

**PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED SCHOOL PERSONNEL
REGARDING THE VALUE OF INDICATORS
USED IN THE EVALUATION OF
TEACHERS IN OKLAHOMA**

By

JAMIE MILLER KETCHUM

Bachelor of Science

Southwestern Oklahoma State University

Weatherford, Oklahoma

1986

**Submitted to the faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 1993**

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to show my appreciation to those individuals who have supported and helped me throughout this Master of Science degree program: to thank God for giving me the capabilities, dedication, and commitment to start this project and see me through; to thank my son, Zachary, for being that bright smiling face to keep me going when the end did not seem possible; for some very special and dear friends, George, Barbara, and Jami, for helping me and supporting me, and many other Christian friends as well; for my parents and grandmother for their continued support and love; for Dr. Terry, Dr. Key, Debbie White, and Paul Simon, plus many others who enhanced and contributed to my college education; to Kay Porter for helping and typing this paper, for making the end result such a success; just to thank you for all of your support, love, help and contributions to myself and Zachary. Without you, our journey would not have been possible. God bless each of you, and I hope I can be a small light to someone also, in their time of need.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	1
Purpose of this Study	2
Scope and Limitations	3
Assumptions	4
Definition of Terms	4
Significance of the Study	5
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	7
Early Evaluation Attempts	9
Current Methods of Evaluation	12
New Trends in Evaluation.	15
III. METHODOLOGY.	18
Preliminary Procedures.	18
Choice of Research Design	19
Choice of Population and Sample	19
Development of the Questionnaire.	20
Choice of Testing Statistics.	20
Collection of Data.	21
Analysis of Data.	22
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA.	23
Description of Study Participants	24
Analysis and Results of Research.	26
Research Question One.	28
Research Question Two.	30
Research Question Three.	32
Research Question Four	34
Research Question Five	36
Analysis of Response by Participants to Open-Ended Question on the Questionnaire.	36
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION	41
Findings.	42
Conclusions	45
Recommendations	46
Implications.	48

Chapter	Page
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	50
APPENDIXES	53
APPENDIX A - INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FORM	54
APPENDIX B - SUPERINTENDENT'S LETTER	56
APPENDIX C - PRINCIPAL'S LETTER.	58
APPENDIX D - MINIMUM CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING PERFORMANCE INDICATORS.	60
APPENDIX E - QUESTIONNAIRE	63

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Number of Questionnaires and Percent Returned	25
II. Distribution of Participants by Teaching Experience .	27
III. Distribuiton of Participants by Highest Degree Held.	27
IV. Perceived Mean Values of Teacher Management Indicators.	29
V. Perceived Mean Values of Teacher Instructional Indicators.	31
VI. Perceived Mean Values of Teacher Product Indicators .	33
VII. Perceived Mean Values of Professional Development Indicators.	35
VIII. Perceptions of Ranking Order of the Indicators As A Part of the Minimum Criteria of Effective Teaching Performance.	37
IX. Suggestions From Participants on the Elimination of Indicators As A Part of the Minimum Criteria of Effective Teaching Performance	38
X. Suggestions of Additional Items to be Added to the Indicators As A Part of the Minimum Criteria of Effective Teaching Performance	40

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

When assessing current trends in the education field, little can compare with the emphasis being placed on teacher evaluation in the State of Oklahoma. In response to a statewide concern for quality education, legislation commonly referred to as House Bill 1466 was put into effect by the Education Reform Act of 1985, revised in 1988. Since 1990, education professionals have joined forces to enhance and administer a commonly known tool . . . evaluation.

The need for quality teachers in America's schools was of extreme importance in order to compete in a global market. Thus, educators need to be continually evaluating current methods and developing better ones. With the increased emphasis on teacher effectiveness, a thorough understanding of the relationship between teaching and learning was necessary, which leads to the need for a tool assessing instructor performance, using indicators as a part of the minimum criteria of effective teaching performance.

The Problem

By legislative mandate, (House Bill 1466), beginning in the Fall term of 1990, all personnel within the school district were to be observed a minimum of three times the first year of teaching, while probationary teachers were to be observed a minimum

of twice a year, and career teachers were to be observed a minimum of once a year. Teacher evaluations were designed to serve a two-fold purpose: to measure teacher competence and to foster professional development and growth (Boyd, 1989). Accountability of instructors within the school districts has become a major focus over the past few years. The teacher evaluation indicators approved by the Professional Standards Board and adopted by the Oklahoma State Board of Education addressed these goals.

The problem, therefore, was the need to assess the indicators currently used for the process known by administrators and teachers, as evaluation.

Purpose of this Study

The purpose of this study was to analyze the perceptions of the value of indicators used in the evaluation of teachers by administrators and teachers who teach in selected central Oklahoma school districts. To accomplish this purpose, the following research questions were to be answered:

1. Are there any differences in the way school administrators and teachers perceive the value of the Teacher Management Indicators as a part of the minimum criteria for effective teaching performance?

2. Are there any differences in the way school administrators and teachers perceive the value of the Teacher Instructional Indicators as a part of the minimum criteria for effective teaching performance?

3. Are there any differences in the way school administrators and teachers perceive the value of the Teacher Products Indicators as a part of the minimum criteria for effective teaching performance?

4. Are there any differences in the way school administrators and teachers perceive the value of the Professional Development Indicators as part of the minimum criteria for effective teaching performance?

5. How are the four major categories rank ordered as the indicators of the minimum criteria for effective teaching performance according to the perceived value?

6. What improvements could be incorporated into the indicators as a part of the minimum criteria for effective teaching performance to make it more adaptable to everyday classroom situations and to make the evaluation process a more positive experience for both administrators and teachers?

Scope and Limitations

Certain limitations characterized in the study were:

1. The validity of the responses depends upon the willingness of the individual to cooperate, their honesty in answering, and their interest in the completeness of their answers.

2. The findings of the study are limited to the number of questionnaires returned by the participants.

3. The study sample was limited to one larger school district, and one smaller school district, from which no attempt to generalize was made.

Assumptions

In this study, the following assumptions were made:

1. The data collection instrument has given an accurate and concise representation of the perceptions of importance regarding the Teacher Evaluation Indicators in terms of each group's role, purpose, and function.

2. The Standard Evaluation Instrument used in Oklahoma's school districts had been incorporated to fit and meet each particular school district's needs.

Definition of Terms

A number of terms have been used in this study. The major source of definitions used in this study are from School Laws of Oklahoma, Section 94.3, (1990). The following definitions are applicable throughout this study:

Administrator: A duly certified person who devotes a majority of time to service as a superintendent, principal, supervisor, vice president, or any administrative or supervisory, capacity in the school district;

Career Teacher: A teacher who has completed three or more consecutive complete school years in such capacity in one school district under a written teaching contract;

Dismissal: The discontinuance of the teaching service of an administrator or teacher during the term of a written contract, as provided by law;

Evaluation: To examine or judge the quality or degree of;

Perceptions: Intellectual and sensory elements, conscious and unconscious influences; related to personality variables, which means that information is actively related to the concept, attitudes, and motives of the person who is perceiving, a selection process in which a person tends to see things as they fit into their past experiences and situations;

Probationary Teacher: A teacher who has completed fewer than three consecutive complete school years in such capacity; an administrator shall be considered a teacher only with regard to service in an instructional, non-administrative capacity;

Teacher Observation Instrument: The instrument which was used to evaluate or examine teaching performance of teachers during the year. The instrument was comprised of four categories with descriptors delineating the standard criteria to be observed and recorded.

Significance of the Study

Evaluation has been implemented in the school systems within the United States for quite some time. Yet, the program was in continual need for changes to improve the indicators. Numerous research studies, (Barr, 1938; Merritt, 1983), have been conducted on teacher evaluation indicators. In the ever-changing world, new and creative education ideas and concepts must be continually implemented. What was once an important objective, may now be on the back burner. Use of the program by school districts and continuation of funding by the legislature depends upon review of the components of the program and implementation of new ideas to make the process a positive experience and a more accurate account of daily classroom situations. This study can serve as a basis for new views on the criteria currently available for future Board

regulations and standards.

This research has attempted to give some insight into qualities and characteristics through the observation process, including hands-on experience, teaching effectiveness, and performance. It is hoped the results will have significance for the identification of needs and revisions for the standard observation indicators. The information may also be beneficial for the validation, clarification, and further establishment of the instrument.

In summary, the primary purpose of the teacher evaluation process was to promote instruction and professional development. The evaluation instrument must provide for these purposes, as well as, differentiate between effective and ineffective teaching. The criteria on the indicators must be valid, the procedure must be reliable, and the process needed to be objective. Finally, it was hoped that this descriptive survey study could serve as a basis for future research and quest for increased knowledge about the indicators.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature reviewed was exclusive on the basis of its relevance to the research questions being tested. The literature has been presented as follows: A brief history of evaluation, early evaluation attempts, current evaluation methods, new evaluation trends, and summary.

Historically, teacher evaluation has not been well accepted or understood. It was assumed that teachers teach and students learn (Natriello, 1977), thus focusing the purpose of evaluation on accountability instead of improvement, consequently resulting in a lack of enthusiasm by the participants. Program evaluation began in the United States in 1897, with Joseph Rice's comparative study of spelling performance. Robert Thorndike, the "Father of the Educational Testing Movement", successfully convinced educators in the early 1900's that measuring human change would be valuable (Merritt, 1983). Soon, evaluation gained their foothold and expanded nationwide.

During the 1930's two evaluation practices occurred, with the results from these evaluation practices reviewed and published, suggestions for improvements in the evaluation process were made by Worthen and Sanders to enhance this ever-changing instrument (1973). These gentlemen performed an eight-year

study which took place in thirty high schools, and was highly regarded by educators of that period. This study made use of a variety of tests, scales, inventories, questionnaires, checklists, and other measures. From this study the observation-instrument-idea first emerged.

The practice of evaluation evolved from the accreditation process. According to Merritt (1983), teacher evaluation systems were viewed as camouflage schemes for getting rid of nonconformist teachers, for budget cutting, or for enforcing authority within the school district.

Yet, many evaluations failed to measure professional competence, which resulted in broader conflict between administrators and teachers (Barr and Burton, 1938; Bolton, 1973). Various problems arose, such as, a lack of attention to evaluative guidelines, faulty instruments, legal questions, poorly stated performance criteria, and lack of interest. The public's opinion was one of holding the schools accountable. Accountability came into focus in the 1960's. While government did not mandate accountability, society did. The need for evaluation increased and few educators doubted the need. Levin (1979) stated that teacher evaluation had suffered due to lack of informative research and an overabundance of individualistic opinions.

With the high demand for evaluation techniques at the local, state, and national level in the 1970's, an extensive study was brought about to improve ways of evaluating instructors. With

results published by the Phi Delta Kappa Commission on Evaluation in 1973, conclusions were drawn that problems of evaluation included:

- (1) lack of adequate evaluation theory;
- (2) lack of specific types of evaluative criteria;
- (3) lack of adequate instruments and designs;
- (4) lack of good systems for organizing; processing, and reporting evaluation information, and;
- (5) lack of sufficient numbers of well-trained evaluation personnel (Merritt, 1983, p. 3).

Information about educational outcomes has been attacked by society due to the dissatisfaction and disappointment in the evaluation process.

Evaluation, at the very least, was a political and social requirement and, at best, a tool for improvement of instruction. An evaluation system must be objective (Manatt, Palmer, and Hidlebaugh, 1976). Commonly, narratives and checklist reports are used to evaluate teachers. Fortunately for educators, continuing education and research has resulted in a blueprint for review and re-examination of the process of teaching and learning.

Early Evaluation Attempts

Teacher effectiveness plays a major role in our school districts, past and present. Little agreement exists between educators and the public on the description of teacher effectiveness. Early notions concerning teaching were that all teachers needed a thorough knowledge of their subject, as

well as the methods of good teaching (Barr and Burton, 1938). Both of these views of teaching are oversimplified views of the teaching act.

Haefele (1978) presented the employment interview of a prospective teacher as a subset of the teacher evaluation process. Teacher employment interviews convey an appraisal to educators. Questions concerning marital status, one's spouse, whether or not a family was planned, national origin, skills and handicaps, just to name a few, are types of questions administrators routinely ask. Questions such as these are a mechanism by which employers could assess an applicant's qualifications for employment and expectations for a position.

Once hired, a teacher was expected to meet the requirements set forth in the interview, as well as keep the school open and in a learning environment. Social psychologists have come to the conclusion that the school environment sets norms for the behavior of teachers and administrators. The work place in a school affects how people act, how they teach, learn, and evaluate performance. Because of these norms, the behavior dealt with how the school actually functions, rather than how someone thinks it should function (Weber, 1987). The main criterion of teacher effectiveness is classroom management. Under such a model, the responsibility for learning is placed on the pupil, rather than the teacher.

Dyer (1973) presented the absolute minimum requirements for teacher accountability which included physical fitness and

mental fitness, low individual profile, low absentee rate, with no discrimination on basis of religion, sex, or color. Thus, Dyer proposed that teachers should not only meet minimum requirements, but also perform a multitude of "good works" (p. 372). The "good works" are composed of three interrelated categories: (1) knowing the subject, (2) knowing the students, and, (3) presenting the material to the students in such away, that they can remember it (p. 375).

Manatt, Palmer, and Hidlebaugh (1976) and other educators (McCarty and Hawley, 1986), developed an illustrative table of valid, reliable, and discriminating items which depict teacher behavior. The five major categories are:

- (1) productive teaching techniques;
- (2) positive teaching techniques;
- (3) organized/structured class management;
- (4) intellectual stimulation; and
- (5) desirable out-of-class behavior (p. 23-24).

Manatt, Palmer, and Hidlebaugh suggested that improvement targets should be identified and set up for the performance appraisal cycle. The items which fall under each of these five rubrics are adequate to discriminate between teachers' high, medium, and low performance and teacher effectiveness. Special capabilities enhance a teacher's success through their interest in the profession, as well as physical vigor, good health, energy, appearance, and quality of voice. A teacher who posses these qualities is indispensable to the school system.

Other types of evaluations also came into play. Bolton (1973) suggested that summative evaluations may not be helpful for improving instruction. The summative approach served to confirm the school's teacher employment process, reward superior performance, protect students from incompetent educators, and supply information on reassignments and or termination of teachers.

Ryan and Hickcox (1980) suggested the long historical pattern of teacher evaluation in schools can be a clue to the improvement of instruction. Lewis (1973) presented the need to abandon the comparative rating of teachers. Instead, an administrator's aim should have been to establish an agreement between the teacher and local expectations - a negotiation for a meeting of the minds. This idea was to focus on teacher improvement instead of teacher shortcomings and weaknesses.

Improvement in performance may have been an objective in the beginning for school districts, but more important was the need for appropriate evaluative criteria for the purpose of educators assessing the total teaching process. Controversy still exists. Thus, school districts have developed more objective and comprehensive evaluation models.

Current Methods of Evaluation

Methods currently used included student achievement and progress, along with various types of evaluations. School districts may have developed a two-tier evaluation process consisting of a summative evaluation based on minimum criteria

established by the State Department of Education, and the second being a formative process which provides for self-improvement through peer and/or administrative interaction. The summative procedure is used to determine strengths and weaknesses, plus prospective employment decisions.

School districts in Oklahoma require a minimum of 175 days of school taught per year. The School Laws of Oklahoma (1990) states:

Each board of education shall maintain and annually review, following consultation with or involvement of representatives selected by local teachers, a written policy of evaluation for all teachers and administrators. Every policy so adopted shall: (1) Be based upon a set of minimum criteria developed by the State Board of Education; (2) Provide that all evaluations be made in writing and that evaluation documents and response thereto be maintained in a personnel file for each evaluated person; (3) Provide that every probationary teacher be evaluated at least two times per school year; once prior to November 15, and once prior to February 10 of each year; and, (4) Provide that every teacher be evaluated once every year, except otherwise provided by law (p. 107).

Manatt, Palmer, and Hidlebaugh (1976), presented the process of procedural due process to educators. The suggested stages of the evaluation process are:

- (1) self-appraisal for familiarization and preparation for the post conference;
- (2) pre-observation conference used to discuss classroom situations, instructional objectives, methods, and learning;
- (3) classroom observations, two or three different classes;

- (4) post-observation conference used to discuss critical classroom incidents, progress, and exchange questions;
- (5) agreement on a plan of action;
- (6) time to improve, help to improve, and mutual monitoring of change; and,
- (7) report of the summary evaluation to appraisee and to administrators (p. 24).

Most school districts followed the format listed above as stages within the evaluation process.

Evaluations are designed to rank instructors on a continuum. In adopting a workable evaluation system, teaching objectives must be precise and measurable. Moreover, an administrator needs to offer not only constructive criticism, but also an inventory of strengths and weaknesses, and topped off by a formal rating according to McCarty, Kaufman, and Strafford (1986).

Many districts have attempted to meet multiple goals with an all-purpose evaluation system. A school system can no longer depend upon one technique to satisfy the evaluation process; similarly, a teacher cannot depend upon one technique to satisfy all situations in a classroom. The most effective evaluation plan was one that contributed to higher teacher morale and improved learning conditions for students, according to Bolton (1973). Recommendations reflected the need for greater teacher and student participation in both the development and implementation of teacher evaluations. Reavis (1975) offered the following paradox to consider:

Excellent teaching appears to emerge when teachers feel that they are not being judged and evaluated and when they feel their worth as teachers is not contingent on how they score on the administrators grading scale. And yet, it appears that teachers approach excellence in their profession to the extent they respond to evaluations of their teaching (p. 175).

Bergauer (1991) summarized when teachers participated in decision domains, they felt influential, thus resulting in greater teacher effectiveness measured by evaluation attributes, quality and impact of the process. School districts committed to teacher growth set forth teachers' perceptions of evaluations as meaningful and supportive, thus, the outcome being a positive impact on teacher effectiveness.

On a whole, school districts, society and parents have not adequately thought through the idea mentioned above.

New Trends in Evaluation

The evaluation process has evolved into a more positive experience and a more accurate account of everyday situations. Sord (1973), in an article entitled, "Teaching Effectiveness", stated the objective of evaluations was to provide feed-back to the individual instructor in order to assess the results and improve instruction and learning (p. 62). Each faculty member must be measured, with strengths and weaknesses observed, and a plan of action developed. Sord also emphasized that the evaluation of teaching was a difficult process because of the various types of learning, and an effective learning experience

was dependent upon the following variables:

- (1) the ability to communicate effectively;
- (2) well-developed course outlines;
- (3) student participation in class discussions and exchange of ideas and opinions; and,
- (4) the individual is responsible for improving his/her teaching and strengthening the overall academic performance (p. 61).

Boyd (1989) added the process should give teachers useful feedback on the classroom needs, the opportunity to learn new techniques, and counsel from evaluators and peers on changes to be implemented in the classroom. If evaluators used several sources of information about teaching effectiveness, then they could make a more accurate judgement. The administrator needed to understand that teachers generally wanted to improve and were eager to know how others view them. Interaction between administrators and teachers needed to be constant and on a daily basis. Millman (1981) in an article entitled, "Classroom Observation", suggested evaluations are affected by the time of day the observation has taken place, the subject taught, and the calendar of holidays and special events. Evaluations must be supplemented by other sources of information.

Lewis (1973) suggested the whole procedure is based on the assumption the teacher will improve if given encouragement, and the help needed to improve. The following three elements must be present for this process to occur: skill on the job, innovation, and personal development.

Spivey (1976) depicted that a teacher needs to be recognized as a professional who was his own best critic for self improvement.

He suggests educators write two or three general objectives for a period of one school year. They must in turn implement their own objectives, and evaluate themselves, with a supervisor's help. The premise was that everyone can improve their performance on a continuing basis, thus, making a formal commitment which in turn increases the probability of improvement.

Schwan (1992) brought into focus a new approach to educators, "Out Based Education" or otherwise referred to as "OBE". The basis for this type of model was "children can learn if given the time to learn". Paradigms are used as illustrations depicting the goals/objectives which need to be accomplished, thus, yielding the desirable students' exit outcomes. The instructor was characterized as the employer and the student became the employee, thus, detailing a portrait of the global marketplace.

In summary, this review of the literature presented various attempts by researchers to provide an exclusive set of comprehensive instruments to approach the very difficult task of evaluating teacher performance. Determining teacher evaluation criteria from a historical perspective was difficult. Yet, educators have continued to reconstruct the evaluative criteria to reflect standards which needed to be assessed in teacher performance. In essence, continued scrutiny is inescapable due to the complexity of evaluations. The review assisted the researcher in examining perceptions of individuals involved in the evaluation process and regarding the teacher evaluation indicators.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to analyze the perceptions of the value of indicators used in the evaluation of teachers by administrators and teachers who teach in selected central Oklahoma school districts. The purpose of this chapter was to explain the planning of the research, to describe the selection of the population and sample, the development of the instrument, the procedures followed in the collection of data, and clarify the statistical method which was applied to the data collected. The superintendents of the selected school districts in central Oklahoma were hand-delivered cover letters and questionnaires to be distributed to principals and teachers within that particular school district. These individuals were asked to complete a complete a forty-five item questionnaire to determine their perceptions of the standard criteria in the observation instrument used to evaluate teachers.

The methods and procedures used in this study are divided into three areas: (1) preliminary procedures, (2) methods for data collection, and (3) data analysis procedures.

Preliminary Procedures

The preliminary procedures included the following steps: choice of research design, choice of population and sample,

development of the questionnaire, and the choice of the notable differences criteria.

Choice of Research Design

The choice of the best-suited research design for conducting this type of research was the first decision. The type of research chosen for the study was descriptive research with a survey-type study. Best (1970), the author of Research In Education, states:

Descriptive research describes and interprets what is. It is concerned with conditions or relationships that exist; practices that prevail; beliefs, points of view, or attitudes that are held; process that is going on; effects that are being felt; or trends that are developing. Descriptive research is an element of analysis and interpretation of the meaning or significance of what is being described (p. 116).

Tuckman (1978), the author of Conducting Educational Research, endorsed that surveys be conducted within a research design utilizing comparison groups. Thus, the research design chosen was a survey type which was designed to describe perceptions of individuals who are involved in teacher evaluations.

Choice of Population and Sample

Two school districts selected from the public schools in central Oklahoma, one representing the larger schools, and one representing the smaller schools based on the Oklahoma Secondary Sports Association class groupings were chosen. One hundred fifty-eight individuals were asked to participate from the two schools, eight administrators and one hundred fifty teachers.

The respondents from the two school districts consisted of three administrators (37.5 percent), and thirty-seven teachers (24.5 percent).

Development of the Questionnaire

The third step in the preliminary procedures was the development of the questionnaire, which was administered to the selected administrators and teachers. The first part of the questionnaire represented information about the individual completing the survey. This section was designed to obtain the respondent's demographics.

The items on the questionnaire were developed by taking statements from the Standard Evaluation Instrument and placing them in appropriate categories. The respondent was to rate the statements in terms of their perceptions of each evaluation criterion. After the initial development of the questionnaire, the researcher's advisors and a pilot group of teachers and administrators reviewed the instrument for content, validity, and clarity. The questionnaire was approved for an exempt review status by the Oklahoma State University Internal Review Board before it was implemented and delivered to the selected central Oklahoma school districts.

Choice of Testing Statistics

The fourth step in the preliminary procedures was to select an adequate statistical procedure. In answering Research Questions

One through Four the mean rankings were used to report administrators and teachers perceptions and mean differences to reflect a comparison between the two groups. This procedure was to examine notable differences and whether they exist among the mean scores of the groups for each statement on the observation instrument. Mean scores for each of the two groups were determined by assigning a number value to the five-response Likert-type questionnaire as follows:

	# Value	Real Values
No Value	= 0	.0 to .49
Little Value	= 1	.50 to 1.49
Some Value	= 2	1.50 to 2.49
Much Value	= 3	2.50 to 3.49
Great Value	= 4	3.50 to 4.00

Criteria for the notable differences was chosen to be .50 on the scale which was arbitrarily done by the researcher. The final step in the process was to determine if there were any notable differences between the groups based on that criteria. Finally, the difference between the mean rankings of the four categories by the administrators and by the teachers was compared.

Collection of Data

Once the school districts were selected, appointments were made with the superintendents for consideration of participation in the research questionnaire project. At the time of the appointment, a cover letter and a copy of the questionnaire was hand delivered to the superintendent for review. Once permission, was given, copies of the questionnaire, along with cover letters were delivered to the various schools. Cover letters and questionnaires were placed in

teacher's boxes with directions for the completion and the procedure for the return of the completed questionnaires.

Some superintendents were mailed the cover letter and questionnaire, if an appointment could not be set up. Thus, with the return of the completed questionnaire, the permission to continue the research project was given. Cover letters and questionnaire were again hand-delivered to principals and placed in teacher's boxes to be completed. At a later time, the returned questionnaires were picked up for the analysis of data collected.

Analysis of Data

The analysis of data section focused on the five areas of concern: (1) demographic information; (2) analysis of the perceptions of the teacher management indicators; (3) analysis of the perceptions of the teacher instructional indicators; (4) analysis of perceptions of the teacher products indicators; (5) analysis of the perceptions of professional development criteria; and (6) ranking of the four categories.

Criteria for the notable differences was chosen to be .50 on the scale, which was arbitrarily chosen by the researcher. For the rank ordering questions regarding the four categories (teacher management, teacher instruction, teacher products, and professional development), the mean rank was used to determine if any notable differences exist among the means from the groups (Bartz, 1988). The responses to the open-ended questions are reported and analyzed in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The intent of this chapter was to report the data gathered from the survey questionnaire sent to administrators and teachers. The major questions which were addressed by the research were as follows:

1. Are there any differences in the way school administrators and teachers perceive the value of the Teacher Management Indicators as a part of the minimum criteria for effective teaching performance?

2. Are there any differences in the way school administrators and teachers perceive the value of the Teacher Instructional Indicators as a part of the minimum criteria for effective teaching performance?

3. Are there any differences in the way school administrators and teachers perceive the value of the Teacher Products Indicators as part of the minimum criteria for effective teaching performance?

4. Are there any differences in the way school administrators and teachers perceive the value of the Professional Development Indicators as part of the minimum criteria for effective teaching performance.

5. How are the four major categories rank ordered as the indicators of the minimum criteria for effective teaching performance according to the perceived value?

6. What improvements could be incorporated into the indicators as a part of the minimum criteria for effective teaching performance to make it more adaptable to everyday classroom situations and to make the evaluation process a more positive experience for both administrators and teachers?

The data gathered and presented in this chapter was obtained from two sources: administrators and teachers.

A copy of the survey questionnaire given to the school administrators and teachers is presented in Appendix E. The purpose of this instrument was to establish a basis by verifying the school administrators' and teachers' perceptions regarding the value of indicators on the Teacher Evaluation Instrument which was being used in Oklahoma school districts.

The questionnaires returned resulted in a 37.5 percent response from the administrators and 24.6 percent response from the teachers. Table I shows the number of questionnaires hand-delivered to the schools and the division from the elementary and secondary schools, along with the number returned. The returned percentage calculated is also shown. It should be noted that four participants failed to rank the categories regarding the Research Question Five.

Description of Study Participants

Information was gathered from the sample in regard to educational background of the participants, school-teaching

TABLE I
NUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRES AND PERCENT RETURNED

SCHOOLS	# QUESTIONNAIRES SENT		RETURNED	PERCENTAGE
	TEACHERS	ADMINISTRATORS		
Union City				
Elementary	20		6	30.0%
Secondary	10		2	20.0%
Administrator		3	2	66.0%
Chickasha				
Elementary	80		14	17.5%
Secondary	40		15	37.5%
Administrators		5	1	2.0%
3 out of 8 administrators = 37.5%				
37 out of 150 teachers = 24.6%				

experience, administrative experience, current grade level taught, and levels of education (Table II).

The years of experience in the education field affected the value of the participants on certain indicators on the Teacher Evaluation Instrument. The conclusions or findings were from an experienced sample. No first-year teachers completed the survey and there was an equal presentation of the other three categories. The number of respondents in their first year was zero, and the highest number of respondents came from the over the fifteen year category. With the other three categories in an equal representation of the groups of individuals.

The same proportion of the participants were from the elementary level, twenty (50 percent), as were from the secondary level, twenty (50 percent).

Information regarding the participants by their level of education was presented in Table III.

Analysis and Results of Research

This section deals with the analysis of data collected for the purpose of answering the six research questions stated in this study.

Research Question One through Four relates to the perceptions of the value of the indicators as a part of the minimum criteria of effective teaching performance by school administrators and teachers, which was analyzed by the means by categories.

TABLE II
DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY TEACHING EXPERIENCE

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE
0	0	0.0%
1-5	9	22.5%
6-10	4	10.0%
11-15	8	20.0%
OVER 15	19	47.5%
TOTALS	40	100.0%

TABLE III
DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY HIGHEST DEGREE HELD

Degree	Participants	Percentage
Bachelor's	19	47.5
Master's	20	50.0
Doctorate	1	2.5
Total	40	100.0

Research Question Five was analyzed by rank ordering the means of the two groups (administrators and teachers) on the four categories.

Research Question Six was depicted by the use of the open-ended questions at the end of the categories in the survey questionnaire.

Research Question One

Are there any differences in the way school administrators and teachers perceive the value of Teacher Management indicators?

Results: In answering Research Question One, the mean differences were the criteria used to determine the categories by the real values for the indicators. A .50 difference was set as the criteria for a notable difference for answering this research question, which was arbitrarily set by the researcher. There were no notable differences among the items. Data relevant to this question are summarized in Table IV. There was a basic agreement between the school administrators and teachers on the perceived value of the Teacher Management indicators.

The data indicated that on the five point scale, the participants tended to agree with the four items, with the mean scores between 3.33 to 3.66 for the administrators and from 3.43 to 3.81 for the teachers. The grand mean was 3.59. The administrators perceived the value to be "great," as did the teachers.

TABLE IV
PERCEIVED MEAN VALUES OF TEACHER MANAGEMENT INDICATORS

Item	Distribution by Perceived Value										Teach N=37 — X	Admin N=3 — X	$X_T - X_A$ Mean Diff	Grand Mean \bar{X}_G	Category Value
	0		1		2		3		4						
	N#	%	N#	%	N#	%	N#	%	N#	%					
1	0	0	2	5	2	5	12	32.5	23	57.5	3.43	3.33	.10	3.425	Much
2	0	0	1	2.5	1	2.5	15	37.5	23	57.5	3.49	3.66	-.20	3.5	Great
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	20.0	32	80.0	3.81	3.6	.21	3.8	Great
4	0	0	0	0	1	2.5	12	30.0	27	67.5	3.65	3.6	.05	3.65	Great
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	0	3	4	48	105						3.59	3.55	.04	3.59	Great

*Notable difference > .50 mean difference

Teacher Management Indicators

1. The teacher plans for delivery of the lesson relative to short-term and long-term objectives.
2. The teacher uses minimum class time for non-instructional routines thus maximizing time on task.
3. The teacher clearly defines expected behavior (encourages positive behavior and controls behavior).
4. The teacher establishes rapport with students and provides a pleasant, safe and orderly climate conducive to learning.

Research Question Two

As there are differences in the way school administrators and teachers perceive the value of the Teacher Instructional indicators?

Results: In answering Research Question Two, the mean differences were the criteria used to determine the categories of real values. Data relevant to this question are summarized in Table V.

There were notable differences on three of the items based on the .50 criteria. The notable differences existed on Items One, Three, and Six. On Item One, "The teacher communicates the instructional objectives to students," the administrators rated it .52 greater than teachers. Administrators perceived the value as "great," whereas, the teachers perceived the value as "much". On Item Three, "the teacher relates subject topics to existing student experiences," the administrators rated it .52 greater than teachers. Administrators perceived the value as "great," whereas, the teachers perceived the value as "much." And, Item Six, "the teachers gives directions that are clearly stated and related to the learning objectives," administrators rated it .59 less than teachers. Administrators perceived the value as "much," whereas, the teachers perceived the value as "great."

The data indicated that on the five point scale, the participants tended to agree the twelve items were valuable, as reflected in the mean scores between 3.0 to 4.0 for the

TABLE V
PERCEIVED MEAN VALUES OF TEACHER INSTRUCTIONAL INDICATORS

Item	Distribution of Perceived Values										Teach	Admin	$X_T - X_A$	Grand	Category
	0		1		2		3		4		N=37	N=3	Mean	Mean	Value
	N#	%	N#	%	N#	%	N#	%	N#	%	X	X	Diff	X_G	
1	0	0	1	2.5	2	5	12	30	25	62.5	3.48	4.00	-.52	3.5	Great
2	0	0	0	0	2	5	18	45	19	47.5	3.29	4.00	.11	3.35	Much
3	0	0	1	2.5	5	12.5	20	50	14	35	3.14	3.66	.52	3.18	Much
4	0	0	1	2.5	2	5	13	32.5	24	60	3.51	3.33	.18	3.5	Great
5	0	0	1	2.5	3	7.5	15	37.5	21	52.5	3.41	3.33	.08	3.4	Much
6	0	0	0	0	3	7.5	12	30	25	62.5	3.59	3.00	.59	3.55	Great
7	0	0	0	0	1	2.5	10	25	29	72.5	3.70	3.33	.37	3.68	Great
8	0	0	0	0	1	2.5	13	32.5	30	75	4.00	4.00	.00	4.0	Great
9	0	0	1	2.5	1	2.5	13	32.5	25	62.5	3.54	3.33	.21	3.53	Great
10	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	32.5	25	62.5	3.57	3.66	.09	3.58	Great
11	0	0	1	2.5	6	15	13	32.5	20	50	3.29	3.33	.04	3.3	Much
12	0	0	0	0	2	5	19	47.5	19	47.5	3.43	3.33	.10	3.43	Much
	0	0	6	6	30	30	171	171	276	276	3.49	3.52	.03	3.5	Great

** Notable difference > .50 mean difference

Teacher Instructional Indicators:

1. The teacher communicates the instructional objectives to students
2. The teacher shows how the present topic is related to those topics that have been taught or that will be taught.
3. The teacher relates subject topics to existing student experiences.
4. The teacher uses signaled responses, questioning techniques and/or guided practices to involve all students.
5. The teacher teaches the objectives through a variety of methods.
6. The teacher gives directions that are clearly stated and related to the learning objectives.
7. The teacher demonstrates desired skills.
8. The teacher checks to determine if students are progressing toward stated objectives.
9. The teacher changes instruction based on the results of monitoring.
10. The teacher requires all students to practice newly learned skills while under the direct supervision of the teacher.
11. The teacher requires students to practice newly learned skills without the direct supervision of the teacher.
12. The teacher summarizes and fits into context what has been taught.

administrators and 3.14 to 4.0 for the teachers. The grand mean was 3.50. The perceived value overall was of "great" value.

Research Question Three

Are there any differences in the way the school administrators and teachers perceive the value of Teacher Products indicators?

Results: In answering Research Question Three, the mean differences were the criteria used to determine the categories of real values and if there were any notable differences. A .50 difference was set as the criteria for a notable difference for answering this research question, which was arbitrarily set by the researcher. Data relevant to this question are summarized in Table VI. There was disagreement between administrators and teachers on the perceived value of some of the Teacher Products indicators.

The notable differences existed on Items One, Three, and Four. On Item One, "the teacher writes daily lesson plans designed to achieve the identified objectives," the administrators rated it .76 less than teachers. the administrators perceived the value as "some" whereas, the teachers perceived the value as "much." On Item Three, "the teacher utilizes grading patterns that are fairly administered and based on identified criteria," the administrators rated it .57 less than teachers. Administrators perceived the value as "much," whereas, the teachers perceived the value as "great." On Item Four, "students demonstrate mastery of stated objectives through projects, daily assignments, performance, and test scores," the administrators rated it .59 less than the teachers. The

TABLE VI
PERCEIVED MEAN VALUES OF TEACHER PRODUCT INDICATORS

Item	Distribution of Perceived Values										Teach	Admin	$X_T - X_A$	Grand	Category
	0		1		2		3		4		N=37	N=3	Mean Diff.	Mean X_G	
	N#	%	N#	%	N#	%	N#	%	N#	%	\bar{X}	\bar{X}			
1	4	10	1	2.5	4	10	15	37.5	16	40	3.00	2.33	.76*	2.95	Much
2	0	0	1	2.5	2	5	17	42.5	20	50	3.37	3.66	-.29	3.4	Much
3	0	0	0	0	5	12.5	9	22.5	26	65	3.57	3.00	.57	3.525	Great
4	0	0	0	0	4	10	10	25	26	65	3.59	3.00	.59*	3.55	Great
	$\bar{4}$		$\bar{2}$		$\bar{15}$		$\bar{51}$		$\bar{88}$		$\bar{3.38}$	$\bar{2.99}$	$\bar{.39}$	$\bar{3.356}$	Much

*Notable difference > .50 mean difference

Teacher Product Indicators:

1. The teacher writes daily lesson plans designed to achieve the identified objectives.
2. The teacher maintains a written record of student progress.
3. The teacher utilizes grading patterns that are fairly administered and based on identified criteria.
4. Students demonstrate mastery of the stated objectives through projects, daily assignments, performance and test scores.

administrators perceived the value as "much," whereas, the teachers perceived the value as "great."

The data indicated that on the five point scale, the participants tended to agree with the four items with mean scores between 2.33 and 3.66 for administrators and 3.0 to 3.59 for teachers. The grand mean was 3.356. The overall perceived value was "much."

Research Question Four

Are there any differences in the way school administrators and teachers perceive the value of the Professional Development indicators?

Results: In answering Research Question Four, the mean differences were the criteria used to determine the categories of real values. Data relevant to this question are summarized in Table VII. There was a basic agreement between the school administrators and teachers on the perceived value of the Professional Development indicators.

The data indicated that on the five point scale, the participants tended to agree with the four items, with mean scores between 2.66 to 3.66 for the administrators and 2.97 to 3.513 for teachers. The grand mean overall was 3.28, which indicated "much" value to the category.

TABLE VII
PERCEIVED MEAN VALUES OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

Item	Distribution of Perceived Values										Teach	Admin	$X_T - X_A$	Grand	Category
	0		1		2		3		4		N=37	N=3	Mean	Mean	Value
	N#	%	N#	%	N#	%	N#	%	N#	%	\bar{X}	\bar{X}	Diff.	\bar{X}_G	
1	0	0	1	2.5	6	15	19	47.5	14	33.5	3.162	3.0	.16	3.15	Much
2	1	2.5	0	0	0	0	15	37.5	24	60	3.513	3.66	-.15	3.525	Great
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	62.5	15	37.5	3.40	3.0	.40	3.375	Much
4	0	0	0	0	3	7.5	20	50	17	42.5	3.32	3.66	-.34	3.35	Much
5	0	0	0	0	1	2.5	24	60	15	37.5	2.97	3.33	-.37	3.35	Much
6	1	2.5	4	10	4	10	16	40	15	37.5	3.02	2.66	.36	3.0	Much
7	0	0	2	2.5	5	12.5	14	35	19	47.5	3.48	3.00	.48	3.25	Much
	$\bar{2}$		$\bar{7}$		$\bar{19}$		$\bar{133}$		$\bar{119}$		$\bar{3.266}$	$\bar{3.178}$	$\bar{.19}$	$\bar{3.28}$	$\bar{\text{Much}}$

* Notable difference > .50 mean difference.

Professional Indicators:

1. The teacher explores, evaluates, and utilizes effective teaching approaches.
2. The teacher is enthusiastic and approaches the job in a positive manner.
3. The teacher communicates with parents and the community in a professional manner.
4. The teacher complies with school rules, regulations and board policies.
5. The teacher is accurate and prompt with records and reports.
6. The teacher actively supports his/her school's programs and activities.
7. The teacher maintains good relations and work cooperatively with the staff.

Research Question Five

Are there any differences among the four major categories of the ranked ordering indicators as a part of the minimum criteria for effective teaching performance according to the perceived value?

Results: In answering Research Question Five the comparison of the rank ordering of the four categories by administrators and teachers revealed similar rank orders. Data relevant to this research question is summarized in Table VIII. The major ranking difference was in categories Teacher Product and Professionalism. Administrators ranked Teacher Product first and Professionalism second, whereas teachers reversed them.

Analysis of Response by Participants to Open-Ended Questions on the Questionnaire

In Research Question Six, the participants were asked to respond to three open-ended questions following their rating of each item.

First, for each category the participants were asked to indicate any item(s) which should be eliminated from the Teacher Evaluation Indicators. Items mentioned are depicted in Table IX.

Relatively few suggestions were made by the participants. The items most suggested for elimination were in the Teacher Management category.

TABLE VIII
PERCEPTIONS OF RANKING ORDER OF THE INDICATORS AS A
PART OF THE MINIMUM CRITERIA OF EFFECTIVE
TEACHING PERFORMANCE

	Teachers		Administrators	
	Mean Rank	Rank Order	Mean Rank	Rank Order
Teacher Management	2.86	4	2.0	3
Teacher Instruction	2.75	3	2.0	3
Teacher Product	2.51	2	1.0	1
Professionalism	1.83	1	1.6	2

TABLE IX
SUGGESTIONS FROM PARTICIPANTS ON THE ELIMINATION OF
INDICATORS ON THE AS A PART OF THE MINIMUM
CRITERIA OF EFFECTIVE TEACHING PERFORMANCE

CATEGORY: Indicators listed on the instrument

TEACHER MANAGEMENT:

2. The teacher uses minimum class time for non-instructional routines thus maximizing time on task.
3. The teacher clearly defines expected behavior (encourages positive behavior and controls negative behavior).
4. The teacher establishes rapport with students and provides a pleasant, safe, and orderly climate conducive to learning.

TEACHER INSTRUCTIONAL:

5. The teacher teaches the objectives through a variety of methods.
11. The teacher requires students to practice newly learned skills without the direct supervision of the teacher.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:

2. The teacher is enthusiastic and approaches job in positive manner.
-

Second, for each category, the participants were asked to indicate any item(s) which would be better placed in another category on the Teacher Evaluation Instrument. The only suggestion was to move one item concerning signaled responses, questions techniques, or guided practice into a different category.

Third, the participants were asked to indicate for each category additional items which would improve the overall instrument, as well as, that category. Table X shows those suggestions for improvements on the Teacher Evaluation Indicators.

TABLE X

SUGGESTIONS OF ADDITIONAL ITEMS TO BE ADDED TO THE INDICATORS AS A
PART OF THE MINIMUM CRITERIA OF EFFECTIVE TEACHING PERFORMANCE

-
1. Eliminate OBE as it is now used in the secondary levels.
 2. Adopt a statewide grading scale. Example A=100, B=89-80
 3. Adopt a statewide subject matter content requirement.
 4. Adopt statewide testing in all areas of study, such as,
English I, II, III, IV, Biology, Chemistry, Algebra I,
II, III, Geometry, Trigonometry, etc.
 5. Modify statements on the Teacher Evaluation Instrument.
 6. All items on the instrument is part of being an effective
teacher, but there are others as well, but these are
enough to keep a teacher busy.
 7. Modify Teacher Management criteria to include a certain
class size, and concerning behavioral problems in
one particular class.
 8. Incorporate plans relevant to the activities to reinforce
appropriate skills and behaviors.
 9. Instructors should dress professionally.
-

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to analyze the perceptions of the value of indicators used in the evaluation of teachers by administrators and teachers who teach in selected central Oklahoma school district.

The questionnaire was designed to obtain perceptions from the persons involved in the evaluation process, concerning these evaluative indicators. The survey method was used for this study. The questionnaire was delivered to the sample participants for them to complete and place into the envelopes provided to be picked up at a later time. The questionnaire consisted of five parts. The first part was designed to obtain demographic information: position in the evaluation process, years of teaching experience, years of administrative experience, current levels taught, and levels of education or administrative schooling.

The second part of the questionnaire was designed to secure perceptions among those involved in the evaluation process regarding the categories of indicators used in the evaluation of teachers. The third part of the questionnaire included a question in each category on the Instrument requesting participant suggestions for the elimination of inappropriate items. The fourth part of the questionnaire was an open-ended question for each

category requesting suggestions for modifications or reorganization of any of the items found in the Instrument. The fifth part of the questionnaire was an open-ended question securing information by the participants to add any items to the category to help improve each of the categories.

Two school districts selected from the public schools in central Oklahoma, one representing the larger schools, and one representing the smaller schools, based on the Oklahoma Secondary Sports Association class groupings, were chosen. One hundred fifty-eight individuals were asked to participate from the two schools, eight administrators and one hundred fifty teachers.

The respondents from the two school districts consisted of three administrators (37.5 percent) and thirty-seven teachers (24.5 percent).

This chapter extends the purpose by comparing the results from the sample and the related literature. Conclusions and interpretations of the results are discussed relative to the view of the literature presented in Chapter II. The presentation focuses on the six research questions posed. Implications of the findings and considerations for further research are also included in the discussion.

Findings

Research Question One through Four were analyzed by the comparison of means of the categories to determine notable differences. Research Question One: there was a basic agreement

between the administrators and teachers on the perceived value of the Teacher Management indicators or items. The administrators rated the perceived values from 3.33 to 3.66 and teachers rated the perceived values from 3.43 to 3.81. The grand mean was 3.59, which indicates the perceived values of indicators as of "great" value in the Teacher Management category.

Research Question Two: there was a disagreement between administrators and teachers on the perceived value on Item One, Three, and Six. On Item One, "the teacher communicates the instructional objectives to students," the administrators rated it .52 greater than teachers. The administrators' perceived value of this item was of "great" value, whereas, teachers' perceived value of this item was of "much" value. On Item Three, "the teacher relates subject topics to existing student experiences," the administrators rated it .52 greater than teachers. Administrators perceived the value as "great," whereas, the teachers perceived the value of this item as "much." On Item Six, "the teacher gives directions that are clearly stated and related to the learning objectives," administrators rated it .59 less than teachers. Administrators perceived the value as "much," whereas, the teachers perceived the value as "great."

The administrators perceived the values from 3.0 to 4.0 and the teachers perceived value on the indicators was from 3.14 to 4.0. The grand mean was 3.50, which indicates the overall value was "great."

Research Question Three: there was a disagreement between administrators and teachers on the perceived value on Item One, Three, and Four of this category. On Item One, "the teacher writes daily lesson plans designed to achieve the identified objectives," the administrators rated it .76 less than teachers. The administrators' perceived value was of "some" value, whereas, the teachers' perceived value was of "much" value. On Item Three, "the teacher utilizes grading patterns that are fairly administered and based on identified criteria," the administrators rated it "much" value, whereas, teachers' perceived value was of "great" value. On Item Four, "students demonstrate mastery of stated objectives through projects, daily assignments, performance, and test scores," The administrators rated it .59 less than the teachers. The administrators' perceived value was "much" value, whereas, the teachers' perceived value was of "great" value. The administrators' perceived mean values on the items ranged from 2.33 to 3.66 and teachers perceived mean values ranged from 3.0 to 3.59. The grand mean was 3.356, which indicates the overall value was of "much" value.

Research Question Four: There was a basic agreement between the administrators and teachers on the perceived mean values of the Professional Development category. The perceived mean values for the administrators varied from 2.66 to 3.66 and the teachers' perceived mean values varied from 2.97 to 3.513. The grand mean was 3.28, which indicates the overall value was of "much" value.

Conclusions

Research Question One through Four were analyzed by the comparison of the means of the categories to determine notable differences and determine where the indicators are placed within the real values scale.

Research Question One: based on the agreement on items or indicators in the Teacher Management category, it was concluded that administrators and teachers agreed the values of the indicators were of "great" value overall.

Research Question Two: based on the differences on the three items listed previously in the findings, it was concluded that the administrators and teachers were somewhat in agreement on the perceived value of the indicators listed in the Teacher Instructional category as being of "great" value.

Research Question Three: based on the differences on the three items listed previously in the findings, it was concluded that the administrators and teachers were somewhat in agreement on the perceived value of the indicators listed in the Teacher Product category as being of "great" value.

Research Question Four: based on the agreement on items or indicators in the Professional Development category, it was concluded that administrators and teachers agreed the values of the indicators were of "much" value overall.

Research Question Five: based on the disagreement by administrators and teachers on the rank ordering of the four categories by the perceived value, the teachers perceived value was

greater than that of the administrators on Professionalism and less on Teacher Product.

Few suggestions were made to eliminate any indicators or items from one instrument. Some suggestions were made to add or improve the items or indicators on the instrument, yet the response was small.

Overall, there was very close agreement between administrators' and teachers' perceptions on the value of the indicators used for teacher evaluation. They agreed the indicators in all categories except Professionalism were of "great" value. Even Professionalism was perceived as "much" value. This would lead to the conclusion they perceive the indicators used for the evaluation of teachers overall to be quite valuable for the evaluation process. This conclusion was also supported by the few suggestions made for change in the indicators.

Recommendations

1. Since the administrators and teachers both agree that the Classroom Management indicators on the Teacher Evaluation Instrument are of "great" value, they should continue to use them as current criteria for the standard evaluation instrument.

2. Since the administrators and teachers did not agree on some items of the Teacher Instruction Indicators on the Teacher Evaluation Instrument, they should look at the items on which they disagreed and consider how to improve them.

3. Since administrators and teachers did not agree on some of the items of the Teacher Product criteria on the Teacher Evaluation Indicators, they should look at those items where they disagree and consider how to improve them.

4. Administrators and teachers need to reconsider the value of lesson planning.

5. Since the administrators and teachers both agree that the Professional Development Indicators on the Teacher Evaluation Instrument are of "much" value, they should continue to use them as current criteria for the standard evaluation instrument of teachers for those schools.

6. Through the years, teacher evaluations have become an important step in our educational system. Society demands accountability for those individuals teaching our youth and children, thus resulting in evaluations. Many instructors feel evaluations are used to rid school districts of unwanted teachers. Research is needed to examine the process and make evaluations a positive process, not a negative one. The evaluation should be looked upon as reorganization, modification, and improvement for effective teaching.

7. The staff development component was addressed in House Bill 1466. Research should address incentives related to the evaluation area. Rationale for such a study was presented by Spivey (1976), who contends evaluation is a continuing process. Evaluations should serve as a starting point for writing objectives and improving teacher effectiveness.

8. Since observations are such an important part of the educational system for effective teaching, research should focus on the amount of time administrators are involved in the actual observation process evaluating teachers.

9. Research should focus on needed modifications of the teacher evaluation indicators to meet the educational goals set forth for the new and upcoming Outcome-Based Education in the school districts of Oklahoma.

Implications

Regardless of what specific purposes a given evaluation might have, the primary goal of all evaluation is communication. Teacher evaluations have been the vehicle which puts a positive communication system in place, within the school district, as well as, in the community. The evaluation indicators, if properly used, are evaluation tools which should move away from differentiations among teachers, determining salary incentives, and ranking teachers. It should move toward becoming a flexible process that assures feedback, or real communication for teacher and instructional improvement.

Evaluators and/or school administrators have the responsibility to serve, evaluate, and provide feedback to teachers in terms of their perceptions, competencies, and effectiveness. Consequently, the indicators used are guidelines for evaluating teachers. They can be modified to detect and record teacher effectiveness and performance which can be validated. Once the validation is complete

and the process is in place, teachers should be better served. Most importantly, the students in Oklahoma's school districts will have benefitted from having been involved with this process of improving teacher effectiveness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barr, A. S. and Burton, W. H. (1938). Supervision principles and practices in improvement of instruction. London: D. Appleton-Century Co. Inc.
- Bartz, A. E. (1988). Basic statistical concepts (3rd ed.). New York, NY: MacMillian.
- Bergauer, J. A. (1992). The relationship between teacher decisional participation and teacher evaluation effectiveness (shared decision-making). (Unpub. doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.)
- Bolton, D. L. (1973). Selection and evaluation of teachers. Berkley, CA: McCutchan.
- Boyd, R. (1989). Improving teacher evaluation. ERIC Clearinghouse on Tests, Measurements, and Evaluation. Washington, DC: TC American Institute for Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service).
- Dyer, H. (1973). How to achieve accountability in the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan Educational Foundation, 543, 370-378.
- Effective Schooling Practices. (1987). Stillwater, OK: Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education, Instructional Services, 7-8.
- Fisher, S. (1992). Personal Interview. Chichasha, OK, March.
- Haefele, R. C. (1973). The teacher perceiver interview: how valid? Phi Delta Kappan, 59, 683-684.
- Kelinger, F. N. (1973). Foundations of behavioral research. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Levin, B. (1979). Teacher evaluation--a review of research. Educational Leadership, 37(3), 240-244.
- Lewis, J. J. (1973). Appraising teaching performance. West Nyack, NY: Parker.

- Manatt, R. P., Palmer, K. L., and Hidlebaugh, E. (1976). Evaluating teacher performance with improved rating scales. NASSP Bulletin, 60(401), 21-24.
- McCarty, D. J., Kaufman, J., and Strafford J. (1986). Supervision and evaluation, two irreconcilable processes? Clearing House, 59(8), 351-352.
- Merritt, M. L. (1983). The importance of the standard evaluative criteria regarding the entry-year teachers as perceived by members of the entry-year assistance committees. (Unpub. doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.)
- Millman, J. (ed.). (1981). Handbook of teacher evaluation. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Natriello, G. (1977). A summary of recent literature on the evaluation of principals, teachers, and students. Stanford, CA: Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University.
- Reavis, R. G. (1975). Teacher evaluation practices in selected Texas public high schools. Denton, TX: North Texas State University.
- Ryan, D. W., and Hickcox, E. S. (1980). Redefining teacher evaluation. Toronto, Ontario: OISE Press.
- School Laws of Oklahoma, (1990). Oklahoma City, OK: Oklahoma State Department of Education, 98-113.
- Schwan, C. (1932). Personal Interview. Chickasha, OK, May.
- Simon, P. (1992). Personal Interview. Oklahoam City, OK, May.
- Smith, M. (1992). Personal Interview. Chickasha, OK, March and November.
- Sord, B. H. (1973). Teaching effectiveness. Phi Kappa Phi Journal, LIII(1), 58-66.
- Spivey, J. R. (1976). A Model for teacher evaluation. NASSP Bulletin, 60(401), 40-44.
- Tate, R. (1992). Personal Interview. Union City, OK, September.
- Tuckman, B. W. (1978). Conducting educational research. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace, and Jovanovich.

Weber, J. R. (1987). Teacher evaluations as a strategy for improving instruction synthesis of literature. Corvallis, OR: ERIC Clearing House on Education Management, University of Oregon.

Worthen, B. R. and Sanders, J. R. (1973). Educational evaluations: Theory and practice. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FORM

OKLABOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
FOR HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH

Proposal Title: A Review of the Standard Criteria Involved in the
Standard Evaluation of Teachers in the State of Oklahoma

Principal Investigator: Dr. Robert Terry / James key / Jamie Ketchum

Date: 3-25-92 IRB # AG-92-012

This application has been reviewed by the IRB and

Processed as: Exempt [] Expedite [] Full Board Review []
Renewal or Continuation []

Approval Status Recommended by Reviewer(s):

Approved [] Deferred for Revision []
Approved with Provision [] Disapproved []

Approval status subject to review by full Institutional Review Board at
next meeting, 2nd and 4th Thursday of each month.

Comments, Modifications/Conditions for Approval or Reason for Deferral or
Disapproval:

Signature: *Marcia S. Tilley* Date: 3-30-92
Chair of Institutional Review Board

APPENDIX B

SUPERINTENDENT'S LETTER

JAMIE MILLER KETCHUM
117 North 14th Street
Chickasha, Oklahoma 73018
(405) 224-2820

July 24, 1992

Re: AGED 5980
Oklahoma State University
Agricultural Education Master Degree Program
Thesis Subject: Teacher Observation Instrument

Dear

As the research portion of my thesis in pursuit of a Master's Degree in Agricultural Education from Oklahoma State University, I need to conduct a survey of administrators, evaluators, and teachers with regards to the Teacher Observation Instrument. Through a selection process, Pioneer was chosen as one of the school districts to be included in my survey.

Enclosed is a copy of the survey for your interview. I would very much appreciate having your permission to conduct this survey in the Pioneer School District. If you have no objections, I would like to proceed with this survey immediately due to the beginning of the new school session. Please furnish a directory of your instructors, so that I may contact them by mail during the summer term, so that they may complete the same questionnaire, as to not interrupt any school activities. Please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return to me in the self addressed envelope for your convenience.

Thanking you in advance for your consideration of this matter,
I am,

Sincerely yours,


Jamie Miller Ketchum

.JMK:qt

APPENDIX C

PRINCIPAL'S LETTER

JAMIE MILLER KETCHUM
117 North 14th Street
Chickasha, Oklahoma 73018
(405) 224-2820

May 12, 1992

To: All Principals Participating In Survey

Re: AGED 5980
Oklahoma State University
Agricultural Education Master Degree Program
Thesis Subject: Teacher Observation Instrument

As the research portion of my thesis in pursuit of a Master's Degree in Agricultural Education from Oklahoma State University, I am conducting a survey of administrators, evaluators and instructors with regards to the Teacher Observation Instrument. Through a selection process, your school was chosen to be included in my survey.

Attached, please find survey forms and stamped return envelopes for distribution to your teachers. Please retain one of the survey forms for your own use. I am aware that this is asking a lot to have a survey completed this late in the school year; please accept my sincere gratitude for your efforts on my behalf.

Thanking you in advance for your efforts, I am,

Sincerely yours,


Jamie Miller Ketchum

JMK:hs

APPENDIX D

MINIMUM CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

I. Practice**A. Teacher Management Indicators****1. Preparation**

The teacher plans for delivery of the lesson relative to short-term and long-term objectives.

2. Routine

The teacher uses minimum class time for non-instructional routines thus maximizing time on task.

3. Discipline

The teacher clearly defines expected behavior (encourages positive behavior and controls negative behavior).

4. Learning Environment

The teacher establishes rapport with students and provides a pleasant, safe and orderly climate conducive to learning.

B. Teacher Instructional Indicators**1. Establishes Objectives**

The teacher communicates the instructional objectives to students.

2. Stresses Sequence

The teacher shows how the present topic is related to those topics that have been taught or that will be taught.

3. Relates Objectives

The teacher relates subject topics to existing student experiences.

4. Involves All Learners

The teacher uses signaled responses, questioning techniques and or guided practices to involve all students.

5. Explains Content

The teacher teaches the objectives through a variety of methods.

6. Explains Directions

The teacher gives directions that are clearly stated and related to the learning objectives.

7. Models

The teacher demonstrates the desired skills.

8. Monitors

The teacher checks to determine if students are progressing toward stated objectives.

9. Adjusts Based on Monitoring

The teacher changes instruction based on the results of monitoring.

10. Guides Practice

The teacher requires all students to practice newly learned skills while under the direct supervision of the teacher.

11. Provides for Independent Practice

The teacher requires students to practice newly learned skills without the direct supervision of the teacher.

12. Establishes Closure

The teacher summarizes and fits into context what has been taught.

II. Products**A. Teacher Product Indicators****1. Lesson Plans**

The teacher writes daily lesson plans designed to achieve the identified objectives.

2. Student Files

The teacher maintains a written record of student progress.

3. Grading Patterns

The teacher utilizes grading patterns that are fairly administered and based on identified criteria.

B. Student Achievement Indicators

Students demonstrate mastery of the stated objectives through projects, daily assignments, performance, and test scores.

APPENDIX E

QUESTIONNAIRE

A REVIEW OF THE CURRENT CRITERIA INVOLVED IN
THE STANDARD EVALUATION OF TEACHERS
IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

The current teacher evaluation was implemented in Oklahoma school districts employing licensed teachers for the purpose of evaluating certified personnel to improve the performance and quality of the instruction offered to students. This instrument or procedure may be used for contract renewal. You should be familiar with this instrument due to your involvement in the teaching profession.

DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME!

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Your position involved in the evaluation process:
 Teacher Evaluator Administrator
2. Years of teaching experience in public schools:
 Zero 1-5 6-10
 11-15 Over 15
3. Year(s) of administrative experience in public schools:
 Zero 1-5 6-10
 11-15 Over 15
4. Current grade level(s) taught:
 Elementary Secondary Grade(s) _____
5. Level of your education or administrative schooling:
 Bachelor's Master's Doctorate

The categories from the standard observation instrument used in evaluating the certified teacher, in alphabetical order, are as follows:

- _____ A. Classroom Management.
- _____ B. Methods of Instruction.
- _____ C. Products.
- _____ D. Professional Development.

PLEASE RANK-ORDER THEM FROM 0 TO 4 IN TERMS OF YOUR PERCEPTION AS TO THEIR IMPORTANCE IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS WITH 0 BEING NO VALUE AND 4 BEING GREAT VALUE.

DIRECTIONS: After each of the following statements from the standard evaluation criteria, please rate each item according to its value in measuring teaching performance, that most correctly reflects your perception (opinion) of the validity of that item.

The scale is coded as follows: 0=No value, 1=Little value, 2=Some value, 3=Much Value, and 4=Great value.

TEACHER MANAGEMENT INDICATORS:

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The teacher plans for delivery of the lesson relative to short-term and long-term objectives. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. The teacher uses minimum class time for non-instructional routines thus maximizing time on task. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. The teacher clearly defines expected behavior (encourages positive behavior and controls negative behavior). | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. The teacher establishes rapport with students and provides a pleasant, safe and orderly climate conducive to learning. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Please indicate the number(s) of any above mentioned item(s) which should be eliminated from the Teacher Management category of the instrument. _____

Please indicate the number(s) of any above mentioned item(s) which would be better placed in another one of the 4 evaluation categories. _____

Please indicate additional items which would improve the Teacher Management category. _____

TEACHER INSTRUCTIONAL INDICATORS:

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The teacher communicates the instructional objectives to students. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. The teacher shows how the present topic is related to those topics that have been taught or that will be taught. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. The teacher relates subject topics to existing student experiences. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. The teacher uses signaled responses, questioning techniques and/or guided practices to involve all students. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. The teacher teaches the objectives through a variety of methods. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. The teacher gives directions that are clearly stated and related to the learning objectives. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. The teacher demonstrates desired skills. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8. The teacher checks to determine if students are progressing toward stated objectives. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9. The teacher changes instruction based on the results of monitoring. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10. The teacher requires all students to practice newly learned skills while under direct supervision of the teacher. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 11. The teacher requires students to practice newly learned skills without the direct supervision of the teacher. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12. The teacher summarizes and fits into context what has been taught. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Please indicate the number(s) of any above mentioned item(s) which should be eliminated from the Teaching Instructional category of the instrument. _____

Please indicate the number(s) of any above mentioned item(s) which would be better placed in another one of the 4 evaluation categories. _____

Please indicate additional items which would improve the Teacher Instructional category. _____

TEACHER PRODUCT INDICATORS:

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The teacher writes daily lesson plans designed to achieve the identified objectives. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

- | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2. | The teacher maintains a written record of student progress. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. | The teacher utilizes grading patterns that are fairly administered and based on identified criteria. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. | Students demonstrate mastery of stated objective through projects, daily assignments, performance and test scores. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Please indicate the number(s) of any above mentioned item(s) which should be eliminated from the Teacher Products category of the instrument. _____

Please indicate the number(s) of any above mentioned item(s) which would be better placed in another one of the 4 categories. _____

Please indicate additional items which would improve the Teacher Products category. _____

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:

- | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | The teacher explores, evaluates, and utilizes teaching approaches. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. | The teacher is enthusiastic and approaches the job in a positive manner. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. | The teacher communicates with parents and the community in a professional manner. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. | The teacher complies with school rules, regulations and board policies. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. | The teacher is accurate and prompt with records and reports. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. | The teacher actively supports his/her school's programs and activities. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

7. The teacher maintains good relations 0 1 2 3 4
and works cooperatively with the
staff.

Please indicate the number(s) of above mentioned item(s)
which should be eliminated from the Professional Development
category of the
instrument. _____

Please indicate the number(s) of any of above mentioned
item(s) which would be better placed in another one of the 4
evaluation categories.

Please indicate additional items which would improve the
Professional Development category. _____

VITA

JAMIE MILLER KETCHUM

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED SCHOOL PERSONNEL REGARDING THE VALUE OF INDICATORS USED IN THE EVALUATION OF TEACHERS IN OKLAHOMA

Major Field: Agricultural Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, October 2, 1963.

Education: Graduated from Union City High School, Union City, Oklahoma, in May, 1981; received Associate Degree in Liberal Arts from El Reno Junior College in May, 1983; received Bachelor of Science Degree in Vocational Home Economics from Southwestern Oklahoma State University in May, 1986; enrolled in Master of Science program at Oklahoma State University, 1989-1993; completed the requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University, in May, 1993.

Professional Experience: CETA Program Secretary, Community Service Assistant, El Reno Junior College, El Reno, Oklahoma, 1982-1983; Accounting Personnel Production Assistant, Santa Fe Mineral, Inc., El Reno, Oklahoma, 1984-1986; Clerk, Typist, Child Care Careers, Inc., Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1986-87; Vocational Home Economics Instructor, Verden High School, 1987-89; Substitute Instructor, Texas and Oklahoma schools, 1989-91; Customer Service Representative, Licensed Property, Casualty Insurance, Pool-Martin Insurance Agency, Inc., 1991 to present.