other administrators," have increased.

It is also apparent that the only categories which yielded proportions above .50 are "Principals" and "Teachers self-evaluate." Both of these proportions are significantly different from .50 at the .05 alpha level. While there is no evidence to support the hypothesis, it does seem evident that teachers now see principals as the only evaluators and that the teachers would like to be included.
Relationship Between the Three Groups, Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers, in Regard to Present Perceptions and Preference of Evaluators

It was hypothesized that the three groups, superintendents, principals, and teachers, would not differ in the proportion with which they fall into the categories describing evaluators. These coefficients are reported in Tables 9 and 10.

Table 9
Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Comparing Presently Perceived Evaluators Between Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups and tables compared</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents/Principals (Tables 3 and 5)</td>
<td>.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents/Teachers (Tables 3 and 7)</td>
<td>.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals/Teachers (Tables 5 and 7)</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10
Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Comparing Preferred Evaluators Between Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups and tables compared</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents/Principals (Tables 4 and 6)</td>
<td>.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents/Teachers (Tables 4 and 8)</td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals/Teachers (Tables 6 and 8)</td>
<td>.913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All three coefficients are significant (see Table 9) at the .05 alpha level and would indicate a relationship between the variables. It would appear that the three groups do not differ in their perception of who are present evaluators.

The coefficients obtained between the superintendents and principals and between the principals and teachers indicate a relationship between the variables at the .05 alpha level (see Table 10). There is, however, no evidence to support a relationship between the superintendent's list and the teacher's list. It would seem that while all three groups agree as to whom they now perceive as evaluators, there is less agreement between all groups as to whom they would prefer to be evaluators. There is, therefore, some evidence which would negate support of this hypothesis.

What Are and What Should Be the Methods of Evaluation

This hypothesis was divided into four subhypotheses. The first three subhypotheses, each dealing with a single group, represent a comparison between the responses to the question regarding present perception of methods of evaluation and opinions as to what methods should be employed. The fourth subhypothesis is a comparison between the three groups in regard to responses to both the present perceived methods and the opinions regarding preferred methods.
Present Methods and Preferred Methods as Perceived by Superintendents

It was hypothesized that there would be a difference between the observations of superintendents as to the present perceived methods of evaluation and their preferred methods.

The two sets of data came from responses of the superintendents to a question regarding what methods were presently perceived as used and a second question regarding their opinion of what methods should be used. Each question offered 16 categories and requested the respondent to check as many or as few as he/she wished. The data (see Tables 11 and 12), when compared by the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient test, yielded a coefficient of .857. This coefficient was significant at an alpha level of .25 and indicated no support for the difference between the responses by the superintendents on the two questions. Since the hypothesis indicated that there would be a difference between the methods now perceived and those preferred by this group, there is no evidence to support this hypothesis.

The hypothesis further stated that a majority of superintendents would see (a) observation by the principal, (b) trait-related instrument, and (c) subjective narrative as present methods. A ranking of percentages of all categories is reported in Table 11.

It is apparent from the proportions test that observation by an administrator and post-observation conference are the only categories which have proportions above .50 that are significantly different from .50 at the .05 alpha level and the only categories seen as
Table 11
Present Methods as Perceived by Superintendents
(n = 193)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation/principal</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-observation conference</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective narrative</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective narrative</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-observation conference</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting—administrators/teachers</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-related instrument</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up process</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait-related instrument</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/administrator</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation instrument</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/teacher</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation-peer—group</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation-peer—individual</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video tape</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning evaluation</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation/principal or other administrator</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/administrator and teacher</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-observation conference</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-observation conference</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation instrument</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective narrative</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-related instrument</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective narrative</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait-related instrument</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up process</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning evaluation</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video tape</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/teacher</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation/peer--individual</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/administrator</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation/peer--group</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
presently used by the superintendents. The evidence, therefore, does not support the hypothesis.

The hypothesis also states that superintendents would prefer (a) goal setting/administrator and teacher jointly, (b) observation/principal or other administrator, (c) objective narrative, (d) self-evaluation instrument, and (e) follow-up process as methods of evaluation. Ranking this set of responses by percentages is reported in Table 12.

While four of the five categories hypothesized as preferences did fall among the top five in the ranking, only two categories of that four showed significant difference from .50 at the .05 alpha level. There is no evidence to support the hypothesis. It would appear that the majority of superintendents prefer (a) observation by the administrator, (b) goal setting by administrators and teachers, (c) post-observation conferences, and (d) pre-observation conferences as the methods used for evaluation.

Present Methods and Preferred Methods as Perceived by Principals

It was hypothesized that there would be a difference between the observations of the principals as to the present methods of evaluation and their preferred methods.

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient test between the two sets of observations (see Tables 13 and 14), present and preferred methods, yielded a coefficient of .822 and was significant at the .25 level. This coefficient indicates that no support was found
Table 13

Present Methods as Perceived by Principals
(n = 260)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation/principal</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-observation conference</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/administrator and teacher</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective narrative</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-observation conference</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective narrative</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-related instrument</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up process</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait-related instrument</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation instrument</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/administrator</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/teacher</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation/peer--individual</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning evaluation</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video tape</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation/peer--group</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14
Methods Preferred by Principals
(n = 260)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/administrator and teacher</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation/principal</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-observation conference</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation instrument</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-observation conference</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-related instrument</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up process</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective narrative</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait-related instrument</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective narrative</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation/peer--group</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video tape</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning evaluation</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/teacher</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation/peer--individual</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/administrator</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for the difference between the two sets of responses to the questions regarding the presently perceived methods and the preferred methods. This finding is contrary to the hypothesis which proposed a difference. The hypothesis, therefore, has no support. It would appear that there is a high degree of likeness between what methods the principals now see as operating and the methods which they would prefer.

It was also hypothesized that the principals would see (a) observation by the administrator, (b) trait-related instrument, and (c) subjective narrative as the present methods. Ranking by percentages, each of the total response, of this set of observations is reported in Table 13.

It is apparent that only two categories, "Observation/principal" and "Post-observation conference," have proportions over .50 and both are significantly different from .50 at the .05 level. The majority of principals, therefore, see these two methods as presently operating as did the superintendents. There is no evidence to support this section of the hypothesis since only one of the categories hypothesized was supported.

The hypothesis also suggested that the principals would prefer (a) goal setting/administrator and teacher, (b) observation by the administrator, (c) objective narrative, (d) self-evaluation instrument, and (e) follow-up process as methods of evaluation. Ranking the categories from this set of variables by percentages of the total response is reported in Table 14.
The proportions test reveals that only "Goal setting/administrator and teacher," "Observation/principal," and "Post-observation conference" were categories which showed a proportion over .50 which was significantly different from .50 at the .05 alpha level. The first two of these were hypothesized as being preferred as methods by the principals. While there is evidence to support the preferences for these two categories, there is no evidence to support the other three categories hypothesized. The hypothesis is, therefore, only partially supported.

Present Methods and Preferred Methods as Perceived by Teachers

It was hypothesized that there would be a difference between the observations of the teachers as to the present methods of evaluation and their preferred methods.

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient between the two sets of responses (see Tables 15 and 16) from the two questions regarding teacher choices of the 16 categories for perceived present methods and the same 16 categories for preferred methods was .714 and was significant at a level of .25 alpha. It appears that there exists no support for the difference between what the teachers perceive as present methods and what would be their preferences. Since a difference between the two sets of variables was proposed by the hypothesis, there is no support for the hypothesis.

The hypothesis further stated that a majority of the teachers would perceive (a) observation by the administrator, (b) trait-related
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation/principal</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-observation conference</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/administrator and teacher</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-related instrument</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait-related instrument</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/teacher</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective narrative</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation instrument</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-observation conference</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective narrative</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up process</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/administrator</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning evaluation</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation/peer-individual</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation/peer--group</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video tape</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Percent of total responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/administrator and teacher</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation/principal</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-observation conference</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation instrument</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-observation conference</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up process</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-related instrument</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation/peer--group</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/teachers</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective narrative</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning evaluation</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait-related instrument</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video tape</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective narrative</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation/peer--individual</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/administrator</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
instrument, and (c) subjective narrative as the present methods. Ranking the responses, in percentages of the total response for each category, to this set of variables is reported in Table 15.

Only the categories "Observation/principal" and "Post-observation conference" are viewed by the majority of teachers as methods now in use. Use of the proportions test shows that both categories are significantly different from .50 at the .05 level. While one of the categories, "Observation/principal," was part of the hypothesis and is supported, there is no evidence to support the other two categories in the hypothesis.

The hypothesis also stated that teachers would prefer to see (a) goal setting/administrators and teachers, (b) observation by the administrator, (c) objective narrative, (d) self-evaluation instrument, and (e) follow-up process as methods for evaluation. Ranking this set of responses by percentages of the total response is reported in Table 16.

In using the proportions test only one category, "Goal setting/administrators and teachers jointly" showed a proportion over .50 and was significantly different from .50 at the .05 level. It appears that this is the only method of evaluation preferred by a majority of teachers. While this method of proposed by the hypothesis and is supported, there is no evidence to support the remaining four methods named in the hypothesis.
Relationship Between the Three Groups, Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers, in Regard to Present Perceptions and Preference of Methods of Evaluation

It was hypothesized that the three groups, superintendents, principals, and teachers will not differ in the manner in which they respond to the categories describing methods of evaluation.

Correlation coefficients are reported in Tables 17 and 18.

Table 17
Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Comparing Presently Perceived Methods Between Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups and tables compared</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents/Principals (Tables 11 and 13)</td>
<td>.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents/Teachers (Tables 11 and 15)</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals/Teachers (Tables 13 and 15)</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18
Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Comparing Preferred Methods Between Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups and tables compared</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents/Principals (Tables 12 and 14)</td>
<td>.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents/Teachers (Tables 12 and 16)</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals/Teachers (Tables 14 and 16)</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All three coefficients are significant at the .05 alpha level and indicate a relationship between the present methods perceived by the three groups compared (see Table 17).

Again, all three coefficients are significant at a level of .05 and describe a relationship between the opinions of the three groups in regard to what should be the methods of evaluation (see Table 18). The hypothesis seems, therefore, to be supported. The three groups, superintendents, principals, and teachers, do not appear to differ in the manner in which they respond to the categories describing methods of evaluation.

What Are and What Should Be the Purposes of Evaluation

This hypothesis was divided into four subhypotheses. The first three subhypotheses represent a comparison between the responses to the question regarding present perception of the purpose(s) of evaluation and opinions regarding what the purpose(s) of evaluation should be for each of the three groups involved. The fourth subhypothesis is a comparison between the three groups in regard to responses to both the present perceived purposes and the opinions regarding preferred purposes.

Present Purpose(s) and Preferred Purpose(s) as Perceived by Superintendents

It was hypothesized that there will be a difference between what the superintendents observe as the present purpose(s) of evaluation and what would be their preferred purpose(s).
The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to produce a coefficient of .860 between the responses to the question of perceived purpose(s) and the responses to the question of preferred purpose(s) (see Tables 19 and 20). This coefficient was found to be significant at a .25 alpha level. This finding indicates that there is no support for the difference between what the superintendents observe as present purpose(s) and what they would like the purpose(s) to be. The hypothesis assumed a difference and, therefore, there is no evidence to support the hypothesis.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of instruction</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist the teacher in identifying the areas that need improvement</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate the incompetent teacher</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual requirement</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect the competent teacher</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward the competent teacher</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust pay scale</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20
Purpose(s) Preferred by Superintendents
(n = 193)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of instruction</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist the teacher in identifying the areas that need improvement</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate the incompetent teacher</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect the competent teacher</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward the competent teacher</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual requirement</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust pay scale</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hypothesis also suggests that the majority of superintendents would choose contractual requirements as the present purpose of evaluation. Rating the responses to this question by percentages of the total response for the presently observed purposes is reported in Table 19.

The proportion test reveals that the first four suggested purposes are all above .50 and significantly different from .50 at a .05 level. It seems obvious that superintendents see more than one purpose as operable at present. A majority of superintendents do see contractual requirement as a present purpose of evaluation and there is evidence to support the hypothesis. The majority view improvement of instruction as the present purpose.
Another section of this hypothesis states that superintendents are of the opinion that improvement of instruction should be the purpose of evaluation. Ranking the responses to this question by percentages of the total response is reported in Table 20.

The proportion test again reveals that the superintendents view a multiple of purposes. The first three in the ranking are above .50 and significantly different from .50 at the .05 level. Since the majority of superintendents viewed "Improvement of instruction" as their preferred purpose of evaluation, there is support for the hypothesis.

Present Purpose(s) and Preferred Purpose(s) as Perceived by Principals

It was hypothesized that there will be a difference between what the principals observe as the present purpose(s) of evaluation and what would be their preferred purpose(s).

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to obtain a coefficient of .839 between the set of responses to the question regarding present purpose(s) and the set of responses to the question regarding preferred purpose(s) (see Tables 21 and 22). This coefficient was found to be significant at the .25 alpha level. The finding indicates no support for the difference between what the principals observe as present purposes and what purposes they would favor. The hypothesis supposed a difference between the two and, therefore, there is no support.
Table 21
Present Purpose(s) as Perceived by Principals
(n = 260)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of instruction</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist the teacher in identifying the areas that need improvement</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual requirement</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate the incompetent teacher</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect the competent teacher</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward the competent teacher</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust pay scale</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22
Purpose(s) Preferred by Principals
(n = 260)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of instruction</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist the teacher in identifying the areas that need improvement</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate the incompetent teacher</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward the competent teacher</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect the competent teacher</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual requirement</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust pay scale</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The hypothesis further stated that a majority of principals would observe contractual requirement as the present purpose. A ranking of the responses to the question of present perceived purpose(s) by percentages of the total response is reported in Table 21.

The proportions test reveals that the first three ranking purposes are over .50 and significantly different from .50 at the .05 level. While a majority of principals view contractual requirement as a purpose of evaluation, and thus support for the hypothesis is evident, this is not the only purpose which they perceive. The majority view improvement of instruction as the purpose of evaluation.

It is conversely stated in the hypothesis that principals will prefer that improvement of instruction be the purpose of evaluation. Ranking the responses to the question regarding preferred purpose(s) of evaluation by percentages of the total response is reported in Table 22.

The proportions test reveals that again the first three in rank (number 3 is different from number 3 in the first list) are above .50 and significantly different from .50 at the .05 level. The majority of principals do prefer improvement of instruction as the purpose of evaluation thus supporting the hypothesis. This, however, is not the only purpose that they would prefer.

Present Purpose(s) and Preferred Purpose(s) as Perceived by Teachers

It was hypothesized that there would be a difference between what the teachers observe as present purpose(s) of evaluation and
what would be their preferred purpose.

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to compare the responses to the question regarding the presently perceived purpose(s) and the question regarding the preferred purpose(s) (see Tables 23 and 24). The coefficient was found to be .567 and was not significant at the .25 alpha level. This finding indicates that there is a statistically significant difference between what the teachers observe as purpose and what they would prefer the purpose(s) to be. There is, then, evidence to support the hypothesis.

Table 23

Present Purpose(s) as Perceived by Teachers
(n = 359)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractual requirement</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist the teacher in identifying the areas that need improvement</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of instruction</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate the incompetent teacher</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect the competent teacher</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward the competent teacher</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust pay scale</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24
Purpose(s) Preferred by Teachers
(n = 359)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assist the teacher in identifying the areas that need improvement</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of instruction</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate the incompetent teacher</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward the competent teacher</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect the competent teacher</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual requirement</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust pay scale</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hypothesis includes the suggestion that teachers view contractual requirement as the present purpose of evaluation. Ranking the responses to the question regarding the present purpose(s) of evaluation by percentages of the total response is reported in Table 23.

The proportions test used here reveals that the first two in rank are above .50 and significantly different from .50 at the .05 level. While the majority of teachers do, however, see contractual requirement as the present purpose of evaluation.

A section of the hypothesis states that teachers would prefer that improvement of instruction was the purpose of evaluation. Ranking the responses to the question regarding the preference of teachers as to the purpose of evaluation by percentages of the total
response is reported in Table 24.

The proportions test used here reveals that the first two in rank are above .50 and significantly different from .50 at the .05 level. While the majority of teachers felt that assisting teachers in identifying the areas that need improvement should be the purpose of evaluation, a majority also saw improvement of instruction as the purpose. There is sufficient evidence to support the hypothesis realizing that the stated preference is not the only preference.

**Relationship Between the Three Groups, Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers, in Regard to Present Perceptions and Preference of Purpose(s) of Evaluation**

It was hypothesized that the three groups, superintendents, principals, and teachers, will not differ in the manner in which they respond to the categories describing purpose(s) of evaluation. These comparisons are reported in Tables 25 and 26.

**Table 25**

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Comparing Presently Perceived Purpose(s) Between Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups and Tables Compared</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents/Principals (Tables 19 and 21)</td>
<td>.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents/Teachers (Tables 19 and 23)</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals/Teachers (Tables 21 and 23)</td>
<td>.912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Comparing Preferred Purpose(s) Between Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups and tables compared</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents/Principals (Tables 20 and 22)</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents/Teachers (Tables 20 and 24)</td>
<td>.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals/Teachers (Tables 22 and 24)</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25 shows that all three coefficients are significant at the .05 alpha level and support the hypothesis. It appears that the three groups basically agree as to the present purpose(s) of evaluation.

Table 26 shows that all three coefficients are significant at the .05 alpha level and denote agreement between the three groups as to what purposes evaluation should have. There is evidence to support the hypothesis.

What Are and What Should Be the Results of Evaluation

This hypothesis was divided into four subhypotheses. The first three subhypotheses represent a comparison between the responses to the question regarding present perception of the result(s) of evaluation and opinions regarding what the result(s) of evaluation should be for each of the three groups involved. The fourth subhypothesis is a comparison between the three groups in regard to responses to
both the present perceived result(s) and the opinions regarding preferred result(s).

Present Result(s) and Preferred Result(s) as Perceived by Superintendents

It was hypothesized that there will be a difference between what the superintendents observe as the present result(s) of evaluation and what would be their preferred result(s).

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient test revealed a coefficient between the responses to the question regarding presently perceived result(s) and the responses to the question regarding preferred result(s) (see Tables 27 and 28) of .919 which was found to be significant at the .25 alpha level. This coefficient indicates that there is no support to be found for the difference between what results of the evaluation process the superintendents now observe and what results they would like to have. Consequently, there is no evidence to support the hypothesis and it appears that superintendents would have about the same results as they now see emanating from the process.

The same hypothesis further states that superintendents presently see no result of the process. A ranking of the responses to the categories offered for choice of presently perceived result(s) by percentages of the total response is reported in Table 27.

It is obviously the case that very few superintendents see no result of the evaluation process since it appears eighth on a list of nine items, showing a very small percentage. The items that
superintendents apparently do see as current results are "Suggestions for improvement" and "Improvement of instruction." The proportions test shows these two items as both above .50 and significantly different from .50 at the .05 level.

Table 27

Present Result(s) as Perceived by Superintendents
(n = 193)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions for improvement</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of instruction</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help teachers add to their personal development</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal of incompetent teachers</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased job satisfaction for teachers</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service programs</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay adjustment</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This hypothesis also stated that the majority of superintendents would like to see improvement of instruction, increased job satisfaction for teachers, and helping teachers add to their personal development as results of evaluation. Ranking the responses to the question involving preferences of evaluation results by percentages of the
total response is reported in Table 28.

Table 28
Result(s) Preferred by Superintendents
(n = 193)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of instruction</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions for improvement</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal of incompetent teachers</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased job satisfaction for teachers</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help teachers add to their personal development</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service programs</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay adjustment</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of the proportions test reveals that the first five items on the ranked list are above .50 and significantly different from .50 at the .05 alpha level. The three hypothesized items are among the five, however, the two items which were not part of the hypothesis had higher percentages than two of the items which were a part of the hypothesis. Therefore, while there is evidence that a majority of superintendents support the three results, improvement of instruction, increased job satisfaction for teachers, and helping teachers add to their personal development, it is noted that these are not the only
results which they support. There seems to be no question in regard to improvement of instruction as an important result of the evaluation process for a majority of the superintendents.

**Present Result(s) and Preferred Result(s) as Perceived by Principals**

It was hypothesized that there will be a difference between what the principals observe as the present result(s) of evaluation and what would be their preferred result(s).

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient produced a coefficient of .890 between the responses to the question regarding presently perceived results and the responses to the question regarding preferred results (see Tables 29 and 30). This coefficient was significant at an alpha level of .25. This would indicate that there is no support to be found for the difference between what results the principals now observe and what results they would like to see emanating from the process. There is, therefore, no evidence to support the hypothesis.

This hypothesis also stated that principals would observe that there is at present no result of evaluation. Ranking the responses to the choices offered in regard to the presently perceived results by percentages of the total response is reported in Table 29.

The proportions test reveals that the first three items on the ranked list were both above .50 and significantly different from .50 at the .05 level. "Nothing," which implies no result, was seventh on a list of nine with a very low percentage. There is no evidence to
support the hypothesis. It appears that principals do see some present results of the evaluation process.

Table 29
Present Result(s) as Perceived by Principals
(n = 260)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions for improvement</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of instruction</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help teachers add to their personal development</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased job satisfaction for teachers</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal for incompetent teachers</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service programs</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay adjustment</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This hypothesis included the observation that principals would prefer improvement of instruction, increased job satisfaction for teachers, and helping teachers add to their personal development as the results of evaluation. Ranking the responses to the question regarding preference of results of evaluation by percentages of the total response is reported in Table 30.
Table 30

Result(s) Preferred by Principals
(n = 260)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of instruction</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions for improvement</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased job satisfaction for teachers</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help teachers add to their personal development</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal of incompetent teachers</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service programs</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay adjustment</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportions test reveals that the first five items are above .50 and sufficiently different from .50 at the .05 level. These five items include the three items of the hypothesis. A majority of principals would support improvement of instruction, increased job satisfaction for teachers, and helping teachers add to their personal development as results of evaluation. There is evidence to support the hypothesis. However, the majority would support suggestions for improvement before they would support job satisfaction or helping teachers add to their personal development.
Present Result(s) and Preferred Result(s) as Perceived by Teachers

It was hypothesized that there would be a difference between what the teachers observe as the present result(s) of evaluation and what would be their preferred result(s).

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient test produced a coefficient of .606 when used to compare the responses to the question regarding presently perceived result(s) and the responses to the question regarding preferred result(s) (see Tables 31 and 32). This coefficient was not significant at a level of .25. There is then no relationship between the two sets of responses. A difference, as was hypothesized, is implied and the hypothesis is supported. It appears that there is a difference between what result(s) the teachers now see as emanating from the evaluation process and what results they would like to see.

This hypothesis further stated that teachers presently see no result of the evaluation process. Ranking the responses to the question regarding the present result(s) of evaluation by percentages of the total response is reported in Table 31.

The proportions test shows only one category above .50 and it is significantly different from .50 at the .05 level. The teachers apparently do see suggestions for improvement as a present result of evaluation. There is no support for the hypothesis.
Table 31
Present Result(s) as Perceived by Teachers
(n = 359)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions for improvement</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help teachers add to their personal development</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of instruction</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal of incompetent teachers</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased job satisfaction for teachers</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service programs</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay adjustment</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hypothesis also stated that teachers would prefer improvement of instruction, increased job satisfaction for teachers, and helping teachers to add to their personal development as desirable results of evaluation. Ranking the responses to the question regarding the preference of teachers as to the purpose of evaluation by percentages of the total response is reported in Table 32.

The proportions test reveals that the first four categories are all above .50 and are all significantly different from .50 at the .05 level. These four items include the three items suggested in the hypothesis. A majority of teachers would like to include improvement
of instruction, increased job satisfaction, and helping teachers add to their personal development as results of evaluation. This evidence supports the hypothesis. The majority of teachers, however, would support suggestions for improvement as the important result of evaluation.

Table 32
Result(s) Preferred by Teachers
(n = 359)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions for improvement</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of instruction</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help teachers to add to their personal development</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased job satisfaction for teachers</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal of incompetent teachers</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service programs</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay adjustment</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationship Between the Three Groups, Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers, in Regard to Present Perceptions and Preference of Result(s) of Evaluation

It was hypothesized that the three groups, superintendents, principals, and teachers will be similar in the manner in which they respond to the categories describing result(s) of evaluation. These comparisons are reported in Tables 33 and 34.

Table 33
Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Comparing Presently Perceived Result(s) Between Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups and tables compared</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents/Principals (Tables 27 and 29)</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents/Teachers (Tables 27 and 31)</td>
<td>.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals/Teachers (Tables 29 and 31)</td>
<td>.811</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34
Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Comparing Preferred Result(s) Between Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups and tables compared</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents/Principals (Tables 28 and 30)</td>
<td>.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents/Teachers (Tables 28 and 32)</td>
<td>.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals/Teachers (Tables 30 and 32)</td>
<td>.979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These coefficients (see Table 33) are all significant at the alpha level of .05 and show a relationship to exist between the three groups regarding the perceptions of the present results of evaluation.

All three coefficients (see Table 34) are significant at the alpha level of .05. There appears to be support for agreement between the groups in relationship to what the result(s) of evaluation should be. There is evidence to support the hypothesis. It appears that there is agreement between the groups on both sets of responses. The responses dealing with preferred results, however, show a higher degree of correlation.

Who Should Form the Committees to Revise or Adopt Evaluation Processes

It was hypothesized that superintendents, principals, and teachers would agree that administrators and teachers should form committees which adopt and revise evaluation processes. The responses to this question for each group were ranked by the percentages of the total response. Tables 35, 36, and 37 report these ranking of responses.

The proportions test revealed that the categories for "Administrators" and "Teachers" were the only categories which were above .50 and significantly different from .50 at the .05 level for each of the groups. There is evidence to support the hypothesis.
Table 35
Preferred Committee Members as Perceived by Superintendents
\(n = 193\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board members</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Officials</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside consultants</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the business community</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36
Preferred Committee Members as Perceived by Principals
\(n = 260\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board members</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union officials</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside consultants</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the business community</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 37
Preferred Committee Members as Perceived by Teachers
(n = 359)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union officials</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board members</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside consultants</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the business community</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hypothesis also stated that superintendents, principals, and teachers would not differ in the manner in which they respond to the categories describing potential committee members. Table 38 reports these correlation coefficients.

Table 38
Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Comparing Preferred Committee Members Between Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups and Tables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents/Principals (Tables 35 and 36)</td>
<td>.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents/Teachers (Tables 35 and 37)</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals/Teachers (Tables 36 and 37)</td>
<td>.973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All of the coefficients were significant at an alpha level of .05. These coefficients represent a relationship between the responses of the superintendents, the principals, and the teachers in regard to the members of an evaluation review committee. The hypothesis is supported.

The Adequacy of the Present Process as Viewed by Tenured Versus Non-tenured Teachers

It was hypothesized that there is a difference between the perceptions of the adequacy of the present process of the evaluation system by tenured and non-tenured teachers. It was further hypothesized that non-tenured teachers will perceive the present process as more adequate than do tenured teachers. Table 39 presents these data in the form of a contingency table.

Table 39
Corrected Chi-Square Test (Yates) Contingency Table
Tenure and Rate for Present System of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>155 (48%)</td>
<td>169 (52%)</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenured</td>
<td>9 (47%)</td>
<td>10 (53%)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164 (48%)</td>
<td>179 (52%)</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Corrected chi-square (Yates) = .039 with 1 degree of freedom.
Using this test a probability of .844 was found for obtaining at least as great a difference between the tenured and non-tenured teachers as found in this sample. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no difference between the two population proportions cannot be rejected.

The Administrative Perception of the Evaluation Process

It was hypothesized that there would be a negative relationship between the number of years as an administrator and the degree of adequacy perceived for the present system of evaluation.

The mean years for those principals responding to the question of adequacy positively was 10.98. The standard deviation was 6.8. The mean years for those responding to the question negatively was 10.5. This standard deviation was 7.5. It appears that there is little difference between the years of experience of administrators and their perception of the adequacy of the evaluation process.

It was felt that if these two variables were indeed related, the mean years for the negative responses would be greater than the mean years for the positive responses. There is, however, no significant difference in the mean years between the two sets of responses.

The Administrators' Training in the Evaluation Process

It was hypothesized that the percentage of principals who have not had training in the evaluation process will be greater than the percentage of principals who have had training in the process.
The data pointed out that the reverse appears to be true. Seventy-five percent of the principals indicated that they have had this training. Using the proportions test confirmed that 75% was significantly different from .50 at the .05 level. The hypothesis is not supported. It appears that a majority of principals have had training in the evaluation process.

Summary

This chapter has attempted to reveal the pattern of survey responses as well as describe the findings from the data collected. The next chapter will hopefully draw these findings together so that they can be realistically meaningful and applicable.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section presents a general discussion of the study and its potential usefulness to school districts and professional development groups who are considering the task of adopting or revising evaluation processes. Some implications drawn from the findings will be suggested by the researcher. Recommendations for future studies will be made.

Summary and Conclusions

Background

The primary question under review in this study was whether teachers, principals, and superintendents see the need for change in the area of performance appraisal and, if so, what is the desired direction of that change. Also in question was the degree to which the three groups were in agreement regarding the change and the direction of change.

Chapter I sought to set a new stage for the school organization. It attempted to visualize the school as a complex organization existing in a complex society. It sought to point out the multitudinous tasks which society expects the school organization to perform. It sought to establish the need for schools to update their organizational skills, particularly those of quality control, to maintain a
balance between cost and benefit. It was suggested that public confidence must be returned to public schools if they are to continue to survive as American institutions. Only through upgrading the quality of instruction can this confidence be returned. It was suggested that this can only be done by upgrading the quality of the personnel involved.

**Literature**

The literature was surveyed to ascertain three situations:
(a) What is the present status of performance appraisal in the schools? (b) What are some directions for change? (c) What are other organizations doing in regard to personnel in general and performance appraisal in particular to enhance their image and improve their product.

It was found in the literature surveyed that most current evaluation processes were ineffective and their usefulness was suspect (Ingils, 1970). The literature suggested also that evaluation served only to produce fear and anxiety (Barth, 1978). The literature, however, offered many directions for change but little commentary or feedback from participants who were experiencing these changes. The literature (McNeil, 1966, 1967; Stocker, 1971) also offered some very concise methods employed in other organizations which seem to be working and/or workable. These methods seem to involve employee participation and involvement in all stages of the task (Barth, 1978; Beecher, 1979; Bodine, 1973; Bolton, 1973; Hastings, 1973; Wagoner & O'Hanlon, 1968; Withall & Wood, 1979; Wolf, 1973).
The schools were identified as perhaps the last foothold of a truly bureaucratic system with side effects that may produce burnout and stress in individuals (Sergiovanni & Carver, 1973). The literature suggested that the best possible situation occurs when the goals of the organization and the needs of the individual are as closely aligned as possible (Getzels & Guba, 1957). It is then possible for the employee to satisfy needs and reach the defined goals at the same time. The question which is raised involves identification of the needs by the personnel and the identification of the organizational goals by representatives of the organization. This study sought to establish that these needs and goals were manifest in the same direction and whether it was possible to achieve either or both through an evaluation process.

The Eupsychian Management Assumptions (Maslow, 1965) were presented as a possible ideal situation which, while perhaps a bit unrealistic and impractical sounding, still present an ideal to be sought. So much so that one writer suggests that any employee who cannot function under those assumptions be hidden in some unobtrusive way within the organization or, in extreme cases, asked to leave.

The literature of the behavioral scientists (Herzberg, 1968; McGregor, 1957) was reviewed and motivational theory was applied to the school setting. The work of Boles (1978) which identifies a management model of input, process, and output was identified and application to school management was discussed. The importance of the personal development output for all organizations, but particularly the school organization, was outlined.
Recent emphasis by organizations such as General Motors and Ford Motor Company as well as organizations which seek to develop techniques to improve general productivity in the United States were outlined and their relevance for the school organization established.

The review of literature discussed important current research such as that of Shinkfield (1977) which in a survey of Michigan teachers and principals gave this researcher the germ of several hypotheses presented in this study. Particularly of interest was his research finding which established that teachers agreed that they should be held accountable for their professional conduct. This finding seemed contrary to current thinking in regard to teacher attitudes toward accountability. Also important was the positive response to performance appraisal itself. Shinkfield's research also seemed to indicate that teachers and principals felt about the same in regard to the above areas as well as other key issues of appraisal. Replication of that finding was sought in this study.

The hypotheses were responses to the literature in that they were the product of questions raised in the reading. The literature revealed a negative attitude to present forms of evaluation (Barth, 1978; Goens & Lange, 1976; Ingils, 1970). It was of interest to ascertain the actual attitude of practitioners. The question of outdated plans and processes was raised when the several actual evaluation processes (see Appendix A) were reviewed and the dates of implementation were noted. This question became of interest in relationship to the innovation occurring in the management practices of other organizations (Ford Motor Company and General Motors Corporation) as
well as the disturbing statements of Olds (1977) and Kleinman (1966, p. 234) which infer that school organizations are dangerously insular to change.

The multiple articles which indicate stress, anxiety, and "burn-out" symptoms of teachers ("Teacher Burnout," 1979; Withall & Wood, 1979), particularly those who have been on the job for some time, led to a question regarding a relationship between evaluation practices for experienced teachers as opposed to the beginning teacher. The same literature led to questions regarding the decline in perception of adequacy of the evaluation process for both teacher and principal groups as they grow in experience.

The primary purpose of this study was related to the literature which suggests that the negative aspect of evaluation dissipates when certain conditions exist ("Evaluating Teachers," 1974; Shinkfield, 1977). Questions were designed to probe the present condition of the art as well as the preferences of the three groups, teachers, principals, and superintendents, in the area of evaluators, methods, purposes, and results. The questions were designed also to measure the degree of tension for change which exists as well as the degree of agreement between the aforementioned three groups. As has been mentioned, the Shinkfield (1977) study indicated that there may be more agreement than was apparent in day-to-day observation or interaction of the groups. This question of agreement was probed also in the examination of preferred committee formation for revision or adoption of evaluation processes.
Lastly, the question of administration training in the evaluation processes was raised by the literature of supervisory practices of other organizations (Ford Motor Company and General Motors Corporation) and the work of Endres (1976), Herman (1973), Magoon and Linkous (1979), Shinkfield (1977), Whithall and Wood (1979), and Wolf (1973). The suggestion in this literature indicated that part, at least, of the negative attitude toward evaluation was due to procedures followed by administrators who were not schooled in positive type practices.

Design

The design of this study was important since no existing instrument could handle the needed data. It was felt that the basic questions involving the present condition of evaluation in school districts, the tension for change, the direction for change, and the degree of agreement between the surveyed groups needed to be replicated exactly on all three questionnaires. The question of present evaluation adequacy was also to be identical. Beyond those central themes the questions remaining would be included on the questionnaires of the group for whom they seemed most relevant. The question regarding the existence of evaluation process for tenured and non-tenured teachers seemed best posed to the superintendents' group, as did the question regarding the length of time an evaluation process had been in effect. It was felt that these questions were more global and could be answered more correctly by the superintendent. The questions on the principal's questionnaire most directly asked
for information which only he/she might know. For example, the num-
ber of years as an administrator and formal training in the evalua-
tion process were requested of the principals. The teacher's ques-
tionnaire included questions which may be known to only the teacher
or to which the teacher may be more open to answer. Included on
their questionnaires were questions regarding the number of years on
tenure and the number of times evaluated during the previous year.

There may have been some small advantage to include some or all
of these questions on all of the questionnaires. It may have been
interesting to compare the answers of superintendents and teachers to
the question regarding whether there is or is not an evaluation pro-
cess for tenured teachers or the answers of principals and teachers
regarding the formal training of principals in the evaluation process.
In an effort to make the questionnaires as short and as easy to
answer as possible these questions were asked only of the group which,
it was felt, could answer without resorting to other material or
records.

Survey

The first mailing of the survey and its return gave the writer
cause to assume that it was well received. Of a total 1,029 ques-
tionnaires sent, 679 were returned within 2 weeks. Another 133 re-
sponses were returned after the second mailing. This response of 79%
would seem to indicate an interest in the general topic. The break-
down of responses by group also is interesting. The superintendents,
who as a group it would seem are less involved directly in the process
and are perhaps less inclined to return surveys, did indeed return the largest percentage, 91%. Of the 212 questionnaires sent, only 19 were not returned. It would seem that this may indicate the interest of the chief supervisor in teacher evaluation as a management technique. Principals also returned at a high rate of 84% showing a great interest, it would seem, in the importance of evaluation as a supervisory practice. Several comments by this group indicated that evaluation is or should be a "major responsibility of the administrator."

The lower 71% return from teachers, while still quite high, can perhaps be partly attributed to the older nature of the sample used. It should be recalled that while the superintendents' and principals' lists were taken from the then current 1979-1980 school year, the teachers' list was taken from a year-old source, 1978-1979. It may be that teachers had moved during that 1 year especially if one takes into consideration that it was a year of declining enrollment and, presumably, many changes might have occurred (see maps in Appendix D).

Data Analysis

In arranging the data, it was found that much information would be readily understandable through observation of relative percentages. These percentages were reported and certain tests were used to determine significance.

The proportions test was used extensively to determine when the percentage observed was or was not significant at a .05 alpha level. This test was useful also in analyzing the percentage responses of
the three groups, superintendents, principals, and teachers, to the matched questions of present versus preferred evaluators, methods of evaluation, purpose, and result. It was also used on the percentages for committee members preferred.

In the case of tenured versus non-tenured evaluation, only simple percentages were reported. The data were so obvious that it was felt that significance testing was unnecessary.

The mean years were figured and compared for the question of administrative perception of the evaluation process and mean years versus number of times (during the past year) evaluated were compared for the question of relationship between number of years on tenure and times evaluated in the past year.

A contingency table from the corrected chi-square test (Yates) was used to report the data in regard to adequacy of the present process as viewed by tenured versus non-tenured teachers.

The question of present evaluators, methods, purpose, and result as opposed to preferred evaluators, methods, purpose, and result was analyzed by use of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. These correlations were made within the group for responses to present perceptions and preferences to each of the questions and also between the groups to determine likeness or difference in response.

In addition, a chi-square test for two independent samples was used for the question in regard to the adequacy of the present process as perceived by each of the groups to determine likeness or difference among the groups.
The tests in each case were chosen for their appropriateness in relationship to the data as well as simplicity of presentation.

Conclusions

An interesting phenomenon was the return of only 19 questionnaires from non-tenured teachers. It would seem that this is a very small number out of 359 returned questionnaires from teachers. The answer may lie in the nature of the sample, but perhaps it is a commentary of the times. Are we indeed mostly a closed profession? During our declining times it can be assumed that we will add fewer and fewer new teachers and, therefore, this small number among such a large sample is not unusual. This observation should perhaps shock us into finding new and better ways to assist our present teachers in any way we can.

The question of evaluation process for non-tenured teachers was, perhaps, answered very predictably. Every superintendent of every school district responding said that there was an evaluation process for non-tenured teachers. This is not surprising since the state of Michigan mandates teacher evaluation for non-tenured teachers. Therefore, a school district reporting otherwise would be out of compliance. The reported 99% of school districts that have evaluation processes for tenured teachers is a bit more surprising. This finding does not seem to be substantiated by observation nor by the comments of teachers. The question then seems to follow regarding the possibility that while 99% of school districts reporting evaluation processes for tenured teachers in place, they are not being carried out.
Another possibility is the nature of the evaluation process. While the superintendent may identify an evaluation process, it may not be distinguishable as such to personnel. The facts of the matter may, it seems, be most difficult to ascertain. The truth may have been more easily arrived at if this question had appeared on all three questionnaires.

While the quality of the process would be difficult to determine, the fact seems to remain that the superintendents of the districts reporting feel that some process for both non-tenured and tenured teachers is desirable. This coupled with the very good response of superintendents to the survey on teacher evaluation seems to imply that superintendents have a great interest in the process of evaluation. Perhaps the time is right for school districts to update and revise the process in view of the fact that the chief executive may be in the mood to lend support.

If the climate for change seems right, at least in view of support of the superintendents, the change appears to be overdue in most school districts. The direction of change in relation to motivation of personnel as well as encouraging the participation of that personnel in the satisfaction of their own needs as well as the attainment of the organizational goals is noted in the literature, particularly that of large corporations (Ford Motor Company and General Motors). The reported mean year of the present evaluation processes in school districts in Michigan is 10.9 years. Seventy-four percent of these school districts have processes which are 5 years old or older. It seems clear that very little of the new thought regarding personnel
motivation is incorporated in the present processes. The observation of Olds (1977) which suggested that educational administration tends to lag many years behind other management fields in areas of change tends to be supported by these data.

If the product, quality of the service, is to be improved, then current research and literature should be of concern to those who are responsible for management of schools. While it may be wise for school districts to hold to traditional values in regard to curriculum, other areas such as organizational and personnel development should be kept as current as possible.

This study was approached with a hypothesis in mind regarding an inverse relationship between the number of years a teacher was on tenure and the number of times evaluation was done. In discussing the needs level of teachers in the review of literature it was observed that the status need level appeared to be the most important need at present as cited in the work done by Trusty and Sergiovanni (1966). It was noted that status can be raised by giving teachers an active role in assessment of goals as well as in their own personal development. Magoon and Linkous (1979) recognized that school climate and thus instructional improvement are affected by teacher morale. Morale is greatly enhanced by positive recognition by supervision as well as a sincere desire on the part of the supervisor to assist the teacher in his/her development which may or may not include improvement in specific and critical areas.

It appeared to the writer when examining teacher evaluation processes that the mandatory evaluation of non-tenured teachers was
being done but evaluation of tenured, older, more experienced teachers was being neglected. If this was indeed the case, then the teachers who most needed recognition, support, and assistance in overcoming the effects of burnout, which tends to begin 5 years into the job (Klienman, 1966), are exactly the teachers most often left to "cultivate his own garden" (Bennis, 1976, pp. 206-207).

With this in mind the data were tested and it was found that the hypothesis could be supported. This leaves us with an indication that the process of appraisal is not being employed to its fullest potential. The teachers most in need of help are those most often neglected by the process. The supposition that once a teacher is on tenure, they should be left alone to fend for themselves is the reverse of all that the recent literature tells us regarding motivation. It supposes that experienced teachers would view evaluation as an invasion of privacy or a slur on their professionalism. This is to ignore the facts that are being presented by those same teachers voiced in articles on "burnout" as well as the industrial organization research into the area of motivation. This writer feels that further sections of this study support this view.

What seemed to be a valid question regarding the perception of the three groups, superintendents, principals, and teachers, of the adequacy of the present process exposed data which were unexpected. While the literature had suggested that there was much dissatisfaction with the present process, the survey did not quite bear this out. In the case of the administrators, both superintendents and principals, the majority perceived that the present system was adequate.
In the case of the teacher group, however, the majority perceived that the process is inadequate.

It would appear that those who manage the process are more willing to stand by its adequacy than those who are managed by the process. These findings may support those who perceive that teachers are interested in the process of evaluation and would indeed welcome a change in opposition to those who suggest that teachers do not want to be evaluated.

When the three groups were compared, however, on this question, it was found that there was no significant difference between the perceptions of the three groups. It is to be noted here that the wording on the survey may have been deceptive. The free comments regarding this question were greater than for any other question on any of the questionnaires. The word "adequate" was seen by many as unclear and ambiguous. The comments were much alike and pointed out the word "adequate" was much different than good or ideal. Other sections of this study seem to make clear the suggestion that while the process may be adequate, it can and should be improved or, perhaps, enlarged in scope. In this same question the idea of adequate for what purpose was apparent. The adequacy of the process would and should be viewed in relation to the purpose. If the present purpose of evaluation is contractual agreement, then almost any evaluation process is "adequate." If the purpose is improvement of instruction, then only a process that accomplished that end is adequate.

The writer recognizes that this question may have been ambiguous and, at the very least, was answered by the survey takers from many
levels of perception.

**Present Evaluators versus Preferred Evaluators**

When the three groups were asked to indicate present evaluators, it was not difficult to see that all groups identified "Principals" by a wide majority. No other group was identified by so great a majority (see Table 40). The perceptions for all of the categories are remarkably alike.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who is the evaluator</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other administrators</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers self-evaluate</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, when looking at the preferred evaluators, it was easy to see that the preferences of the three groups were much alike (see Table 41). Interestingly, when the correlation coefficient was determined between the present perceptions and the preferences of the superintendents it was found that there was no significant difference
between the two lists. This would indicate little tension for change. This same lack of significant difference seems to be apparent when comparing the present perceived list and the preferred list of principals, again, indicating little tension for change among this group. When the comparison was made of the same two lists supplied by the teachers, however, a significant difference was indicated showing some indication of tension for change.

Table 41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who is the evaluator</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other administrators</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers self-evaluate</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the figures are reproduced to show present perceived with preferred, an interesting observation can be made (see Table 42). The two lists from superintendents and the two lists by principals, while radically different, are in relatively the same rank order. That is to say that the present perceived order of importance is in the same order as the preferred order in the superintendents' responses. This same observation is true of the principals' responses.
Table 42
Comparisons of Responses by Percentages of Total Response to the Questions Regarding Present Perceptions of Evaluators and Preferred Evaluators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who is the evaluator</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other administrators</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers self-evaluate</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is not true of the two lists produced by responses of the teachers. Those lists show a marked difference in the order of importance given to the categories. The categories of "Teachers self-evaluate" and of "Peers" advanced far ahead of the category for "Other administrators."

Another observation which can be made from this combined list is the increase of the percentages for all categories. Even the lists from superintendent and principal responses, while remaining constant in rank have increased in percentage. It would appear that all groups are suggesting that while principals should continue to assume the major responsibility for teacher evaluation, other kinds of evaluation input can and should be used.

Investigation of the individual categories also unearths some thought provoking observations. It is apparent that all three groups view principals as the present evaluators and that all three groups prefer that this be the case. This observation would support the findings of Shinkfield (1977) to some degree. It is interesting to note, however, that the percentages dropped slightly from the present perceived list in both the case of superintendents and that of principals. It dropped even more dramatically between the two lists for teachers. These findings also parallel the literature which indicates that the morale of teachers is a direct product of the attitudes and actions of the supervisor (Magoon & Linkous, 1979). Recognition and status apparently come downward, so to speak, from supervisors higher up on the hierarchy. The lists suggest that superintendents and principals would both like to see more involvement on
the part of other administrators. Certainly the principals, who traditionally view teacher evaluation as overwhelmingly time consuming, may see this increased involvement as necessary. The superintendents may also be responding to this problem. It is not, however, clear what kind of "other administrator" may be recommended. It may be that superintendents and principals are referring to assistant principals, at least on a secondary level, but it may also be that "other administrators" refers to a staff person either attached to personnel or specifically responsible for the evaluation of certain kinds of personnel. In any case, the teachers seem to view the present involvement of "other administrators" as about adequate.

The responses to the questions regarding self-evaluation presented several interesting observations. All three groups reported a present perception of nearly the same percentage, between 10.4% and 14.2%. It would seem that in very few places are teachers involved as evaluators at present. What is remarkable is the closeness of perception for the three groups (superintendents 10.4%, principals 14.2%, and teachers, 13.0%). Again remarkable is the large increase in this category on all three preferred lists (superintendents 44.1%, principals 61.7%, and teachers 60.7%). While the superintendents lag just a bit, the principals and teachers increase to within one percentage point of each other. This increase again bears our the research of Shinkfield (1977, p. 120) in the area of perceived need for increased teacher participation in the process. The perception of need for teacher participation also bears out the literature from industry (Ford Motor Company, 1979; Rundell, 1978) and the
work of Barth (1978), Beecher (1979), Bodine (1973), Bolton (1973), Hastings (1973), Wagoner and O'Hanlon (1968), Withall and Wood (1979), and Wolf (1973), all of whom suggest that teachers need to be included as evaluators.

While the other three categories, peers, students, and parents, did not receive any overwhelming support, the figures again indicate an increase for each from perceived present to preferred for all three groups, superintendents, principals, and teachers. The indications seem to be that there is some support for involvement of those in all three categories. Contrary to the Shinkfield (1977) study and contrary to the literature ("Evaluating Teachers," 1974), very low percentages are perceived at present for the three categories while much higher percentage involvement seems to be preferred. This seems especially true in the case of involving peers for the principal and teacher groups.

The data also appear to establish that the three groups are very much alike in their present perception as well as their preferences. If this is the case and change were approached, that change appears to have more support from administration and teachers than may have been originally thought.

Methods—Present and Preferred

The subject of methods seems to follow a comparable pattern to the previous subject of evaluators. It is interesting to note that the superintendents and principals show that they perceive that more variety of methods are being used at present than the teachers
perceive. A third or more superintendents show eight methods which they perceived as being used. These included observation/administrator, post-observation conference, subjective narrative, objective narrative, pre-observation conference, goal setting by teachers and administrators, task-related instrument, and follow-up process. A third or more of the principals show seven methods as presently used including observation/administrator, post-observation conference, subjective narrative, objective narrative, pre-observation conference, goal setting by teachers and administrators, and task-related instrument. The lists are almost identical. The teachers, on the other hand, perceive far fewer methods as being used at present. Only two categories, observation/administrator and post-observation conference, were observed by at least a third or more of them. The rest of the percentages were surprisingly low compared to the lists of both the superintendents and the principals (see Table 43).

It would appear that superintendents and principals either do perceive or wish to perceive methods being used which the teachers do not perceive as in use. The perceptions of the teachers support both this writer's investigation of evaluation processes (Appendix A) and the description of the process from the Robinson (1978) survey.

Table 44 presents the comparisons for the preferred methods.

Observations from Table 45, the combined list, can show some definite trends. All three groups show great increases in most of the methods listed. It would appear that there is, therefore, a growing interest in the use of a greater variety of methods than are used at present. All three lists show a decrease in observation/
Table 43
Comparisons of Responses by Percentage of Total Response to the Question Regarding Present Perceptions of Evaluation Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/teacher only</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/administrator only</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/both</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-observation conference</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation/administrator</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation/peer--group</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation/peer--individual</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-observation conference</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait-related instrument</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-related instrument</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective narrative</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective narrative</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning evaluation</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video tape</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation instrument</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up process</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 44
Comparisons of Responses by Percentage of Total Response to the Question Regarding Preferred Evaluation Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/teachers</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/administrators</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/both</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-observation conference</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation/administrator</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation/peer--group</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation/peer--individual</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-observation conference</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait-related instrument</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-related instrument</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective narrative</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective narrative</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning evaluation</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video tape</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation instrument</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up process</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/teachers</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/administrators</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/both</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-observation conference</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation/administrator</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation/peer—group</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation/peer—individual</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-observation conference</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait-related instrument</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-related instrument</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective narrative</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective narrative</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning evaluation</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video tape</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation instrument</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up process</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
administrator. While this category remains first in rank for the superintendents, it drops to second in rank for both principals and teachers. Goal setting by teachers and administrators becomes first in rank for those two groups.

For all three groups the post-observation conference declines slightly in rank, while the pre-observation conference gains quite substantially in percentages and also, in the case of the teachers, in rank.

The increases between the presently perceived lists and the preferred lists for all three groups are worthy of note for the categories of self-evaluation instrument, student learning evaluation, video tape, and peer group observation. The category of self-evaluation instrument may be expected from the literature, particularly of the behavioral scientists (Herzberg, 1968; Maslow, 1965; McGregor, 1957) and the industrialists (Ford Motor Company, 1979; Rundell, 1978). The other categories are surprising in view of the Shinkfield (1977) study as well as the other literature (Heath & Nielson, 1974; Moon, 1971; Rosenshine, 1970) in the area of student evaluation and Withall and Wood (1979) in the area of video taping.

The questions not answered here are many. While, for example, student learning evaluations may be gaining some support, the "how" of the use of this method remains unanswered. It would seem that there may be a difference of opinion if the student learning was evaluated and the results used only by the teacher to improve instruction or whether, in fact, the learning was evaluated by the school
district and used to evaluate the teacher's effectiveness. The same question of use of the findings would be appropriate for the methods of video taping and peer evaluation.

The fact remains, however, that it appears all three groups are more open to the use of the wider range of methods than are now being employed.

The hypotheses in question were not supported in that for none of the three groups, superintendents, principals, nor teachers, was the difference between the presently perceived lists significant from the preferred list. In all cases the ranks of the two lists were remarkably alike. There did not seem to be much tension for change. The hypothesis which sought to ascertain likeness or difference among the three groups were found to be significant. This would lead to the fourth observation that superintendents, principals, and teachers perceive present methods about the same and that their preferences also fall into the categories in about the same general rank manner. This must be pointed to as an important observation. The degree of agreement between the groups seems to be high and this should make working together far easier whether on revision, adoption, or simply execution of whatever evaluation process is in existence. The findings support the Shinkfield (1977) study which this study sought to replicate in part in this hypothesis.

Present and Preferred Purpose of Evaluation

Since there appeared not to be a significant difference between the present perceptions of the superintendents and principals and
their preferences, the hypotheses which stated that there would be a difference was not supported. It seems then, for these two groups, there is little tension for change in regard to the purpose of evaluation. In the case of the teachers, however, there was a significant difference observed and there does seem to be some tension for change. Some observations which may account for these conclusions may be evident in looking at the percentages of the various groups (see Tables 46, 47, and 48).

Table 46
Comparisons of Responses by Percentage of Total Response to the Question Regarding Present Perceptions of the Purpose of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of instruction</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist teachers in identifying areas needing improvement</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect the competent teacher</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward the competent teacher</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate the incompetent teacher</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust pay scale</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual requirement</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 47
Comparisons of Responses by Percentage of Total Response to the Question Regarding Preference of the Purpose of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of instruction</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist teachers in identifying areas needing improvement</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect the competent teacher</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward the competent teacher</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate the incompetent teacher</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust pay scale</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual requirement</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was hypothesized that all groups would see "Contractual requirement" as the present purpose. In fact, all three groups saw this category as the present purpose in about the same percentage proportion. However, for the teachers' group, it ranked number one while in the superintendents' group it ranked fourth, and in the principals' group it ranked third. It is also interesting that on the preferred lists of all three groups "Contractual requirements" fell to sixth position. Second to the bottom only slightly higher than "Pay adjustment" which was seen by all groups as the lowest priority for purpose of evaluation. It would appear that all groups feel that this category may be too often the purpose of evaluation and would seek to diminish its importance.
Table 48

Comparisons of Responses by Percentages of Total Response to the Questions Regarding Both Present Perceptions and Preferences of Purpose of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of instruction</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist teachers in identifying areas needing improvement</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect the competent teacher</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward the competent teacher</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate the incompetent teacher</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust pay scale</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual requirement</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All groups showed strong percentages in favor of improvement of instruction and assisting the teacher as the important purposes of evaluation. The notable differences here were that the superintendents and principals report these purposes as already operating while the teachers report less evidence of that actually occurring. It is possible that, since most evaluation policies in most, if not all, of the school districts reviewed (see Appendix A) indicate that improvement of instruction is the avowed purpose of evaluation, the superintendents and principals were responding not with what is but with what is stated as being. It is also possible that these two groups genuinely believe that this is their purpose. Whichever is the case, teachers are apparently not seeing the avowed purpose in the same way.

An interesting observation can be made by looking at the percentages for the category "Eliminate the incompetent teacher." Support for this purpose was quite high in both lists, present and preferred, for the superintendents and principals groups. This would seem to indicate that many feel that this is a viable purpose and that it is also now part of the process. The percentages from the teachers' list are noteworthy since less than a fourth of the teachers see elimination of incompetent teachers as part of the process now but almost half of them feel it should be part of the process.

Once again the data show that the three groups are very much in agreement as to what the purposes of evaluation should be. The coefficients between the three groups on both lists show a relationship between the sets of responses.
Present and Preferred Results of Evaluation

The data tested again showed that there was no significant difference between the present perceived list and the preferred list for neither the superintendents nor the principals. There was significant difference found, however, between those two lists for teachers. It would, therefore, appear that there is little tension for change among the superintendents and principals but that this tension is apparent among the teachers. It is true, when analyzing the percentages for the groups, that the perceived list and the preferred list for both superintendents and principals show about the same ranks for all categories (see Tables 49, 50, and 51). Both of these groups show low rank for "Nothing" as a result of teacher evaluation at present. The teachers, on the other hand, ranked this category second only to "Suggestions for improvement." The three groups all rank "Nothing" on the bottom of the preferred list. While not a large percentage, many more, one-fourth of the teachers felt that evaluation often had no result and may, therefore, be useless and perhaps frustrating. This category accounted for the largest difference among the three groups and may lead to support of the literature of Barth (1978) and Ingils (1970) regarding the waste of time which much that goes by the name of teacher evaluation has become.

Except for this one category, all other categories gained percentages from all three groups. Suggestions for improvement and improvement of instruction changed places in rank for the superintendents and principals. This may show that all three groups would
Table 49
Comparisons of Responses by Percentages of Total Response to the Question Regarding Present Perceptions of the Results of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay adjustment</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal of incompetent teacher</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service programs</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions for improvement</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of instruction</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction for teachers</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased personal development for teachers</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 50
Comparisons of Responses by Percentage of Total Response to the Question Regarding Preference of the Result of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay adjustment</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal of incompetent teacher</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service programs</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions for improvement</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of instruction</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction for teachers</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased personal development for teachers</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 51
Comparisons of Responses by Percentages of Total Response to the Questions Regarding Both Present Perceptions and Preferences of Result of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay adjustment</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal of incompetent teacher</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service programs</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions for improvement</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of instruction</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction for teachers</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased personal development for teachers</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
prefer to see more results from the evaluation process.

While all three groups saw improvement of instruction and suggestions for improvement as the most important results, the principals and teachers saw job satisfaction for teachers and personal development of teachers as very important as well. The percentages in these last two categories from the superintendents were as high or higher than the principals and teachers which seems to show high interest in these areas from them as well. They, however, ranked dismissal of incompetent teachers even higher. It would appear that there is a growing awareness of the possibility of job satisfaction and increased personal development as viable results of performance appraisal. And, perhaps, from this awareness one can extrapolate an awareness of these two categories to the health of the educational process itself (Boles, 1978).

The coefficients between the different groups on each of the lists showed a relationship between the responses. Once again this may indicate more agreement between management and personnel in the matter of teacher evaluation and its processes than may have been suspected, but which were indicated by the Shinkfield (1977) study.

**Evaluation Committee**

The hypothesis investigated in this survey suggested that all three groups, superintendents, principals, and teachers, would agree that administrators and teachers should form the committees for adoption and/or revision of the evaluation process. The results substantiate this hypothesis in two ways. All three groups gave very
high percentages to both administrators and teachers as the committee members ranking them either first or second (see Table 52) and comparatively low percentages to all of the other categories. The three groups, when compared with each other, had significantly high coefficients. There appears to be a great deal of agreement on this subject.

Table 52
Comparisons of Responses by Percentage of the Total Response to the Question Regarding the Formulation of Committees to Adopt or Revise Evaluation Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board members</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of business community</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside consultants</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union officials</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentages, however, are much higher than this writer would have expected in view of the literature for the categories, "Board members," "Students," "Parents," and, for principals and teachers at least, "Union officials." In respect to the category, "Outside
consultant," the percentages are lower than one may have expected given the number of school districts which have selected to have this kind of assistance.

Non-tenured and Tenured Teachers View Adequacy of Present Process

The results of this investigation were interesting, particularly in regard to the uneven nature of the responses. Only 19 of the 343 total responses were from non-tenured teachers. This factor alone may lead us to an observation about the mean years of service of Michigan teachers. It may well be that as enrollment declines, the number of non-tenured teachers also declines. Michigan may be generally at the point where few new teachers are being hired and general cut-backs have hit first and second year teachers so that the mean of the service years is on the rise. It may, of course, be a coincidence. The sample, however, is relatively large enough to preclude coincidence. It might be interesting to do a comparison study of the 1970 and 1980 years to determine the nature of the two populations of school personnel. Given the data collected for this study in hand, it does not appear that there is any basis to believe that tenured teachers view evaluation processes as less adequate than do non-tenured teachers.

Administrative Perception of Adequacy of Evaluation Process

Observing the mean of 10.98 years and the standard deviation, 6.8, for service of the principals who agreed that the present process
of evaluation was adequate and comparing these figures to the mean years, 10.5, and standard deviation, 7.5, for those who chose to report the present system as inadequate leaves little doubt that the years of service does not affect the perception of adequacy of the evaluation process. It might be noted that 70% of those who viewed the process as adequate have been administrators from 4.2 years to 17.8 years while 70% of those who viewed the process as inadequate ranged from 3 years to 18 years. This second group includes a slightly wider span of service years. It seemed interesting that the slightly newer administrator seemed to be included in the second group who viewed the process as inadequate. It may be of some value to pursue these data in relationship to the more recent training that the newer administrators may be receiving in regard to the supervision of personnel.

Administrative Training

It appears that three-fourths of the principals reported that they had some training in the evaluation process. This finding was quite unexpected in view of the literature (Herman, 1973; Withall & Wood, 1979; Wolf, 1973) which often cites the ineptness of the evaluators as problematic to the process. In view of this writer's personal interviews with principals in Utica, Michigan, in 1977 who unanimously listed lack of training in the evaluation process, the observation may be made that while training in the evaluation process is in evidence it is not helpful training in reality or the process to which one is trained does not lead to the results one hopes for.
Either possibility is speculation.

Practical Implications of the Findings

It appears clear to the writer that there is much more interest in the evaluation process and in performance appraisal than seems generally to be recognized by school people. It seems generally that more rather than less evaluation is wanted. While the administrative groups appear to perceive present evaluation as adequate, they as well as the teachers who do not agree on the adequacy prefer the use of a wider variety of evaluators, methods, and results. All three of the groups seem willing to experiment with different methods and all three groups see the possibility of different combinations of evaluators.

Support was readily given to improvement of instruction as an important purpose of evaluation and to committees which include administrators as well as teachers.

Support was also given to greater teacher participation in the process both as joint goal setters with the administrators and as self-evaluators.

The greatest implication and one which this study sought to ascertain is the degree of agreement among the three groups. Anyone seeking to develop a new or revised evaluation process and fearing the conflict which may ensue between management and personnel should be encouraged by these findings. Where disagreement is evident it is more generally a matter of present perceptions of the process. The preferences are remarkably alike.
It would seem worthwhile for those responsible for performance appraisal and/or professional development to consider the following:

1. In view of the length of time most evaluation processes have been in use, it may be advisable to review the effectiveness of the process.

2. Any committee formed to revise or adopt an evaluation process should include both administrators and teachers.

3. Principals are regarded as the primary evaluators, but other evaluative input which would assist the principal or the teacher in arriving at the goal of improvement of instruction should be considered.

4. Observation by the principal should be coupled with joint goal setting by the principal and the teacher.

5. A variety of methods may be employed to arrive at the goal of improvement of instruction.

6. The purpose of evaluation should be improvement of instruction.

7. The result of evaluation should be improvement of instruction.

8. The evaluation process may be a starting place to identify areas which are in need of improvement for individual teachers.

9. Job satisfaction and personal development are increasing in importance as results of evaluation.

10. Teachers who have been on the job the longest have been most often neglected, for whatever reason, by the lapse in evaluation.
Recommendations

It would, of course, be useful to duplicate this study with other populations. The more input from the actual practitioner that can be obtained would render the evidence more valid. It would also give assurance to those interested that certain results found here were acceptable and practical.

It would also be interesting to do comparison studies between districts which offer participatory goal setting and evaluation and those that do not. These studies would be difficult in that they would necessitate a measurement of motivation, job satisfaction, and personal development in relation to a productivity variable. The school organization has typically found it difficult to measure productivity. Perhaps some concentrated effort is necessary to determine a measure of this kind before it would be possible to determine what increases productivity and what does not.

Further studies may reveal if and how particular methods, using the methods offered here, may increase the effectiveness of the service. For example, does the use of video equipment for evaluation increase teacher effectiveness and what is the best use of the equipment to produce the required effect. Any of the methods, which in this study are only mentioned as possibilities, could and perhaps should be studied to determine usefulness. This fertile field of possible methods alone could generate numerous studies each of which might add to our understanding of the process of evaluation. It may also be interesting to study each of the methods in relationship to
its effect on motivation as well as productivity. This latter again remembering that a measure of productivity is needed.

Numerous studies could explore possible uses of evaluators. Perhaps there is a way in which parent input could be used, other that the P.T.A. program or terror telephone calls, that would impact the service. The students may be a source of input the value of which is as yet unexplored. The universities and colleges are, in many cases, beginning to require feedback, usually at the end of the course, by the clients themselves. The study of these data is just beginning to be available in journals and much more observation needs to be done. Perhaps there are ways to use it effectively and also ways to use student input in the pre-college years.

Further study might reveal some interesting findings comparing school districts which state that they have evaluation processes and the manner in which these evaluation processes are used. Further study into the training process of evaluators and observers may also be revealing.

It was remarked earlier in this study that the question of adequacy may have been misleading. It would be interesting to go back and use language and categories for this question which may be more enlightening.

The question of purpose of evaluation, of course, leads to the question of purpose of formal education. Perhaps, as we begin to realize the toll that changing technology is taking on the ever tradition-conscious school organization we will want to study alternative ways to educate our young. Perhaps there are better ways to
accomplish the purpose of education and, if this is the case, we may need to turn our energies from what has been and concentrate on what is. Future studies may need to focus then on the organization of the school organization. And this may not be a proper outgrowth of this study for this would take the work of change agents, innovators, and dreamers rather than researchers.

Most of those surveyed in this study agree that the result of evaluation should be "Improvement of instruction." More work needs to be done in the area of defining improvement of instruction. Much has already been done and the results, in my opinion, are confusing and vague. Is it more instruction, better instruction, or some quality as yet undefined? What is better instruction? Much of the current investigation and literature on this subject seems to leave one with the feeling that the art of good teaching is undefinable. There is danger in that assumption. The danger is that we will stop questioning and therefore miss the key, the breakthrough. The truth remains that we can evaluate for eternity, but unless we define good teaching which translates itself to quality service, we will not really know what it is we are looking for. Unlike those who suggest that we stop evaluating because of this indecision, this writer suggests that we continue and that we do the job thoroughly because only by watching the actual process can we ever hope to know what part of the process is most effective and how to cultivate it. Further study of the process itself is therefore a natural direction of educational researchers.
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School District Evaluation Systems Reviewed
Center Line Public Schools
6775 Ten Mile Rd.
Centerline, MI 48015

Chippewa Valley Schools
19120 Cass
Mt. Clemens, MI 48043

Clintondale Community Schools
35100 Little Mack
Mt. Clemens, MI 48043

Grosse Pointe Public Schools
389 St. Clair
Grosse Pointe, MI 48230

L'anse Creuse Public Schools
36727 Jefferson
Mt. Clemens, MI

Lansing School District
519 W. Kalamazoo
Lansing, MI 48933

Macomb County Community College
12 Mile Rd.
Warren, MI 48090

Community Unit School District #203
DuPage and Will Counties
Naperville, IL

Utica Community Schools
52188 Van Dyke
Utica, MI 48087

Van Dyke Public Schools
22100 Federal
Warren, MI

Warren Consolidated Schools
29900 Lorraine Blvd.
Warren, MI 48093

Warren Woods Public Schools
27100 Schoenherr
Warren, MI 48093

Iowa Association of School Boards
707 Savings and Loan Building
Des Moines, IA 50309
Appendix B

Covering Letters
February 11, 1980

Dear

Many organizations today are reviewing their policies and procedures in regard to personnel appraisal. It seems important to determine what is now being done in school districts and also to ask educators what process they see as most valuable.

This survey is being sent to a random sample of teachers, principals, and superintendents in Michigan. The results should suggest answers to many questions which may help school districts who wish to redesign their evaluation procedures in the future.

I have requested and received permission to share with you the following comments:

"The survey has been reviewed by C. Wm. Hanichen, President of the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals, and he encourages all participants to respond. The results will be shared with all MASSP members and should prove beneficial to school districts across the state."

Your survey, which is numbered, will be checked against a list for follow-up and then the number will be removed. The researcher collected the list, typed the envelopes and placed the enclosures. The incoming surveys will be checked and numbers removed only by the researcher before the data is tallied.

It is your valuable input which can make this study useful. I hope to publish the results in a MASSP publication early in the 1980 school year.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Sincerely,

JoAnn A. Simon
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Educational Leadership

Uldis Smidchens, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Educational Leadership
February 11, 1980

Dear

Many organizations today are reviewing their policies and procedures in regard to personnel appraisal. It seems important to determine what is now being done in school districts and also to ask educators what process they see as most valuable.

This survey is being sent to a random sample of teachers, principals, and superintendents in Michigan. The results should suggest answers to many questions which may help school districts who wish to redesign their evaluation procedures in the future.

I have requested and received permission to share with you the following comments:

"This survey has been reviewed by Keith Geiger, President of the Michigan Education Association, and he encourages all participants to respond. The results will be available to MEA members and should prove beneficial to further planning."

Your survey, which is numbered, will be checked against a list for follow-up and then the number will be removed. The researcher collected the list, typed the envelopes and placed the enclosures. The incoming surveys will be checked and numbers removed only by the researcher before the data is tallied.

It is your valuable input which can make this study useful. I hope to publish the results in a MASSP publication early in the 1980 school year.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Sincerely,

JoAnn A. Simon
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Educational Leadership

Uldis Smidchens, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Educational Leadership
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February 11, 1980

Dear,

Many organizations today are reviewing their policies and procedures in regard to personnel appraisal. It seems important to determine what is now being done in school districts and also to ask educators what process they see as most valuable.

This survey is being sent to a random sample of teachers, principals, and superintendents in Michigan. The results should suggest answers to many questions which may help school districts who wish to redesign their evaluation procedures in the future.

I have requested and received permission to share with you the following comments:

"The survey has been reviewed by Don Elliott, Executive Director of the Michigan Association of School Administrators, and he encourages all participants to respond. The results will be shared with all M.A.S.A. members and should prove beneficial to school districts across the state."

Your survey, which is numbered, will be checked against a list for follow-up and then the number will be removed. The researcher collected the list, typed the envelopes and placed the enclosures. The incoming surveys will be checked and numbers removed only by the researcher before the data is tallied.

It is your valuable input which can make this study useful. I hope to publish the results in a MASSP publication early in the 1980 school year.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Sincerely,

JoAnn A. Simon
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Educational Leadership

Uldis Smidchens, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Educational Leadership
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Appendix C

Teacher, Principal, and Superintendent Questionnaires
Superintendent's Survey

1. Does your school district have any evaluation process at the present time for
   ( ) Yes  ( ) No  non-tenured teachers
   ( ) Yes  ( ) No  tenured teachers

2. How long has the present process of evaluation been in effect?
   _______ years.

3.0 Please check as many or as few answers as apply in the following.

3.1 Which of the following are teacher evaluators in your district?
   ( ) Principals
   ( ) Other administrators
   ( ) Peers
   ( ) Teachers self-evaluate
   ( ) Students
   ( ) Parents

3.2 Which of the following methods of evaluation are used in your district?
   ( ) Goal setting—teacher only
   ( ) Goal setting—administrator(s) only
   ( ) Goal setting—administrator(s)/teacher together
   ( ) Pre-observation conference
   ( ) Observation/principal or other administrator
   ( ) Observation/peer—group
   ( ) Observation/peer—individual
   ( ) Post-observation conference
   ( ) Trait-related instrument (personality factors rated)
   ( ) Task-related instrument (job factors rated)
   ( ) Subjective narrative
   ( ) Objective narrative
   ( ) Student learning evaluation
   ( ) Video tape
   ( ) Self-evaluation instrument
   ( ) Follow-up process
   ( ) Other (specify) ____________________________

3.3 For what purpose does your school district use teacher evaluation?
   ( ) Improvement of instruction
   ( ) Assist the teacher in identifying the areas that need improvement
   ( ) Protect the competent teacher
( ) Reward the competent teacher
( ) Promote the competent teacher
( ) Eliminate the incompetent teacher
( ) Adjust pay scale
( ) Contractual requirement
( ) Other (specify) _________________________________________

3.4 What is the usual result(s) of teacher evaluation in your school district?
( ) Pay adjustment
( ) Promotion
( ) Dismissal of incompetent teachers
( ) In-service programs
( ) Suggestions for improvement
( ) Improvement of instruction
( ) Increased job satisfaction for teachers
( ) Help teachers add to their personal development
( ) Nothing
( ) Other (specify) _________________________________________

4.0 Please check as many or as few answers as apply in the following.

4.1 If you were to adopt or revise your teacher evaluation process at this time which of the following would you want on the committee?
( ) Board member(s)
( ) Administrator(s)
( ) Teacher(s)
( ) Student(s)
( ) Parent(s)
( ) Member(s) of the business community
( ) Outside consultant(s)
( ) Union Officers(s)
( ) Other (specify) _________________________________________

4.2 Which of the following would you include as teacher evaluator(s)?
( ) Principals
( ) Other administrators
( ) Peers
( ) Teachers self-evaluate
( ) Students
( ) Parents
( ) Other (specify) _________________________________________

4.3 If you were to adopt or revise your teacher evaluation process at this time which of the following methods would you like to see used?
( ) Goal setting—teacher only
( ) Goal setting—administrator(s) only
Goal setting—administrator(s)/teacher together
Pre-observation conference
Observation/principal or other administrator(s)
Observation/peer—group
Observation/peer—individual
Post-observation conference
Trait-related instrument (personality factors rated)
Task-related instrument (job factors rated)
Subjective narrative
Objective narrative
Student learning evaluation
Video tape
Self-evaluation instrument
Follow-up instrument
Other (specify)

4.4 What should be the purpose, in your opinion, of a new evaluation process?

Improvement of instruction
Assist the teacher in identifying the areas that need improvement
Protect the competent teacher
Reward the competent teacher
Promote the competent teacher
Eliminate the incompetent teacher
Adjust pay scale
Contractual requirement
Other (specify)

4.5 What should be the result, in your opinion, of teacher evaluation?

Pay adjustment
Promotion
Dismissal of incompetent teachers
In-service programs
Suggestions for improvement
Improvement of instruction
Increased job satisfaction for teachers
Help teachers add to their personal development
Nothing
Other (specify)

5.0 How would you rate your present system of teacher evaluation?

Adequate
Inadequate

Comments:

Thank you for your assistance.
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Principal's Survey

1. How many years have you been an administrator? _______

2. Have you had formal training (course work, workshop, etc.) in evaluation of personnel? ( ) Yes ( ) No

3.0 Please check as many or as few answers as apply in the following:

3.1 Which of the following are teacher evaluators in your school?
   ( ) Principals
   ( ) Other administrators
   ( ) Peers
   ( ) Teachers self-evaluate
   ( ) Students
   ( ) Parents
   ( ) Other (specify) ________________________________

3.2 Which of the following methods of evaluation are used in your school?
   ( ) Goal setting--teacher only
   ( ) Goal setting--administrator(s) only
   ( ) Goal setting--administrator(s)/teacher together
   ( ) Pre-observation conference
   ( ) Observation/principal or other administrator
   ( ) Observation/peer--individual
   ( ) Observation/peer--group
   ( ) Post-observation conference
   ( ) Trait-related instrument (personality factors rated)
   ( ) Task-related instrument (job factors rated)
   ( ) Subjective narrative
   ( ) Objective narrative
   ( ) Student learning evaluation
   ( ) Video tape
   ( ) Self-evaluation instrument
   ( ) Follow-up process
   ( ) Other (specify) ________________________________

3.3 For what purpose does your school district use teacher evaluation?
   ( ) Improvement of instruction
   ( ) Assist the teacher in identifying the areas that need improvement
   ( ) Protect the competent teacher
   ( ) Reward the competent teacher
   ( ) Promote the competent teacher
   ( ) Eliminate the incompetent teacher
   ( ) Adjust pay scale
   ( ) Contractual requirement
   ( ) Other (specify) ________________________________

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
3.4 What is the usual result(s) of teacher evaluation in your school district?

( ) Pay adjustment
( ) Promotion
( ) Dismissal of incompetent teachers
( ) In-service programs
( ) Suggestions for improvement
( ) Improvement of instruction
( ) Increased job satisfaction for teachers
( ) Help teachers add to their personal development
( ) Nothing
( ) Other (specify)______________________________________

4.0 Please check as many or as few answers as apply in the following:

4.1 If a new or revised teacher evaluation process were to be adopted in your district at this time, which of the following should be on the committee?

( ) Board member(s)
( ) Administrator(s)
( ) Teacher(s)
( ) Student(s)
( ) Parent(s)
( ) Member(s) of the business community
( ) Outside consultant(s)
( ) Union official(s)
( ) Other (specify)______________________________________

4.2 Which of the following, in your opinion, should be included as teacher evaluator(s)?

( ) Principals
( ) Other administrators
( ) Peers
( ) Teachers self-evaluate
( ) Students
( ) Parents
( ) Other (specify)______________________________________

4.3 If your district were to revise your teacher evaluation process at this time which of the following methods would you like to see used?

( ) Goal setting--teacher only
( ) Goal setting--administrator(s) only
( ) Goal setting--administrator(s)/teacher together
( ) Pre-observation conference
( ) Observation/principal or other administrator
( ) Observation/peer--individual
( ) Observation/peer--group
( ) Post-observation conference
4.4 What should be the purpose, in your opinion, of a new evaluation process?

( ) Improvement of instruction
( ) Assist the teacher in identifying the areas that need improvement
( ) Protect the competent teacher
( ) Reward the competent teacher
( ) Eliminate the incompetent teacher
( ) Adjust the pay scale
( ) Contractual requirement
( ) Other (specify) ________________________________

4.5 What should be the result, in your opinion, of teacher evaluation?

( ) Pay adjustment
( ) Promotion
( ) Dismissal of incompetent teachers
( ) In-service program
( ) Suggestions for improvement
( ) Improvement of instruction
( ) Increased job satisfaction for teachers
( ) Help teachers add to their personal development
( ) Nothing
( ) Other (specify) ________________________________

5.0 How would you rate your present system of teacher evaluation?

( ) Adequate
( ) Inadequate

Comments:

Thank you for your assistance.
Teacher's Survey

1.0 Are you a teacher with tenure? ( ) Yes ( ) No

If your answer to number 1 was yes, please answer numbers 1.1 and 1.2. If not, please go on to question number 2.

1.1 How many years have you been a tenured teacher? _________

1.2 How many times were you formally evaluated during the past year? _________

2.0 Please check as many or as few answers as apply in the following:

2.1 Which of the following are teacher evaluators in your school?

( ) Principals
( ) Other administrators
( ) Peers
( ) Teachers self-evaluate
( ) Students
( ) Parents
( ) Other (specify) _____________________________

2.2 Which of the following methods of evaluation are used in your school?

( ) Goal setting--teacher only
( ) Goal setting--administrator(s) only
( ) Goal setting--administrator(s)/teacher together
( ) Pre-observation conference
( ) Observation/principal or other administrator
( ) Observation/peer--individual
( ) Observation/peer--group
( ) Post-observation conference
( ) Trait-related instrument (personality factors rated)
( ) Task-related instrument (job factors rated)
( ) Subjective narrative
( ) Objective narrative
( ) Student learning evaluation
( ) Video tape
( ) Self-evaluation instrument
( ) Follow-up process
( ) Other (specify) _____________________________

2.3 For what purpose does your school district use teacher evaluation?

( ) Improvement of instruction
( ) Assist the teacher in identifying the areas that need improvement
( ) Protect the competent teacher
2.4 What is the usual result(s) of teacher evaluation in your school district?

( ) Pay adjustment
( ) Promotion
( ) Dismissal of incompetent teachers
( ) In-service programs
( ) Suggestions for improvement
( ) Improvement of instruction
( ) Increased job satisfaction for teachers
( ) Help teachers add to their personal development
( ) Nothing
( ) Other (specify) __________________________________________________________________

3.0 Please check as many or as few answers as apply in the following:

3.1 If a new or revised teacher evaluation process were to be adopted in your district at this time, which of the following should be on the committee?

( ) Board member(s)
( ) Administrator(s)
( ) Teacher(s)
( ) Student(s)
( ) Parent(s)
( ) Member(s) of the business community
( ) Outside consultant(s)
( ) Union official(s)
( ) Other (specify) __________________________________________________________________

3.2 Which of the following, in your opinion, should be included as teacher evaluator(s)?

( ) Principals
( ) Other administrators
( ) Peers
( ) Teachers self-evaluate
( ) Students
( ) Parents
( ) Other (specify) __________________________________________________________________

3.3 If your district were to revise your teacher evaluation process at this time which of the following methods would you like to see used?

( ) Goal setting--teacher only
( ) Goal setting--administrator(s) only
( ) Goal setting—administrator(s)/teacher together
( ) Pre-observation conference
( ) Observation/principal or other administrator
( ) Observation/peer—individual
( ) Observation/peer—group
( ) Post-observation conference
( ) Trait-related instrument (personality factors rated)
( ) Task-related instrument (job factors rated)
( ) Subjective narrative
( ) Objective narrative
( ) Student learning evaluation
( ) Video tape
( ) Self-evaluation instrument
( ) Follow-up process
( ) Other (specify)

3.4 What should be the purpose, in your opinion, of a new evaluation process?

( ) Improvement of instruction
( ) Assist the teacher in identifying the areas that need improvement
( ) Protect the competent teacher
( ) Reward the competent teacher
( ) Promote the competent teacher
( ) Eliminate the incompetent teacher
( ) Adjust the pay scale
( ) Contractual requirement
( ) Other (specify)

3.5 What should be the result, in your opinion, of teacher evaluation?

( ) Pay adjustment
( ) Promotion
( ) Dismissal of incompetent teachers
( ) In-service programs
( ) Suggestions for improvement
( ) Improvement of instruction
( ) Increased job satisfaction for teachers
( ) Help teachers add to their personal development
( ) Nothing
( ) Other (specify)

4.0 How would you rate your present system of teacher evaluation?

( ) Adequate
( ) Inadequate

Comments:

Thank you for your assistance.
Appendix D

Questionnaires Returned by Area
Areas of Superintendent Survey Responses
Areas of Superintendent Survey Nonresponses
Areas of Principal Survey Responses
Areas of Principal Survey Nonresponses
Areas of Teacher Survey Responses
Appendix E

Summary of Questions Used to Survey Hypotheses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses (as outlined in Statement of the Hypotheses, pp.)</th>
<th>Questions on survey instrument (see Appendix C)</th>
<th>Superintendent</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The use of evaluation processes currently</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The present evaluation processes are outdated</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The evaluation process as a means to improvement of instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The adequacy of the present evaluation system</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Who should be the evaluators</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What should be the methods of evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What should be the purpose of evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What should be the result of evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Who should form the committees to revise or adopt evaluation processes</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The adequacy of the present processes as viewed by tenured versus non-tenured teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The administrator's perception of the evaluation process</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The administrator's training in the evaluation process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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