

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE STANDARD EVALUATIVE  
CRITERIA REGARDING ENTRY-YEAR TEACHERS  
AS PERCEIVED BY MEMBERS OF ENTRY-  
YEAR ASSISTANCE COMMITTEES AND  
ENTRY-YEAR TEACHERS

By

MARY LOUISE MERITT

Bachelor of Arts  
Central State University  
Edmond, Oklahoma  
1966

Master of Science  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
1973

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
December, 1983



THE IMPORTANCE OF THE STANDARD EVALUATIVE  
CRITERIA REGARDING ENTRY-YEAR TEACHERS  
AS PERCEIVED BY MEMBERS OF ENTRY-  
YEAR ASSISTANCE COMMITTEES AND  
ENTRY-YEAR TEACHERS

Thesis Approved:

*Kenneth H. Clair*

Thesis Adviser

*Kenneth L. King*

*Imogene L. Lord*

*A. Kenneth Stein*

*Norman D. Durhan*

Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer would like to dedicate this study to an outstanding educator and friend, Dr. C. T. Shades, retired Professor of Education at Phillips University. The writer deeply appreciates the inspiration and expectation.

For the synthesizing and critical inquiry from Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, Chairman of the Doctoral Committee, the writer expresses her sincere appreciation. For the unqualified professional acceptance by Dr. Ken Stern, Dr. Imogene Land, Dr. Ken McKinley, and Dr. Ken King, the writer acknowledges the friendship and guidance which leads to both personal and professional growth. A note of gratitude is due Dr. John Folks, Assistant State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Mrs. Judy Leach, Administrator of Teacher Education/Staff Development State Department of Education, and Senator Bernice Shedrick, State Senator District 21, for their accessibility and assistance relative to this study.

With the support and sacrifice from her husband, Ray, and her children, Stephannie, Shannon, and Robert, this study was a family's effort at promoting scholarship and achievement.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Background . . . . .	3
The Problem. . . . .	4
Objective of the Study . . . . .	5
Hypotheses to be Tested. . . . .	6
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	7
Assumptions. . . . .	8
Definition of Terms. . . . .	9
Significance of the Study. . . . .	11
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE. . . . .	13
Early Evaluation Attempts. . . . .	15
New Trends in Evaluation . . . . .	19
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	26
Introduction . . . . .	26
Preliminary Procedures . . . . .	27
Choice of Research Design. . . . .	27
Choice of Populations and Samples. . . . .	28
Development of the Questionnaire . . . . .	29
Choice of Testing Statistics . . . . .	31
Collection of Data . . . . .	32
Analysis of Data . . . . .	32
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA . . . . .	35
Introduction . . . . .	35
Description of Study Participants. . . . .	37
Analysis and Results of Research . . . . .	41
Hypothesis One. . . . .	43
Hypothesis Two. . . . .	44
Hypothesis Three. . . . .	46
Hypothesis Four . . . . .	48
Hypothesis Five . . . . .	49
Analysis of Responses by Group to Open-Ended Questions on the Questionnaire . . . . .	52
Additional Analyses. . . . .	55
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	69
Introduction . . . . .	69

Chapter	Page
Findings and Conclusions . . . . .	70
Conclusions. . . . .	72
Recommendations. . . . .	79
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	83
APPENDIXES . . . . .	87
APPENDIX A - STATE DEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE. . . . .	88
APPENDIX B - ENTRY-YEAR TEACHER OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT. . . . .	90
APPENDIX C - QUESTIONNAIRE. . . . .	98
APPENDIX D - CORRESPONDENCE TO SAMPLE . . . . .	104
APPENDIX E - FOLLOW-UP LETTER . . . . .	107
APPENDIX F - CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE SAMPLE . . . . .	109
APPENDIX G - TEACHER CONSULTANT REGULATIONS . . . . .	121

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Number of Questionnaires Mailed to Each Group and Percentage of Return . . . . .	37
II. Distribution of Respondents by Teaching Experience in Public Schools . . . . .	38
III. Distribution of Higher Education Respondents by Teaching Experience in Public Schools . . . . .	39
IV. Distribution of Respondents by Teaching Experience in Institutions of Higher Education . . . . .	40
V. Distribution of All Respondents by Administrative Experience . . . . .	40
VI. Distribution of Higher Education Respondents by Administrative Experience . . . . .	41
VII. Distribution of Respondents by Present Grade Level Taught . . . . .	42
VIII. Distribution of Respondents by Highest Degree Held . . . . .	42
IX. Summary of Data for Hypothesis One . . . . .	44
X. Comparison of Four Entry-Year Assistance Committee Responses on Human Relations Category. . . . .	45
XI. Summary of Data for Hypothesis Two . . . . .	46
XII. Comparison of Four Entry-Year Assistance Committee Responses on Teaching and Assessment . . . . .	46
XIII. Summary of Data for Hypothesis Three . . . . .	47
XIV. Comparison of Four Entry-Year Assistance Committee Responses on Classroom Management. . . . .	48
XV. Summary of Data for Hypothesis Four. . . . .	49
XVI. Comparison of Four Entry-Year Assistance Committee Responses on Professionalism . . . . .	50

Table	Page
XVII. Group Rank Ordering of Standard Observation Categories .	51
XVIII. Items Recommended to be Eliminated From Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument . . . . .	53
XIX. Items Recommended to be Placed in Another Category on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument. . . . .	56
XX. Summary of Suggested Items to Improve the Human Rela- tions Category . . . . .	59
XXI. Summary of Suggested Items to Improve the Teaching and Assessment Category. . . . .	60
XXII. Summary of Suggested Items to Improve the Classroom Management Category. . . . .	61
XXIII. Summary of Suggested Items to Improve the Profession- alism Category . . . . .	62
XXIV. Data for Years of Teaching Experience, Public School . .	63
XXV. Data for Years of Teaching Experience, Higher Edu- cation . . . . .	65
XXVI. Data for Administrative Experience . . . . .	66
XXVII. Data for Current Grade Level Taught. . . . .	67
XXVIII. Data for Level of Education. . . . .	68

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

In spite of a decade of educational innovations in teacher education, little can compare to the significant, far-reaching change being sought in the entry-year of the teachers in Oklahoma's schools. In the 1982-83 school year, the Entry-Year Assistance Programs based on Oklahoma Statutes 70 O.S. 6-155 were implemented. These statutes, commonly referred to as House Bill 1706, are a legislative response to a statewide concern for the status of education, including the preparation of teacher candidates and the performance of practicing teachers. Since 1980, in particular, administrators, teachers, and higher education representatives in the state of Oklahoma have joined forces to enhance the entry-year teacher's induction year through a committee support system culminating in on the job assessment of the teaching performance.

The need to provide quality assistance to beginning teachers and assess teaching performance is an outgrowth of the continued primary concern of the nation's citizenry regarding schools. The Fourteenth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools continues to give evidence that the quality of teachers in America's classrooms is of extreme importance (Gallup, 1982).

In April of 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform suggests that



teacher effectiveness is enhanced through a better understanding of learning and teaching and the implications of this knowledge for school practice. Further, the Commission recommended that persons preparing to teach should be required to meet high educational standards, to demonstrate an aptitude for teaching, and to demonstrate competence in an academic discipline. Finally, the Commissioners proposed that master teachers should be involved in designing teacher preparation programs and in supervising teachers during their probationary years. These recommendations are integral parts of the Entry-Year Assistance model currently in place in Oklahoma.

Through the efforts of the special committee of educators appointed in February, 1981, by the Oklahoma State Department of Education, a process was designed to serve as a guide for entry-year committee members as they worked with entry-year teachers (Emmons, 1983). One part of that process was the design and development of an evaluation instrument. The committee took the responsibility for determining appropriate criteria to be used in assessing the entry-year teachers' teaching performances.

While effectiveness was difficult to define and describe, the special committee reviewed and relied on available research to develop a standard observation instrument. Controversy existed around how to assess the many variables involved in a teacher's performance. The categories and the descriptors were designed to be a guide for the Entry-Year Assistance Committee in assessing the teaching performance at designated times during the entry year.

With the input of various agencies, professional organizations, and the special committee of educators, the policy decisions for the

Entry-Year Assistance Program were developed. There was an understanding that changes would need to occur once the program was in place and adjustments were needed (Folks and Leach, 1983). Finally, the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument was designed by the committee and approved by the State Board of Education on September 24, 1981.

Questions have been raised by educators concerning the content, format, and purpose of the standard observation instrument in evaluating the performance of the entry-year teacher. The extent to which knowledgeable people agree that the evaluation system contains items or categories that are clearly articulated and representative of the concepts that are to be measured refers to content validity (Mazur, 1980). While many of these questions have been answered as the program has been implemented, there are some questions which need to be addressed through research efforts involving the members of the entry-year committees across Oklahoma.

### Background

In late spring of 1981, the State Department of Education convened a committee of teachers, administrators, and higher education representatives to assist in the development of a standard observation instrument (Appendix A). From the outset, classroom teachers, who made up the majority of the special committee, opposed a summative or rating scale format (Robinson, 1983). The committee examined numerous evaluation instruments used in Oklahoma's school districts. As the discussion progressed, the members expressed support for an instrument which would be a guide for the entry-year committee members, as well as an evaluation tool for ultimately making the recommendation for

certification. There was sentiment for an evaluation instrument with broad criteria and with observation as an integral part of the evaluation process. In the final draft, the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument had both.

In the final analysis, the special committee felt a priority was to have a common beginning frame of reference for all Entry-Year Assistance Committee members. The broad categories were "homegrown" for use in Oklahoma's school districts employing entry-year teachers (Wisniewski, 1983). From the broad categories, the special committee members generated a list of descriptors with inherent individual interpretation (Emmons, 1983). Some members felt that it was important that entry-year assistance committee members be allowed an opportunity to cite both strengths and weaknesses. By September, 1981, the Professional Standards Board and the State Board of Education approved a draft which included four categories, 35 descriptors, and a required narrative statements regarding strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations (Appendix B). In addition, observation was an integral part of the evaluation process.

Because of the urgency of fall implementation, the special committee faced time constraints prior to submission of the instrument for use in Oklahoma's school districts (Folks, 1983; Leach, 1983). As a result, the school districts employing an entry-year teacher received notification from the Oklahoma State Department of Education of the process to be followed and the instrument to be used.

#### The Problem

By legislative mandate (House Bill 1706), beginning with the

1982-83 school year, Entry-Year Assistance Committees have been formed in all school districts in which an entry-year teacher has been employed. These committee members meet and contribute to a process intended to insure that the public education of the children of Oklahoma will be provided by teachers of demonstrated ability (Oklahoma Statutes Supplement, 1980).

Along with their other duties, the Entry-Year Assistance Committee members observe and evaluate the entry-year teacher for the purpose of recommendation for certification. The Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument approved by the Professional Standards Board and adopted by the State Board of Education is in use in Oklahoma's school districts for the purpose of providing feedback and, eventually, evaluating the entry-year teacher's teaching performance. At this time, no information about the congruence or incongruence of committee member's perceptions concerning the standard observation criteria is available.

Thus, the problem is to determine if there is a difference among the members of the Entry-Year Assistance Committee and the Entry-Year Teacher in perceptions of the importance of the evaluative criteria on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument.

#### Objective of the Study

The objective of this study is to determine and analyze any differences in perceptions of the importance of the evaluative criteria on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument by the members of the entry-year committees and the entry-year teacher. To accomplish this objective, the following questions will be answered:

1. Are there differences in the way teacher consultants, higher education representatives, entry-year teachers, and administrative representatives perceive the importance of the human relations criteria in the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument?

2. Are there differences in the way teacher consultants, higher education representatives, entry-year teachers, and administrative representatives perceive the importance of the teaching and assessment criteria in the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument?

3. Are there differences in the way teacher consultants, higher education representatives, entry-year teachers, and administrative representatives perceive the importance of the classroom management criteria in the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument?

4. Are there differences in the way teacher consultants, higher education representatives, entry-year teachers, and administrative representatives perceive the importance of the professionalism criteria in the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument?

5. Is there a difference among the groups in the rank ordering of the four major categories according to perceived importance?

#### Hypotheses to be Tested

To accomplish the purpose of the study and to answer the questions posed in the objective of the study, the following hypotheses were developed and tested:

$H_{01}$  There is no significant difference among the response levels of entry-year teachers, teacher consultants, administrative representatives, and higher education representatives regarding the descriptors

in the human relations category on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument.

Ho<sub>2</sub> There is no significant difference among the response levels of entry-year teachers, teacher consultants, administrative representatives, and higher education representatives regarding the descriptors in the teaching and assessment category on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument.

Ho<sub>3</sub> There is no significant difference among the response levels of entry-year teachers, teacher consultants, administrative representatives, and higher education representatives regarding the descriptors in the classroom management category on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument.

Ho<sub>4</sub> There is no significant difference among the response levels of entry-year teachers, teacher consultants, administrative representatives, and higher education representatives regarding the descriptors in the professionalism category on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument.

Ho<sub>5</sub> There are no significant differences among the groups in the rank ordering of the categories on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument according to perceived importance.

#### Limitations of the Study

Certain limitations inherent in the study were:

1. The first year for the implementation of the Entry-Year Assistance Program statewide was 1982-83. Any change in an educational process requires adjustment which will necessitate further related research over time. The current study is cross sectional in

nature, thus tapping perceptions as they exist now, early in the state's experience with this new effort.

2. The validity of responses depended upon the willingness of respondents to cooperate, their honesty in answering, and their interest to answer completely.

3. The findings of the study are limited to the number of questionnaires returned by the subjects.

4. For the purpose of this study, the categories and descriptors were of primary concern. The strengths, weaknesses, and concerns sections on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument were not included as a part of the questionnaire.

#### Assumptions

For the purpose of this study, the following assumptions were made:

1. The samples of entry-year teachers, teacher consultants, higher education representatives, and administrative representatives will be representative of the respective larger populations, since they will be randomly selected.

2. The samples from each of the four groups: entry-year teachers, teacher consultants, higher education representatives, and administrative representatives, will permit generalizations to the respective larger populations.

3. The data collection instrument will give an accurate representation of the perceptions held regarding the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument in terms of each group's role, function, and purpose.

## Definition of Terms

A number of terms will be used in this study. The major source of definitions used in this study are from School Laws of Oklahoma, Section 2 (1982). The following definitions will be applicable throughout this study:

Administrative Representative: The superintendent, or chief administrative officer, or individual serving as his/her designee in an administrative capacity in the school district. Usually this will be the building principal.

Board: For the purpose of this study, the Oklahoma State Board of Education shall be referred to as the Board.

Certified or Certificated Teacher: "Any teacher who has been issued a certificate by the State Board of Education in accordance with this act and the rules and regulations of the Board" (School Laws of Oklahoma, 1982, p. 98).

Entry-Year: That period of time a teacher holds a license and is under the guidance of an Entry-Year Assistance Committee.

Entry-Year Assistance Committee: A committee in a local school district organized for the purpose of reviewing the teaching performance of an entry-year teacher and making recommendations to the Board and the preparing institution of higher education regarding certification for the entry-year teacher.

Entry-Year Assistance Program: The program established in House Bill 1706 to provide assistance to licensed entry-year teachers.

Entry-Year Teacher: A licensed teacher who is employed in a state accredited school to serve as a teacher under the guidance and assistance of an Entry-Year Assistance Committee; all persons



graduating from an accredited institution of higher education before February 1, 1982, and not meeting approved program certificate requirements prior to that date or not holding a valid certificate on February 1, 1982.

Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument: The instrument which is used to evaluate teaching performance of the entry-year teacher during the entry-year. The instrument is comprised of four categories with descriptors delineating the criteria to be observed and recorded.

Higher Education Representative: A college or university faculty member who serves on an Entry-Year Assistance Committee; this person must have an active involvement in the institution's undergraduate or graduate programs and be acceptable to the local school district's board of education.

House Bill 1706: Legislation passed by the Second Regular Session of the 37th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma for the purpose of establishing qualifications of teachers in the accredited schools of Oklahoma through licensing and certification.

License: Written authority issued by and in accordance with the rules and regulations of the State Board of Education, to perform the particular services for which a person is employed.

Licensed Teacher: "Any person who holds a valid license to teach, issued by the Board in accordance with House Bill 1706 and the rules and regulations of the Board" (School Laws of Oklahoma, 1982, p. 98).

Perceptions: Intellectual and sensory elements, conscious and unconscious influences (Dolores, 1965); related to personality variables, which means that information is actively related to the

concepts, attitudes, and motives of the person who is perceiving (Vinacke, 1968); a selective process in which a person tends to see things as they fit into his past experiences (Vinacke, 1968); the way each individual structures the presumably common objective situation selectively (Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell, 1968).

Profession: Defined in the Oxford English Dictionary (1933) as a vocation in which a professed knowledge of some department of learning or science is used in its application to the affairs of others or in the practice of an art founded upon it.

Teacher Consultant:

Any teacher holding a standard certificate who is employed in a school district to serve as a teacher and who has been appointed to provide guidance and assistance to an entry-year teacher employed by the local school district. A teacher consultant shall be a classroom teacher and have a minimum of two (2) years of classroom teaching experience as a certified teacher. No certified teacher shall serve as a teacher consultant more than two (2) consecutive years, although such certified teachers may serve as teacher consultants for more than two (2) years. A teacher consultant shall be selected by the principal from a list submitted by the bargaining unit where one exists. In the absence of a bargaining agent, the teachers shall elect the names to be submitted. No teacher may serve as a teacher consultant for more than one entry-year teacher at a time (School Laws of Oklahoma, 1982, p. 98).

### Significance of the Study

The Entry-Year Assistance Program has been implemented in Oklahoma's school districts employing entry-year teachers. Yet, the Entry-Year Assistance Program is so new that little research has been generated to address practices, committee function, or perceptions of the committee members.

Continuation of the program by school districts and continuation of funding and support by the legislature are dependent upon reviewing the components of the Entry-Year Assistance Program. Many of these concerns may be resolved as the program moves through developmental stages while other concerns about the instrument may need to be addressed. This study can serve as a basis for future Board regulations.

The research will give insight into those qualities valued in evaluating, through observation, the on-the-job performance of the entry-year teacher by the respective groups. The results may be pertinent to consideration of the need for revision or elimination of some descriptors within the categories on the standard observation instrument. The information may also be used as supporting evidence further validating the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument. For there to be validation, one requirement for any instrument is reliability. Reliability answers the question of to what degree can two or more persons observe the same teacher at the same point in time and independently draw the same conclusion.

In summary, the fundamental purpose of teacher evaluation systems is to differentiate between effective and ineffective teaching. The content must be valid, the procedure must be reliable, and the evaluation system needs to be comprehensive. Finally, it is hoped that this descriptive study will serve as a basis for future research and increased knowledge of instrumentation and observation in education.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature reviewed in this chapter was selected on the basis of its relevance to the problem being studied. The literature has been presented as follows: a brief history of evaluation in the United States, early attempts at determining teacher evaluation criteria, and new trends in evaluation.

Historically, evaluation of educators has never been enthusiastically accepted or understood. In part, the lack of interest has been perpetuated because it has been assumed that teachers taught and students learned (Natriello, 1977). Movement toward teacher evaluation began with continued attempts to refine program evaluation. Program evaluations began in the United States with Joseph Rice's 1897-1898 comparative study of spelling performance of 33,000 students. Additionally, in the 1900's, Robert Thorndike, referred to by educators in the field as the father of the educational testing movement, was successful in convincing educators of the value of measuring human change. In the first two decades of the 1900's, the measurement technology for determining human abilities expanded. Historically, evaluation of programs or student achievement has long been acceptable to educators.

Worthen and Sanders (1973) suggest that during the 1930's, two developments occurred which have resulted in continuing impact on

evaluation practices. First, the widely read and highly regarded Eight Year Study was evaluated, making use of a variety of tests, scales, inventories, questionnaires, checklists, and other measures in each of 30 high schools. Second, educational practice evolved from the accreditation movement. Policies for evaluating students have been distinct from those for evaluating teachers and administrators. Unfortunately, according to Oldham (1974), in the 1900's teacher evaluation systems were viewed as thinly disguised weapons for getting rid of nonconformist teachers, for budget slashing, or for enforcing authoritarianism in the schools.

Many evaluation devices failed to measure professional competence fairly, which resulted in the alienation between teachers and administrators. Lack of attention to evaluation processes, faulty instruments, poorly defined performance criteria, lack of participant involvement, and legal questions are cited by DeVaughn (1971) as major problems with teacher evaluation.

After the 1950's, teacher evaluation focused upon the beginning teacher, and its major use was to make decisions about permanent certification or about dismissal with just cause. State legislatures in the 1960's succeeded in appropriating significant dollar increases to education and those appropriations were tied to accountability laws. The 1960's push for accountability contributed to the volume of material on the evaluation of teachers. Where laws did not mandate accountability, the public did. Evaluation became a preoccupation in education. The need for evaluation was widely acknowledged and few educators doubted the need. Levin (1979) suggests that the field of

teacher evaluation has suffered from a surplus of opinion and a shortage of good research.

With interest in evaluation practices at both the local and state level, the 1970's ushered in the intensive search for improved ways to evaluate teachers. As a result, in the 1970's the Phi Delta Kappa Commission on Evaluation concluded that problems of evaluation included:

- a) lack of adequate evaluation theory,
- b) lack of specification of the types of evaluative information,
- c) lack of appropriate instruments and designs,
- d) lack of good systems for organizing, processing, and reporting evaluative information, and
- e) lack of sufficient numbers of well-trained evaluation personnel (p. 8).

In essence, information about educational outcomes has been lacking and educators have been unable to defend against attacks on the schools which have come about in the 1970's and 1980's as an outgrowth of the dissatisfaction and disappointment with the public schools.

An objective measure of teachers' performances has been illusive. Typically, narrative reports and/or checklist evaluations are used to evaluate teachers. Fortunately, continuing research and experimentation have resulted in a data base and framework for reexamining the process of teaching and learning.

#### Early Evaluation Attempts

Little agreement exists on the description of teacher effectiveness. The problem in evaluating teacher effectiveness lies in the teacher's involvement in so many tasks with so many children of

varying abilities. In many cases, selection and evaluation centered on personal traits or attributes. For teachers, their first contact with a school district's evaluation criteria occurs in the selection process. Haefele (1978) presented the teacher interview as an approach to teacher evaluation with two important functions. First, the interview is the most significant phase of the process used in the selection of teachers. Second, the interview is the principal method of conveying a performance appraisal to the employed teacher. Haefele further states:

In many states (e.g., Ohio and New York), unlawful inquiries include questions or statements such as the following: Are you known as Mr., Mrs., Miss, or Ms.? Are you married? Single? Divorced? Separated? Name or other information about spouse. Are you able to reproduce, or do you advocate any form of birth control or family planning? Have you ever been arrested? Please affix photograph. Did you receive an honorable discharge from military service? What is your national origin? Do you have any handicaps? (p. 44).

Such questions and inferences were designed to be a mechanism by which teachers could assess their qualifications for employment and what was expected of them.

Once on the job, teachers were expected to meet community expectations and keep the school open and comfortable. Writings detail the main criterion of teacher effectiveness as classroom management. Under such a managerial model, the responsibility for learning was the pupil's. The teacher's time was spent organizing the work.

In keeping with the manager model described, Dyer (1973) holds that there are absolute minimum requirements in teacher accountability. Minimums such as low absentee rate, physical fitness, mental fitness, and low profile (personal life), do not discriminate on basis of race, religion, or social class background and are highly defensible for the

good of the children (Dyer, 1973). Further, Dyer suggests an expectation for a teacher to perform a multitude of "good works" in addition to meeting minimum requirements. The "good works" come in three inter-related categories: (1) knowing the subject, (2) knowing the students, and (3) acting in a way so as to make as certain as possible that the students will learn the subject.

School records reveal samples of evaluation forms which give evidence of the administrator and/or local school boards' focuses on traits valued in early criteria selection (Appendix D). These traits or personal attributes were used as the criteria on which continued employment rested. Criteria such as personality, marital status, race, and propagation plans were the bases for the perpetuation of the threat of imminent doom for failure to comply with a local district's arbitrary, and sometimes nebulous decisions.

Dewey (1939) and other educators ushered in a new assumption that a teacher's job was to facilitate and enhance learning in the student. A range of criteria was introduced as a result. Thus, educators saw the personal traits coupled with learning outcomes for evaluation purposes.

In some school districts, evaluation attempts were viewed as adhering to a deficiency model. Dewey (1939) reported the following:

When the contexts are taken into account, what emerges are propositions assigning a relatively negative value to existing conditions; a comparatively positive value to a prospective set of conditions; and intermediate propositions (which may or may not contain a valuation-expression) intended to invoke activities that will bring about a transformation from one state of affairs to another. There are thus involved (i) aversion to an existing situation and attraction toward a prospective possible situation and (ii) a specifiable and testable relation between the latter as an end and certain activities as means for accomplishing it (p. 13).



The connotation of evaluation was that "something" must be wrong and that "something" better was to be gained from evaluation. Dewey (1939) was concerned with the relationship between criteria which were valued and educational means and ends.

Hughes (1965) developed a five category classification of personal qualifications responsible for success in teaching: (1) native intelligence, (2) social intelligence, (3) special abilities, (4) physical traits, and (5) facility of expression. Hughes suggested that scores related to native intelligence could be used to establish a critical minimum point. He contends that the higher the scores one makes on such a scale, the more certain is successful teaching. Social competencies associated with successful teaching are not measurable. There are social competencies such as capacity for leadership, tactfulness in working closely with others, and sensitivity to the needs and wants of others associated with successful teacher performance. Special abilities do enhance an individual's interest and success in teaching. Physical vigor and good health are necessary to teaching effectiveness. Energy, appearance, and quality of voice are believed to enhance the quality of teaching. Finally, Hughes contends that the teacher who gives vivid illustrations and is highly verbal is valuable indeed.

Bolton (1973) suggests that summative evaluations may not have been helpful for improving instruction. The approach served to validate the schools' teacher selection process, reward superior performance, protect students from incompetence, and supply information that could lead to the modification of teachers' assignments and terminations.

In addressing the problem in evaluating means and ends, educators were conscious of the importance of the process and procedures involved in evaluation.

Redfern (1978) reported that conventional evaluation, in many instances, was a post-performance, checklist rating process. Such a process relied heavily upon observations and required the observer to rate what was seen and heard, using a scale that classified performance by categories of competence. Typically, conventional procedures posed an additional problem. Performance was, in many cases, rated on a five-point scale, often labeled outstanding, good, average, weak, and unsatisfactory.

Lewis (1973) states that traditional methods of evaluating the performances of teachers are based erroneously on two assumptions. First, the evaluation program is based on a motivational theory which predicts that telling an educator where he is ineffective will provide the necessary effective motivation to improve his performance. Second, the evaluation program is based on the assumption that the roles of the administrator and the teacher are compatible and that criticism itself will result in improvement in performance.

Improvement in performance may have been the objective in school districts, but the importance of appropriate evaluative criteria was recognized as educators began to assess the total teaching process. While controversy still exists, school districts have, in many cases, developed much more comprehensive evaluation models.

#### New Trends in Evaluation

Teacher evaluation seems to lag behind the better methods of

student and program evaluation. Generally, teaching skill is judged almost exclusively on the basis of observational ratings of teacher activity inside and outside the classroom.

Changing patterns of evaluation evidence a trend away from the negative (identifying poor teachers so they can be terminated) and toward the positive (identifying weaknesses and strengths for improvement in performance). Consequently, many districts give consideration to both the cognitive and affective outcomes of the teaching performance. Ideally, evaluation programs require well thought through goals and objectives.

Because of the historically negative connotation of evaluation, Evans (1976) suggests that the intelligent use of evaluation results will include a constructive feedback procedure for a teacher's benefit to provide assistance toward the refinement of skills. Evans envisions a system in which two-way communication, professional growth, and positive attitudes enhance the evaluation process.

Sord (1973), in an article entitled "Teaching Effectiveness," proposes that the objective of evaluation is to provide feedback to the instructor for the purposes of assessing the outcome of learning, improving instruction, and improving learning. He suggests that each faculty member should be measured in total, and his strengths and weaknesses should be evaluated in light of the school's entire program. Further, he emphasizes that evaluation of teaching is difficult because learning can be accomplished in many ways, and an effective learning experience is dependent upon many variables:

1. the ability to communicate effectively

2. student participation in class discussions and the exchange of ideas and opinions by students

3. well-developed course outlines and carefully designed class assignments.

4. faculty members taking responsibility for improving the effectiveness of their teaching and strengthening their overall academic performance.

Bolton (1973) agrees that comprehensive and systematic procedures help to improve learning conditions for children. Effective evaluation procedures include cooperative planning by teachers and administrators with outside assistance as needed. Bolton outlines a five stage process: goal-setting conferences, observation and information collection, postobservation conferences and communication, decision making, and assessment of the evaluation process.

The most common and fundamental assumption about the purpose of teacher evaluation is that evaluation should contribute to the improvement of instruction or the improvement of the teaching/learning process.

The nature of the criteria selected will determine the purpose of evaluation. In the evaluation of teachers, most educators (Ware, 1964; Ryans, 1957, 1963; Barr, 1941; Schalock, 1967) agree that in a complex environment, performance is influenced by the interaction of personal characteristics and situational variables. Personal variables include intellectual and affective structures, perceptual habits, age, and level of training, while the situational variables might include the characteristics of the learners, the materials used, the goals of the institution, the instructional objectives, and the physical setting.

While no single instrument can include all of the potential behavior worthy of observation, well designed instruments and well organized procedures will make allowance for the variables inherent in evaluation (Peterson, 1983). According to Peterson, school districts generally adopt one instrument for the purpose of evaluation, which may include six to twelve categories. Peterson used six points to present essential gauges for appropriate evaluation of teacher performance:

1. Only performance teachers can control should be summatively evaluated, i.e., their own behavior.
2. Items in the evaluation system should stem from researched performance that directly relates to student learning rather than items chosen only because they are 'valued,' i.e., consensus based upon group opinion.
3. Groups of performances (examples are how instruction is organized and managed) must be identified, classified, defined, and examples given to make explicit the basis on which evaluations are to occur.
4. Instruments designed to detect and record teacher performance must be developed and validated and observers trained and tested for reliability.
5. Formative evaluation should result from observations scheduled during significant periods of extended teaching, e.g., over the period of a unit or sequence of instruction.
6. Summative evaluation must be based on a representative sample of teacher performance and where resources are adequate should be the end result of a series of formative evaluations (p. 15).

Flanders and Simon (1969) have identified certain teacher activities as contributors to desirable student outcomes:

1. Acceptance of student ideas and opinions.
2. Adjusting instruction to different levels of cognitive ability.

3. Diagnosing student difficulties and providing appropriate remedial work.

4. Using advanced organizers and outlines.

Beginning in the fall of 1980, newly certified teachers in Georgia have had to demonstrate 14 competencies. Competency statements were organized by functions (planning instruction, evaluating learners, managing instruction, instructing, providing the learning environment, and being a professional) in the study conducted by Adams, Johnson, Okey, and Capie (1978) at the University of Georgia. The competencies criteria used for certification are listed below:

#### Teaching Plans and Materials

- I. Plans instruction to achieve selected objectives.
- II. Organizes instruction to take into account individual differences among learners.
- III. Obtains and uses information about the needs and progress of individual learners.
- IV. Refers learners with special problems to specialists.
- V. Obtains and uses information about the effectiveness of instruction to revise it when necessary.

#### Classroom Procedures

- VI. Uses instructional techniques, methods, and media related to the objectives.
- VII. Communicates with learners.
- VIII. Demonstrates a repertoire of teaching methods.
- IX. Reinforces and encourages learner involvement in lessons.
- X. Demonstrates an understanding of the school subject being taught and demonstrates its relevance.
- XI. Organizes time, space, materials, and equipment for instruction.

### Interpersonal Skills

- XII. Demonstrates enthusiasm for teaching, learning, and the subject being taught.
- XIII. Helps learners develop positive self concepts.
- XIV. Manages classroom interactions (Ellett, Capie, and Johnson, 1980, pp. 219-220).

Redfern (1978) contends that, while evaluation, traditionally, has been viewed as a one-day rating process, it is more sensible to design evaluation procedures that call for performance objectives, specify a cooperative plan of action to achieve those goals, engage in both self-evaluation and evaluator assessments, and conduct a conference between teacher and evaluator to discuss implications of the evaluations. Additionally, he suggests that one approach worthy of consideration is evaluation by objectives. The five steps include diagnosing current performance, setting objectives and action plans, achieving objectives and action plans, assessing results, analyzing results, and planning the next cycle.

The Redfern (1978) method requires high involvement of the teacher to set specific goals and objectives (job targets) toward which he or she will work. The process requires classroom visitation and subsequent conferences to assess how well goals have been met, whether amendments are needed, or new goals added.

Mannatt, Palmer, and Hidlebaugh (1976), in research done over five years, developed a 30 item instrument. Each item is descriptive of teacher behavior: productive teaching techniques, positive interpersonal relations, organized/structured class management, intellectual stimulation, and desirable out-of-class behavior. They caution that successful use of any evaluation instrument depends upon the skills of

the appraiser. Like Redfern, they support, at the very least:

1. Self-appraisal for familiarization and preparation for the post-conference.
2. Pre-observation conferences to discuss instructional objectives, methods, and the learners.
3. Classroom observations--two or three periods per cycle.
4. Post-observation conferences to discuss critical classroom incidents, progress, and to exchange questions.
5. Agreement on a plan of action.
6. Time to improve, help to improve, and mutual (appraiser-appraisee) monitoring of change.
7. Report of the summary evaluation to appraisee and to superiors (Mannatt, Palmer, and Hidlebaugh, 1976, pp. 23-24).

In summary, this review of the literature presented various attempts by researchers and practitioners to provide the best and most comprehensive instruments to approach the very complex task of assessing teaching performance. Historically, determining teacher evaluation criteria and procedures has been a difficult task. Yet, educators have continued over the years to refine the evaluative criteria to reflect the goals needed for performance assessment. Continued scrutiny is inevitable due to the complexity of the teaching performance. This review will assist the researcher in examining perceptions of the Entry-Year Assistance Committee members, including the entry-year teacher regarding the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument.



## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a difference among the members of selected Oklahoma Entry-Year Assistance Committee and the entry-year teacher regarding their in perceptions of the evaluative criteria on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument. The purpose of this chapter is to explain the planning of the research, to discuss the selection of the samples, the formulation of the instrument, the procedures followed in obtaining the data, and to describe the statistical treatment which was applied to the data.

Selected members participating in entry-year assistance committees for the 1982-83 school year who were identified prior to November 11, 1982, were asked to complete a 53 item questionnaire (Appendix C) to determine their perceptions of the standard observation criteria used to evaluate entry-year teachers. In addition, the entry-year teachers were asked to respond to the same questionnaire to ascertain the perceptions of beginning teachers. Specifically, perceptions were gathered from the teacher consultants, the administrative representatives, the higher education representatives, and the entry-year teachers. Members of the four groups represented were asked to complete the questionnaire indicating their opinions about the criteria as they

utilized the document for the "purpose of reviewing the teaching performance" of the entry-year teacher.

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

### Preliminary Procedures

The preliminary procedures include the following steps: choice of research design, choice of populations and samples, development of the questionnaire, and choice of statistical procedures.

### Choice of Research Design

The choice of the appropriate research design for conducting the research was the first procedural decision. The type of research method chosen for this study was descriptive research. Best (1970), author of Research in Education, had this to say regarding descriptive research:

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; processes that are going on; effects that are being felt; or trends that are developing. The process of descriptive research goes beyond the mere gathering and tabulating of data. It involves an element of analysis and interpretation of the meaning or significance of what is described (p. 116).

In addition, Tuckman (1978) recommends that surveys be undertaken within a research design utilizing comparison groups. Therefore, the research design chosen was a survey-type study which was designed to describe perceptions certain individuals have regarding the standard

evaluative criteria on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument used by Entry-Year Assistance Committees.

#### Choice of Populations and Samples

The mandated entry-year program would not be completed unless the entry-year teacher had been employed and served by an entry-year committee a minimum of 120 days by the end of the school year, 1982-83 (Appendix G). Therefore, the sample was selected randomly from among Entry-Year Assistance Committees formed up to and including the 60th day of the school year 1982-83. In other words, only entry-year committees that had the potential to complete their entry-year committee function were included in the sample. School districts in Oklahoma require a minimum of 175 school days taught per school year. Most school districts begin the school year the third week in August. For the purpose of this study, August 15 was the arbitrary starting date for the 60 day period, which ended November 11, 1982. The list of committees formed by November 11, 1982, was secured from the Oklahoma State Department of Education.

As the committees were formed and the Oklahoma State Department of Education was notified by each school having an entry-year committee, those committees were logged by date of official notification of the State Department. The total population, 849 committees identified prior to November 11, 1982, was listed and the total sample of 100 committees was drawn by unit entirely at random from the 849 committees. The random selection was most easily effected with the help of a table of random numbers. The best method of achieving random sampling

is the use of a table of random numbers, since randomized selection prevents any systematic biases (Kerlinger, 1973).

Care was taken to control for any repetition of individuals or school sites. When repetition occurred, replacements were drawn for the sample by continuing the use of the table of random numbers. After the committees were randomly selected, the name, address, and school site of each member, for the purpose of initial contact, was secured from the Oklahoma State Department of Education.

The total sample size was 400. It consisted of 100 entry-year teachers, 100 teacher consultants, 100 administrative representatives, and 100 higher education representatives.

#### Development of the Questionnaire

The third step in the preliminary procedures was the development of the questionnaire which was administered to the randomly selected entry-year assistance committee members and the entry-year teachers.

Part one of the questionnaire consisted of six questions and was designed to obtain respondent demographics. Part two of the questionnaire was comprised of 47 items designed to gather committee (respondent) perceptions regarding the criteria on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument.

The demographic data section requested the respondents to submit additional education-related information. The purpose of this section was to determine if additional experience, degree, or grade level taught might affect differentially the perceptions of the committee members and the entry-year teacher. Demographic information is used in the statistical treatment of the data. For a breakdown of the

by position on the committee, years of teaching experience in public schools, years of teaching experience in institutions of higher education, years of administrative experience, current grade level(s) taught, and level of education, see Tables II through VIII in Chapter IV.

No previous studies have been conducted concerning the criteria used as standard observation criteria by the entry-year assistance committees. Therefore, an instrument was developed to yield data to test the hypotheses of this study. The instrument was designed to allow the researcher to determine the perceptions of the four groups regarding the standard evaluative criteria and make inferences about their perceptions. The items on the questionnaire were developed by taking statements from the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument and restating them in a format in which the subjects responded in terms of their perceptions of each evaluative criterion. After the initial development of the questionnaire, the researcher's doctoral advisory committee reviewed the instrument for content, relevance, and clarity. (See Appendix C for a sample of the questionnaire.)

The reliability of the instrument was determined from two administrations of the questionnaire. The instrument was administered to 23 students enrolled in a university undergraduate class in elementary education and to 25 graduate students enrolled in a class in public school administration. Application of the Cronbach alpha coefficient statistical procedure resulted in a reliability coefficient of .94 for the total questionnaire. Category analysis of the questionnaire resulted in a reliability coefficient as follows: Human Relations, 0.89;

Classroom Management, 0.90; Teaching and Assessment, 0.86; and Professionalism, 0.85 (Appendix D).

Because the content validity and an acceptable level of reliability had been established for the questionnaire, it was judged adequate to use as the data collection instrument for the study.

#### Choice of Testing Statistics

The fourth step in the pre-experimental procedures was to select the appropriate statistical procedure. In testing  $H_{01}$ ,  $H_{02}$ ,  $H_{03}$ , and  $H_{04}$ , the one-way analysis of variance technique was used. This procedure was used to determine if significant differences exist among the mean scores of the four groups for each statement on the standard observation instrument. Mean scores for each of the four groups were determined by assigning a number value to the four response Likert-type questionnaires as follows:

Strongly Agree	= 4
Agree	= 3
Disagree	= 2
Strongly Disagree	= 1

Probability levels of .05 or less were used to infer that significant differences exist in the mean scores of the respondent groups in testing  $H_{01}$ ,  $H_{02}$ ,  $H_{03}$ , and  $H_{04}$ . The final step in the process following the analysis of variance was to determine if groups differ significantly. In testing  $H_{05}$ , the Kruskal-Wallis Large Sample Approximation Chi Square Test was used to determine if a difference exists in the rank ordering according to perceived importance of the four major categories among the groups. The respondents were asked to rank the four categories on a scale of 1 to 4, with 1 being the most important and 4 being the least important.

### Collection of Data

After the 100 Entry-Year Assistance Committees were randomly selected, the four members of each of those 100 committees were requested to respond to the questionnaire mailed to them. The higher education entry-year committee members were mailed the questionnaire; a numerically coded self-addressed, stamped envelope for returning the questionnaire was included.

The questionnaires sent to the public school entry-year committee members and the entry-year teachers included a cover letter to the administrator, the teacher consultants, and the entry-year teacher (Appendix D). The administrator was requested to distribute the questionnaires and to select and return the questionnaires in the numerically coded self addressed, stamped envelope (Appendix D). On April 20, 1983, a follow-up letter was sent to the committee members who did not respond (Appendix E). In all, the respondents numbered 277, or 69.25 percent (see Table I, Chapter IV).

### Analysis of Data

The analysis of data procedures focused on four areas of concern: (1) demographic information, (2) analysis of data for research questions one to four, (3) analysis of data for research question five, and (4) the report on the open-ended questions. Procedures used to analyze the data related to the four areas outlined are discussed below.

The 53 item questionnaire consisted of four parts: 6 items for demographic information, 35 items using a Likert-type scale, 4 rank order items, and 3 open-ended questions in each of the 4 categories to

which Entry-Year Assistance Committee members, including the Entry-Year Teacher, responded.

The questionnaires were organized for computer analysis. The data from these questionnaires were coded, keypunched onto data cards, and put on Time Sharing Option (TSO). Analysis was completed by computer using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

The six demographic items were tabulated. Tables were compiled for the review of frequencies involving the classifications or categories of demographic data:

1. Committee member's position on the Entry-Year Assistance Committee (item 1).
2. Year(s) of teaching experience in public schools (item 2).
3. Year(s) of teaching experience in institutions of higher education (item 3).
4. Year(s) of administrative experience (item 4).
5. Current grade level(s) taught (item 5).
6. Level of education (item 6).

Demographic data were assessed for the purpose of accurately describing the sample used in the study and to examine possible attributes of respondents that could be contributing to their perceptions of the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument.

In addition, the SPSS program "ANOVA" was utilized to generate the means, standard deviations, and F-values of the 35 items from the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument. Chapter IV contains the results of the statistical analysis.

For the rank ordering of the four categories (Human Relations, Teaching and Assessment, Classroom Management, and Professionalism),



the Kruskal-Wallis, a non-parametric statistic, was used to determine if significant differences exist among the mean rankings from the four groups (Table XVII, Chapter IV). The responses to the open-ended questions are reported and analyzed in Chapter IV.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

#### Introduction

The purpose of this chapter was to report the data gathered from the questionnaires sent to a sampling of Entry-Year Assistance Committees, including Entry-Year Teachers. The major questions this research effort addressed were as follows:

1. Are there differences in the way teacher consultants, higher education representatives, entry-year teachers, and administrative representatives perceive the importance of the human relations criteria in the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument?

2. Are there differences in the way teacher consultants, higher education representatives, entry-year teachers, and administrative representatives perceive the importance of the teaching and assessment criteria in the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument?

3. Are there differences in the way teacher consultants, higher education representatives, entry-year teachers, and administrative representatives perceive the importance of the classroom management criteria in the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument?

4. Are there differences in the way teacher consultants, higher education representatives, entry-year teachers, and administrative representatives perceive the importance of the professionalism criteria in the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument?

5. Is there a difference among the groups in the rank ordering of the four major categories?

Data presented in this chapter were obtained from four sources: (1) the entry-year teachers, (2) the teacher consultants, (3) the administrative representatives, and (4) the higher education representatives selected in a sampling procedure using a system of random numbers.

A copy of the questionnaire sent to Entry-Year Assistance Committee Members is presented in Appendix C. The purpose of the instrument was to establish a data base by ascertaining the Entry-Year Assistance Committee Members' and the Entry-Year Teachers' perceptions regarding the criteria on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument now in use in school districts in Oklahoma employing entry-year teachers.

The questionnaires returned resulted in a 69.25 percent response. Table I shows the number mailed to each group and the number and the percentage returned. It should be noted that 17 respondents failed to answer all of the 35 Likert-type items on the questionnaire for hypotheses 1-4; those respondents were omitted from the analysis. Likewise, 12 respondents failed to rank order the four categories regarding hypothesis 5; those respondents were omitted from the analysis.

This chapter is devoted to the analysis of data collected. Presented in the first section is a description of the subjects. Demographic data is assessed for the purpose of describing accurately the sample used in the study. Analysis of the five hypotheses presented in Chapter I is presented in the second section. The final section, relating to additional analysis by experience by groups, by elementary

or secondary level, and by highest degree held, contains an assessment of any possible relationships between the Entry-Year Committee Members' position and perceptions of the criteria on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument.

TABLE I  
NUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRES MAILED TO EACH  
GROUP AND PERCENTAGE OF RETURN

Group	Number Mailed	Number Returned	Percentage Returned
Entry-Year Teachers	100	68	68
Teacher Consultants	100	69	69
Administrative Reps.	100	70	70
Higher Education Reps.	100	<u>70</u>	<u>70</u>
Total	400	277	69.25

In tables to follow, rounding errors caused the total percentages not to equal 100 percent in every case.

#### Description of Study Participants

Information gathered in regard to educational background of the respondents was public school teaching experience, teaching experience

in institutions of higher education, administrative experience, current grade level taught, and level of education.

Years of experience in the field of education could possibly affect the perception of respondents on certain categories on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument. The experience levels are represented in Table II. There were 69 in the 0 category, 46 in the 1-5 years category, 56 in the 6-10 years category, 40 in the 11-15 years category, and 66 in the over 15 years category.

TABLE II  
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY TEACHING  
EXPERIENCE IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Years of Experience	Respondents	Percentage
0	69	24.9
1-5	46	16.6
6-10	56	20.2
11-15	40	14.4
Over 15	<u>66</u>	<u>23.4</u>
Total	277	99.5

The higher education respondents' teaching experience in public schools is presented in Table III. Based on this sample, 94.3% of the

higher education member respondents had public school teaching experience.

TABLE III  
DISTRIBUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION RESPONDENTS  
BY TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Years of Experience	Respondents	Percentage
0	4	5.7
1-5	23	32.8
6-10	18	25.7
11-15	18	17.1
Over 15	<u>13</u>	<u>18.6</u>
Total	70	99.9

The higher education respondents' teaching experience in colleges and universities is presented in Table IV.

Table V shows the administration experience of all respondents, both public school and higher education. In the administrative category, 45 (64.2%) of the 70 higher education respondents had experience (Table VI).

TABLE IV  
 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY TEACHING  
 EXPERIENCE IN INSTITUTIONS OF  
 HIGHER EDUCATION

Years of Experience	Respondents	Percentage
0	1	1.4
1-5	15	21.4
6-10	15	21.4
11-15	18	25.7
Over 15	<u>21</u>	<u>30.0</u>
Total	70	99.9

TABLE V  
 DISTRIBUTION OF ALL RESPONDENTS BY  
 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE

Years of Experience	Respondents	Percentage
0	164	59.2
1-5	44	15.5
6-10	36	13.0
11-15	13	4.7
Over 15	<u>21</u>	<u>7.6</u>
Total	277	100.0

TABLE VI  
DISTRIBUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION RESPONDENTS  
BY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE

Years of Experience	Respondents	Percentage
0	25	35.71
1-5	20	28.57
6-10	16	22.85
11-15	5	7.14
Over 15	<u>4</u>	<u>5.17</u>
Total	70	99.44

Given in Table VII is a summary of the distribution of the respondents by present grade level taught. The largest portion of respondents were found to be elementary teachers, 111 (40.0%), with 96 (34.6%) teaching secondary level.

Information from respondents showed that all degree categories were represented as presented in Table VIII.

#### Analysis and Results of Research

This section focuses on the analysis of the data. Data were collected for the purpose of answering the five research questions posed in the study.



TABLE VII  
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY PRESENT  
GRADE LEVEL TAUGHT

Category	Respondents	Percentage
Elementary without adm.	74	40.0
Elementary with adm.	37	
Secondary without adm.	64	34.7
Secondary with adm.	32	
Higher education	70	<u>25.2</u>
		99.9

TABLE VIII  
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY HIGHEST  
DEGREE HELD

Degree	Respondents	Percentage
Bachelor's	111	40.0
Master's	109	39.3
Doctorate	<u>57</u>	<u>20.7</u>
Total	277	100.0

Hypotheses one to four relating to the perceptions of the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument by the Entry-Year Committee Members and the Entry-Year Teachers were analyzed by means of one-way analysis of variance.

Hypothesis five was analyzed by using the descriptive statistical tool, Kruskal-Wallis, by rank ordering the means of the four groups (entry-year teachers, teacher consultants, administrative representatives, and higher education representatives) on the four categories. Commonalities and discrepancies were ascertained from the results of the priority rankings.

The results of hypotheses testing are included in the following analysis:

#### Hypothesis One

There is no significant difference among response levels of entry-year teachers, administrative representatives, teacher consultants, and higher education representatives regarding the descriptors in the human relations category on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument.

Results. In testing  $H_{01}$ , the analysis of variance technique was used to determine the significance of difference. The .05 level of significance was used for accepting or rejecting the null hypothesis. Data relevant to this hypothesis are summarized in Table IX. Based upon the analysis of variance ( $F = 2.39$ ;  $df = 3, 256$ ), the study failed to reject the null hypothesis.

TABLE IX  
SUMMARY OF DATA FOR HYPOTHESIS ONE

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Position	108.79	3	36.26	2.39
Error	3884.82	256	15.18	

Note:  $p < .05$ .

The means of the four groups relative to hypothesis one are summarized in Table X. The data indicated that, on the four point scale, the respondents tended to agree with the 11 items, with possible scores between 11 and 44. The mean of the means was 37.57, indicating a high level of agreement with the instrument. Although not significantly different from the other groups, data for the teacher consultants revealed the low mean of the four groups (36.78).

### Hypothesis Two

There is no significant difference among the response levels of entry-year teachers, consultant teachers, administrative representatives, and higher education representatives regarding the descriptors in the teaching and assessment category on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument.

TABLE X  
COMPARISON OF FOUR ENTRY-YEAR ASSISTANCE  
COMMITTEE RESPONSES ON HUMAN RELATIONS  
CATEGORY (HR)

Position	Number of Respondents	Mean for HR	SD
Entry-Year Teachers	68	37.95	4.15
Teacher Consultants	64	36.78	3.97
Adm. Representatives	66	37.14	3.72
Higher Ed. Representatives Representatives	<u>62</u>	38.44	3.70
Total Responses Calculated	260		

Results. In testing  $H_{02}$ , the analysis of variance technique was used to determine the significance of difference. The .05 level of significance was used for accepting or rejecting the null hypothesis. Data relevant to this hypothesis are summarized in Table XI.

Based upon the analysis of variance ( $F = 0.31$ ;  $df = 3, 256$ ), the study failed to reject the null hypothesis.

The means of the four groups relative to hypothesis three are summarized in Table XII. The data indicated that on the four point scale, the respondents tended to agree with the eight items, with total scores between 8 and 32. The average of the means was 28.26, indicating a high level of agreement among the groups. Although not significantly different from the other groups, data for the entry-year teachers' group revealed the low mean of the four groups (28.12).

TABLE XI  
SUMMARY OF DATA FOR HYPOTHESIS TWO

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Position	7.89	3	2.63	0.31
Error	2188.33	256	8.55	

Note:  $p < .05$ .

TABLE XII  
COMPARISON OF FOUR ENTRY-YEAR ASSISTANCE  
COMMITTEE RESPONSES ON TEACHING  
AND ASSESSMENT (TA)

Position	No. of Respondents	Mean for TA	SD
Entry-Year Teacher	68	28.12	3.24
Teacher Consultants	64	28.16	3.00
Adm. Representative Higher Ed.	66	28.23	2.75
Representative	<u>62</u>	28.56	2.67
Total Responses Calculated	260		

### Hypothesis Three

There is no significant difference among the response levels of entry-year teachers, teacher consultants, administrative representatives, and higher education representatives regarding the descriptors

in the classroom management category on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument.

Results. In testing  $H_{03}$ , the analysis of variance technique was used to determine the significance of difference. The .05 level of significance was used for accepting or rejecting the null hypothesis. Data relevant to this hypothesis are summarized in Table XIII.

Based upon the analysis of variance ( $F = 0.72$ ;  $df = 3, 256$ ), the study failed to reject the null hypothesis.

TABLE XIII  
SUMMARY OF DATA FOR HYPOTHESIS THREE

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Position	30.14	3	10.05	0.72
Error	3550.76	256	13.87	

Note:  $p < .05$ .

The means of the four groups relative to hypothesis three are summarized in Table XIV. The data indicated that on the four point scale the respondents tended to agree with the 10 items, with scores between 10 and 40. The mean of the means was 35.02, indicating a high level of agreement among the groups. Although not significantly

different from the other groups, data for the higher education group revealed the low mean of the four groups (34.58).

TABLE XIV  
COMPARISON OF FOUR ENTRY-YEAR ASSISTANCE  
COMMITTEE RESPONSES ON CLASSROOM  
MANAGEMENT (CM)

Position	No. of Respondents	Mean for CM	SD
Entry-Year Teachers	68	35.46	3.52
Teacher Consultants	64	34.80	3.76
Adm. Representatives Higher Ed.	66	35.20	3.41
Representatives	<u>62</u>	35.48	4.20
Total Responses Calculated	260		

#### Hypothesis Four

There is no significant difference among the response levels of entry-year teachers, teacher consultants, administrative representatives, and higher education representatives regarding the descriptors in the professionalism category on the Entry-Year Teachers Observation Instrument.

Results. In testing  $H_{04}$ , the analysis of variance technique was used to determine the significance of difference. The .05 level of

significance was used for accepting or rejecting the null hypothesis. Data relevant to this hypothesis are summarized in Table XV.

TABLE XV  
SUMMARY OF DATA FOR HYPOTHESIS FOUR

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Position	27.69	3	9.23	1.61
Error	1466.53	256	5.73	

Note:  $p < .05$ .

Based upon the analysis of variance ( $F = 1.61$ ;  $df = 3, 256$ ), the study failed to reject the null hypothesis. The means of the four groups relative to hypothesis four are summarized in Table XVI.

The data indicated that on the four point scale the respondents could agree with the six items, with total scores of 6 and 24. The average of the means was 20.74, indicating a high level of agreement among the groups. Although not significant, data for the higher education group revealed the low mean of the four groups (20.21).

#### Hypothesis Five

There are no significant differences in the rank ordering of the categories on the standard observation instrument among the groups.



TABLE XVI  
 COMPARISON OF FOUR ENTRY-YEAR ASSISTANCE  
 COMMITTEE RESPONSES ON PROFES-  
 SIONALISM (PR)

Position	No. of Respondents	Mean for Prof.	SD
Entry-Year Teachers	68	20.88	2.50
Teacher Consultants	64	20.72	2.31
Adm. Representatives Higher Ed.	66	21.11	2.22
Representatives	<u>62</u>	20.21	2.53
Total Responses Calculated	260		

Results. In testing  $H_{05}$ , a non-parametric technique, the Kruskal-Wallis was used to determine the significance of difference in the rank ordering of the categories on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument among the four groups. The ranking was from 1 to 4, with 1 being the most important and 4 being the least important. The lower the mean rank, the greater the agreement with the dependent variable. The .05 level of significance was used for accepting or rejecting the null hypothesis. Data relevant to this hypothesis are summarized in Table XVII. Based upon the Kruskal-Wallis Large Sample Approximation Chi Square human relations (9.47) and classroom management (8.75), the null hypothesis was rejected (Table XVII). Twelve respondents failed to rank order the four categories; those respondents were omitted from the analysis. There were significant differences among the groups in the rank ordering of the human relations and classroom management

TABLE XVII  
 GROUP RANK ORDERING OF STANDARD  
 OBSERVATION CATEGORIES

Group	No. of Cases	Mean Ranks (HR)	Mean Ranks (TA)	Mean Ranks (CM)	Mean Ranks (PR)
Entry-Year Teachers	64	134.74	124.52	143.95	130.85
Teacher Consultants	68	146.23	136.05	119.99	123.21
Adm. Representatives	63	142.97	136.95	118.18	136.63
Higher Ed. Representatives	70	109.81	134.17	149.10	140.25
Kruskal-Wallis Large Sample Approximation Chi Square		9.47*	1.01	8.75*	1.86

\*p < .05.

categories. The low mean rank (109.81) for the higher education representatives evidence the highest level of importance attributed to the category by the four groups. The Entry-Year Teachers with a mean rank of 134.74 were next in ranking the human relations category as important. Of the four groups, the administrative representatives (mean rank 118.18) tended to give the classroom management category a number one priority. Teacher consultants (mean rank 119.99) were next in viewing the importance of classroom management.

#### Analysis of Responses By Group to Open-Ended Questions on the Questionnaire

The respondents were asked to respond to three questions following their rating of each descriptor. First, for each category the respondents were to indicate any item(s) which should be eliminated from the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument. Frequencies for those items suggested by respondents for elimination are included in Table XVIII. As the four groups reviewed the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument by category, a relatively low number of respondents suggested elimination of any of the descriptors. The item suggested most often for elimination was "Teacher and students have accessibility to materials and supplies" (18 respondents).

Second, for each category, the respondents were to indicate any item(s) which would be better placed in another one of the categories on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument. Frequencies for those items suggested for different categorical placement are included in Table XIX. Of the 277 respondents, few suggested moving descriptors from one category to another category. The descriptors in the

TABLE XVIII  
 ITEMS RECOMMENDED TO BE ELIMINATED FROM  
 ENTRY-YEAR TEACHER OBSERVATION  
 INSTRUMENT

Category and Item Number	Frequency
<b>A. <u>Human Relations</u></b>	
1. Reacts with sensitivity to the needs and feelings of others.	3
2. Helps students build self-awareness and a positive self-concept.	4
3. Provides positive reinforcement to students.	3
4. Interacts and communicates effectively with parents and staff.	10
5. Treats students firmly and fairly while maintaining respect for their worth as individuals.	1
6. Develops and maintains rapport with students.	5
7. Helps students to understand and accept their similarities and differences.	16
8. Shows awareness of the growth and development patterns characteristic of the group taught.	14
9. Exhibits a sense of humor.	5
10. Attempts to include all class members in classroom activities.	8
11. Accepts and/or uses ideas of students.	8
<b>B. <u>Teaching and Assessment</u></b>	
1. Organizes time, resources, and materials for effective instructions.	1
2. Makes a clear and adequate explanation of material presented and procedures followed, and teacher expectations for student involvement.	2
3. Implements a variety of instructional strategies to motivate students.	3

TABLE XVIII (Continued)

Category and Item Number	Frequency
4. Encourages class participation through interaction with students and feedback.	1
5. Recognizes and uses opportunities for impromptu teaching.	1
6. Utilizes valid testing techniques based on the identified objectives.	6
7. Exhibits enthusiasm for the subject matter.	1
8. Demonstrates initiative and responsibility in changing situations.	1
<b>C. <u>Classroom Management</u></b>	
1. Maintains classroom discipline	3
2. Handles disruptive students effectively.	3
3. Treats students fairly.	4
4. Provides an environment conducive to learning.	4
5. Teacher and students have accessibility to materials and supplies.	18
6. Physical arrangement of room is attractive and safe as circumstances permit.	11
7. Teacher makes an effort to include all students through participation, eye contact, and feedback.	8
8. Students and teacher are courteous and respectful to one another.	6
9. Gives clear, explicit directions to students.	4
10. Teacher is careful for the safety of the student.	5
<b>D. <u>Professionalism</u></b>	
1. Maintains a friendly, cooperative, and helpful relationship with other employees.	1

TABLE XVIII (Continued)

Category and Item Number	Frequency
2. Exhibits leadership by sharing knowledge and techniques with other faculty.	12
3. Works effectively as a member of an educational team.	3
4. Demonstrates evidence of professional demeanor, scholarship, and behavior.	2
5. Effectively expresses self in written and verbal communication using correct grammar and appropriate vocabulary.	2
6. Uses current educational theories and practices.	11

classroom management category were mentioned most often by respondents for placement in other categories. As noted in Table XIX, most respondents would keep the categories and their respective descriptors intact.

Third, the respondents were asked to indicate for each category additional items which would improve the category. Tables XX through XXIII presents summaries by group of the items suggested. Additional comments and suggested format changes are reported in Appendix G.

#### Additional Analysis

From the respondent demographics, additional analysis data was generated. Demographic data for teacher consultants, administrative members, and higher education members' responses were assessed for the

TABLE XIX  
 ITEMS RECOMMENDED TO BE PLACED IN ANOTHER  
 CATEGORY ON THE ENTRY-YEAR TEACHER  
 OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

Category and Item Number	Frequency
<u>A. Human Relations</u>	
1. Reacts with sensitivity to the needs and feelings of others.	0
2. Helps students build self-awareness and a positive self-concept.	1
3. Provides positive reinforcement to students	12
4. Interacts and communicates effectively with parents and staff.	3
5. Treats students firmly and fairly while maintaining respect for their worth as individuals.	14
6. Develops and maintains rapport with students.	0
7. Helps students to understand and accept their similarities and differences.	5
8. Shows awareness of the growth and development patterns characteristic of the group taught.	18
9. Exhibits a sense of humor.	2
10. Attempts to include all class members in classroom activities.	18
11. Accepts and/or uses ideas of students.	10
<u>B. Teaching and Assessment</u>	
1. Organizes time, resources, and materials for effective instruction.	1
2. Makes a clear and adequate explanation of material presented and procedures followed, and teacher expectations for student involvement.	1
3. Implements a variety of instructional strategies to motivate students.	1

TABLE XIX (Continued)

Category and Item Number	Frequency
4. Encourages class participation through interaction with students and feedback.	1
5. Recognizes and uses opportunities for impromptu teaching.	1
6. Utilizes valid testing techniques based on the identified objectives.	0
7. Exhibits enthusiasm for the subject matter.	2
8. Demonstrates initiative and responsibility in changing situations.	3
<b>C. <u>Classroom Management</u></b>	
1. Maintains classroom discipline	2
2. Handles disruptive students effectively.	2
3. Treats students fairly.	11
4. Provides an environment conducive to learning.	3
5. Teacher and students have accessibility to materials and supplies.	8
6. Physical arrangement of room is attractive and safe as circumstances permit.	4
7. Teacher makes an effort to include all students through participation, eye contact, and feedback.	26
8. Students and teacher are courteous and respectful to one another.	22
9. Gives clear, explicit directions to students.	23
10. Teacher is careful for the safety of the students.	5
<b>D. <u>Professionalism</u></b>	
1. Maintains a friendly, cooperative, and helpful relationship with other employees.	9



TABLE XIX (Continued)

Category and Item Number	Frequency
2. Exhibits leadership by sharing knowledge and techniques with other faculty.	1
3. Works effectively as a member of an educational team.	3
4. Demonstrates evidence of professional demeanor, scholarship, and behavior.	0
5. Effectively expresses self in written and verbal communication using correct grammar and appropriate vocabulary.	6
6. Uses current educational theories and practices.	13

purpose of accurately describing the sample used in the study and to examine possible attributes of respondents that could be contributing to their perceptions of the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument. Inherent within the design of the instrument were categories by which responses could be analyzed. Responses from questions 2-6 on the questionnaire were analyzed for possible relationship(s) to the perception of the respondents to the category.

Data relevant to years of teaching experience in public schools (question 2) are summarized in Table XXIV. Based upon the analysis of variance, a significant difference ( $p = 0.04$ ) was reported when years of teaching experience relates to perceptions of the importance of classroom management. The analysis gives evidence that the longer

TABLE XX  
SUMMARY OF SUGGESTED ITEMS TO IMPROVE THE  
HUMAN RELATIONS CATEGORY

Group	Suggested Item
Entry-Year Teachers	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recognizes functioning level of students.</li> <li>2. Has fairly consistent temperament.</li> <li>3. Helps students become aware of their responsibility.</li> </ol>
Teacher Consultants	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strengthens and develops interpersonal skills.</li> <li>2. Appreciates student contribution.</li> <li>3. Teaches students self discipline.</li> <li>4. Is involved in students' activities outside of class.</li> </ol>
Adm. Representative	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develops a sense of responsibility in students.</li> <li>2. Encourages student self expression.</li> <li>3. Encourages two-way communication.</li> <li>4. Has respect for students.</li> <li>5. Is involved in student activities outside the classroom.</li> <li>6. Listens to students.</li> </ol>
Higher Ed. Representative	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Exhibits a sense of positive worth.</li> <li>2. Meets and mixes with a variety of people.</li> <li>3. Listens to students.</li> <li>4. Learns to care what students care about.</li> <li>5. Perceives students as capable and able to benefit from instruction.</li> <li>6. Maintains good public relations with administration.</li> <li>7. Exhibits genuine interest in students.</li> <li>8. Demonstrates "love of teaching."</li> <li>9. Has no personal irritating mannerisms.</li> <li>10. Dresses neatly.</li> </ol>

TABLE XXI  
 SUMMARY OF SUGGESTED ITEMS TO IMPROVE THE  
 TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT CATEGORY

Group	Suggested Item
Entry-Year Teachers	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Demonstrates an adequate background in subject matter.</li> <li>2. Evidences student progress.</li> <li>3. Adapts material to student's abilities.</li> <li>4. Makes use of lab approach to teaching.</li> </ol>
Teacher Consultants	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has decision making skills.</li> <li>2. Knows how to develop problem solving abilities in students.</li> <li>3. Uses field trips and museums for teaching.</li> </ol>
Adm. Representative	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Organizes learning activities to meet readiness levels of students.</li> <li>2. Provides for individual differences.</li> <li>3. Encourages creativity.</li> <li>4. Stimulates student interest.</li> <li>5. Includes all class members in class activities.</li> <li>6. Meets individual needs.</li> </ol>
Higher Ed. Representative	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Maintains poise and self-confidence.</li> <li>2. Is able to diagnose and use test results for instruction.</li> <li>3. Uses appropriate questions and wait time.</li> <li>4. Uses teaching skills effectively.</li> <li>5. Includes all class members.</li> <li>6. Teachers and students have available needed materials and supplies.</li> <li>7. Uses effective questioning.</li> <li>8. Possesses substantial knowledge of subject matter.</li> <li>9. Is flexible in following teaching plans.</li> <li>10. Introduces creativity and variety.</li> <li>11. Covers an adequate amount of material.</li> <li>12. Accepts and/or uses ideas of students.</li> </ol>

TABLE XXII  
SUMMARY OF SUGGESTED ITEMS TO IMPROVE THE  
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT CATEGORY

Group	Suggested Item
Entry-Year Teachers	1. Allows students to help with discipline.
Teacher Consultants	1. Can identify students by name. 2. Has set of "Do's" and "Don'ts." 3. Organizes and recognizes class timeframe. 4. Treats students fairly and firmly.
Adm. Representative	1. Teaches subject matter as if it is important and essential for student to know. 2. Is prompt in supervising the classroom. 3. Organizes class activities toward acceptable goals. 4. Exhibits firm control of student behavior. 5. Organizes time and resources. 6. Is in the room before the students arrive. 7. Promotes student self-control. 8. Encourages and plans for appropriate time on task.
Higher Ed. Representative	1. Uses current theories of classroom management. 2. Treats students equally. 3. Is aware of each student's progress and specific problems. 4. Involves students in activities which are initiated through the classroom. 5. Develops class rules of which all students are aware. 6. Returns graded papers promptly. 7. Patiently assists students. 8. Shows practical application of subject matter. 9. Acknowledges questions. 10. Begins and ends class on time. 11. Prepares lessons daily. 12. Promotes children's independence. 13. Is concerned about appropriate disciplinary techniques.

TABLE XXIII  
SUMMARY OF SUGGESTED ITEMS TO IMPROVE THE  
PROFESSIONALISM CATEGORY

Group	Suggested Item
Entry-Year Teachers	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Interacts with parents.</li> <li>2. Includes parents as members of the education team (informs parents of student progress and problems).</li> <li>3. Dresses appropriately.</li> <li>4. Is properly groomed.</li> <li>5. Remains professional outside the job.</li> </ol>
Teacher Consultants	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is a viable role model.</li> <li>2. Dresses appropriately.</li> <li>3. Has good personal hygiene.</li> <li>4. Seeks and accepts constructive criticism.</li> </ol>
Adm. Representative	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Actively participates in professional organizations.</li> <li>2. Attends professional organizations.</li> <li>3. Has a positive attitude toward teaching.</li> <li>4. Strives to grow professionally.</li> <li>5. Has loyalty to the school district.</li> <li>6. Plans to participate in professional organizations.</li> </ol>
Higher Ed. Representative	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is a member of professional organizations.</li> <li>2. Reads professional magazines.</li> <li>3. Has specific continuing education goals.</li> <li>4. Has a professional demeanor and behavior.</li> <li>5. Exhibits scholarship.</li> <li>6. Is actively involved in the community.</li> <li>7. Interacts effectively with parents and staff.</li> <li>8. Uses appropriate educational theories and practices.</li> <li>9. Is in the improving professional skills.</li> </ol>

TABLE XXIV  
DATA FOR YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE, PUBLIC SCHOOL

Yrs. Exp.	Count	HR Mean Rank	TA Mean Rank	CM Mean Rank	PR Mean Rank
1-5	42	37.31	28.02	33.76	20.14
6-10	48	36.63	27.88	34.40	20.54
11-15	39	37.54	28.36	35.10	21.03
Over 15	62	37.77	28.60	35.81	20.98
F		.84	.70	2.82*	1.42

\*p = < .05.

categories on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument are summarized in Table XXV.

Based upon the analysis, no significant difference was reported when years of higher education teaching experience are examined, as experience relates to perceptions of the importance of the four categories.

Data relevant to years of administrative experience (question 4) and the four categories on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument were examined. Results of the analysis are summarized in Table XXVI. Based upon the analysis, a significant difference ( $p = 0.03$ ) was reported when number of years of administrative experience are examined as it related to perceptions of the importance of classroom management.

Data relevant to current grade level taught (question 5) and the four categories on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument were examined. Results of the analysis are summarized in Table XXVII. Based upon the analysis, no significant difference was reported when current grade level taught is examined as grade level taught relates to perceptions of the four categories.

Data relevant to level of education (question 6) were examined. Data relevant to the four categories on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument are summarized in Table XXVIII. Based upon the analysis, significant difference was reported in the classroom management category ( $p = 0.03$ ) and in the professionalism category ( $p = 0.05$ ) as level of education relates to perceptions of the four categories. Respondents with master's degrees attributed more importance to the professionalism and classroom management categories than did the respondents holding bachelor degrees or doctoral degrees.

TABLE XXV  
DATA FOR YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION

Yrs. Exp.	Count	HR Mean Rank	TA Mean Rank	CM Mean Rank	PR Mean Rank
1-5	20	37.90	28.85	35.05	20.30
6-10	14	36.64	27.43	34.00	19.50
11-15	16	39.31	28.19	33.88	20.44
Over 15	21	38.00	29.05	35.95	20.81
F		1.16	1.11	1.08	.80

Note:  $p = < .05$ .



TABLE XXVI  
DATA FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE

Yrs. Exp.	Count	HR Mean Rank	TA Mean Rank	CM Mean Rank	PR Mean Rank
1-5	41	37.29	28.05	33.56	20.44
6-10	30	36.63	27.67	34.80	20.83
11-15	14	37.64	29.00	35.64	21.00
Over 15	20	37.80	36.30	28.65	21.05
F		.45	1.03	2.98*	.39

\*p = < .05.

TABLE XXVII  
DATA FOR CURRENT GRADE LEVEL TAUGHT

Grade Level	Count	HR Mean Rank	TA Mean Rank	CM Mean Rank	PR Mean Rank
Elementary	110	37.46	28.07	34.84	20.77
Secondary	88	37.02	28.22	35.49	21.01
Higher Ed.	61	38.51	28.61	34.62	20.25
F		2.67	0.67	1.18	1.87

TABLE XXXVIII  
DATA FOR LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Education Level	Count	HR Mean Rank	TA Mean Rank	CM Mean Rank	PR Mean Rank
BA	107	37.62	28.06	35.21	20.85
MA	99	37.22	35.45	28.49	21.00
Ph.D.	54	38.13	33.85	28.24	20.04
F		.94	0.58	3.54*	3.05*

\*p = < .05.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not there was a difference among the members of the Entry-Year Assistance Committee, including the entry-year teacher, in their perceptions of the evaluative criteria utilized in the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument.

The questionnaire was designed to obtain perceptions from Entry-Year Assistance Committee members concerning these evaluative criteria. The survey method was used for this study. The questionnaire which was mailed to the study respondents consisted of five parts. The first part was designed to secure demographic information: teaching experience in public schools, teaching experience in institutions of higher education, years of administrative experience, current grade level taught, and level of education. The second part of the questionnaire was designed to ascertain perceptions among the four groups regarding criteria on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument. The third part of the questionnaire included a question in each category on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument requesting respondent suggestions for eliminating inappropriate descriptors. The fourth part of the questionnaire was a question for each category requesting suggestions for reorganizing any of the descriptors. The fifth part of the

questionnaire was a question requesting the respondents to add any items which could improve each of the categories. For the purpose of this study, the strengths, concerns, and recommendations sections on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument were not a part of the questionnaire.

The population was comprised of four groups: (1) entry-year teachers, (2) teacher consultants, (3) administrative representatives, and (4) higher education representatives. A sample was chosen by random means.

The questionnaires were mailed to a total of 400 Entry-Year Committee members. One hundred questionnaires were mailed to entry-year teachers, with a 68 percent return; 100 were mailed to teacher consultants, with a 69 percent return; 100 were mailed to administrator members, with a 70 percent return; and 100 were mailed to higher education members, with a 70 percent return.

This chapter extends the purpose by bringing together the results of the study and the related literature. Conclusions and interpretations of the results are discussed relative to the review of the literature presented in Chapter II. The presentation focuses on the five research questions posed in the study. Implications of the findings and considerations for further research are also included in the discussion.

### Findings and Conclusions

Hypotheses 1 through 4 were tested by utilizing one way analysis of variance technique to determine the significance of difference.

Ho<sub>1</sub> There is no significant difference among the response levels of entry-year teachers, teacher consultants, administrative representatives, and higher education representatives regarding the descriptors in the human relations category on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument. The study failed to reject the null hypothesis ( $F = 2.39$ ;  $df = 3, 256$ ).

Ho<sub>2</sub> There is no significant difference among the response levels of entry-year teachers, teacher consultants, administrative representatives, and higher education representatives regarding the descriptors in the teaching and assessment category on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument. The study failed to reject the null hypothesis ( $F = 0.31$ ;  $df = 3, 256$ ).

Ho<sub>3</sub> There is no significant difference among the response levels of entry-year teachers, teacher consultants, administrative representatives, and higher education representatives regarding the descriptors in the classroom management category on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument. The study failed to reject the null hypothesis ( $F = 0.72$ ;  $df = 3, 256$ ).

Ho<sub>4</sub> There is no significant difference among the response levels of entry-year teachers, teacher consultants, administrative representatives, and higher education representatives regarding the descriptors in the professionalism category on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument. The study failed to reject the null hypothesis ( $F = 1.61$ ;  $df = 3, 256$ ).

Ho<sub>5</sub> There are no significant differences in the rank ordering of the categories on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument among the groups. The hypothesis was rejected.

## Conclusions

While there was no significant difference among the groups regarding the human relations evaluative criteria, data for the teacher consultants revealed the low mean rank. It seems that teacher consultants were more in disagreement with the use of the human relations criteria to assess the teaching performance of entry-year teachers. The members of the entry-year assistance committee who have more years of experience and contact with students felt that descriptive criteria for human relations such as:

1. reacts with sensitivity to the needs and feelings of others,
2. helps students build self-awareness and a positive self-concept,
3. provides positive reinforcement to students,
4. interacts and communicates effectively with parents and staff,
5. treats students firmly and fairly while maintaining respect for their worth as individuals,
6. develops and maintains rapport with students,
7. helps students to understand and accept their similarities and differences,
8. shows awareness of the growth and development patterns characteristic of the group taught,
9. exhibits a sense of humor,
10. attempts to include all class members in classroom activities, and
11. accepts and/or uses ideas of students

were appropriate, but it appears they did not feel as strongly about

the criteria as other committee members. Higher education members and entry-year teachers appeared to be in closer agreement in their perceptions of the human relations category and descriptors.

Although there was no significant difference among the response levels of the four groups regarding the teaching and assessment evaluative criteria, the entry-year teachers had the low mean rank. The data would suggest that entry-year teachers may not be comfortable with the expectation that an entry-year teacher have teaching and assessment expertise such as:

1. Organizes time, resources, and materials for effective instruction.
2. Makes a clear and adequate explanation of material presented and procedures followed, and teacher expectations for student involvement.
3. Implements a variety of instructional strategies to motivate students.
4. Encourages class participation through interaction with students and feedback.
5. Recognizes and uses opportunities for impromptu teaching.
6. Utilizes valid testing techniques based on the identified objectives.
7. Exhibits enthusiasm for the subject matter.
8. Demonstrates initiative and responsibility in changing situations.

As would be expected, higher education members whose expertise should be theory and assessment based were in most agreement as to the level of importance of the teaching and assessment category and descriptors.



Again, there was no significant difference among the groups regarding the classroom management evaluative criteria. Data for the higher education members indicated less concern as compared with the other members when considering the classroom management criteria. Higher education members may not be as concerned with day-to-day management. It could be that higher education members felt that when the needs of the students are met appropriately, classroom management is not a primary concern. The teacher consultants appear to be next in perceiving the category as important. It is conceivable that these "master teachers" see themselves more "in charge" and perhaps do not perceive this category as the entry-year teachers and administrators do.

Finally, there was no significant difference among the groups regarding the professionalism evaluative criteria. Data for the administrative representatives indicated a tendency toward the highest level of agreement with the professionalism category. The higher education members had the low mean rank. The higher education mean rank may be a reflection of the inability of the college or university members to judge the professionalism of the entry-year teacher in the time allowed for observation (Appendix F).

The four groups were requested to rank order the four categories on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument from most important to least important. The four groups differed significantly in their rank ordering of the human relations and the classroom management categories. In reviewing the data, it should be noted that the lower the mean, the greater the importance or priority ranking.

Higher education respondents gave the human relations category a higher priority ranking than the other groups. The data do not allow a

definitive statement as to where the significant difference exists. It would appear that the administrator representatives were in closer agreement with the teacher consultants in the ranking of the importance of the human relations category. It would appear that there is a tendency for those in the public schools over a period of time to view the category similarly.

The classroom management category data revealed a significant difference in the rank ordering by the four groups. It appears that the administrators view this category as a number one priority. From the data, it appears that the higher education members and the entry-year teachers attributed less importance to classroom management than did the administrators and consultant teachers.

The third part of the questionnaire requested the respondents to indicate items which should be eliminated from the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument. The frequency of suggestions for each item to be eliminated from the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument was reported in Chapter IV. In the human relations category, items 4 (interacts and communicates effectively with parents and staff), 7 (helps students to understand and accept their similarities and differences, and 8 (shows awareness of the growth and development patterns characteristic of the group taught) were mentioned for elimination by 10 or more respondents. In the teaching and assessment category, no items were mentioned for elimination by 10 or more respondents. In the classroom management category, items 5 (teacher and students have accessibility to materials and supplies) and 6 (physical arrangement of room is attractive and safe as circumstances permit) were mentioned for elimination by 10 or more respondents. In the professionalism category,

items 2 (exhibits leadership by sharing knowledge and techniques with other faculty) and 6 (demonstrates appropriate behavior and composure in a variety of situations) were mentioned for elimination by 10 or more respondents.

In summary, items flagged for deletion from the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument by approximately three percent or more of the respondents have been noted. A maximum of approximately 10 percent of the respondents indicated displeasure with a few items as noted. Yet, those same figures would suggest a 90 percent minimum approval of the descriptors in the category by the Entry-Year Committee members.

The fourth part of the questionnaire requested the respondents to indicate items which should be moved to another category on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument. The frequency of suggestions for each item to be moved to another category on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument was reported in Chapter IV.

Items 3 (provides positive reinforcement to students), 5 (treats students firmly and fairly while maintaining respect for their worth as individuals), 8 (shows awareness of the growth and development patterns characteristic of the group taught), 10 (attempts to include all class members in classroom activities), and 11 (accepts and/or uses ideas of students) were suggested for movement from the human relations category by 10 or more respondents. No items in the teaching and assessment category were recommended for movement to another category by 10 or more respondents. In the classroom management category, items 3 (treats students fairly), 7 (teacher makes an effort to include all students through participation, eye contact, and feedback),

8 (students and teacher are courteous and respectful to one another), and 9 (gives clear, explicit directions to students) would be better placed in another category on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument. Approximately four percent of the respondents would move item 6 (demonstrates appropriate behavior and composure in a variety of situations) to another category.

The number of respondents who suggested new items for the human relations, teaching and assessment, classroom management, and professionalism categories was not noteworthy. However, the suggestions by several respondents to move an item would suggest that while there is support for the item, the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument might be enhanced by rearranging some of the items.

The fifth part of the questionnaire requested the respondents to list items which they felt would strengthen each category. The results by group and category were reported in Chapter IV.

The items suggested for the human relations category on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument would include: establishing a caring, helping relationship, maintaining and promoting student teacher communication, and acknowledging the importance of fairness, discipline, and appreciation of differences in people.

The items suggested for the teaching and assessment category on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument would suggest that the four groups view the teacher's performance with regard to how well individual student needs are met. Meeting student needs according to the suggested items would involve the development of appropriate instructional units, selection and/or adaptation of appropriate

instructional materials and activities, and the evidence of student progress.

Suggestions for improving the classroom management category on the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument are evidences of an awareness of a number one concern of educators nationwide. The number of suggestions by the administrators and the higher education representatives was significantly greater than the Entry-Year Teachers and Teacher Consultants. Entry-year teachers and teacher consultants appeared to view classroom management as time management and rules and regulations for the class. The administrators want the teacher in the room on time, in control of the students, and in charge of resources and activities. The higher education members are concerned about the teacher's awareness of classroom management techniques, effectiveness in promoting student academic and personal growth, and efficiency in supervising classroom activities and providing feedback.

For the professionalism category, the members of the Entry-Year Assistance Committees borrowed from the personal traits, such as dress code and proper grooming, characteristic of early evaluation instruments used with teachers. Suggestions for the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument from the Entry-Year Assistance Committee members would be difficult to observe and evaluate. Neither the entry-year teachers nor the teacher consultants recommended adding an item regarding membership in professional organizations. Some of the administrators and the higher education representatives suggested attendance and active participation in professional organizations. The higher education representatives' suggestions were marked by responses

which indicated an expectation of continuing education for the classroom teacher.

In summary, fewer than 10 percent of the respondents made suggestions for additional items to be added to the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument. From the responses, the Entry-Year Assistance Committee members would need to make certain that all members viewed the categories and the descriptors as guidelines for the observation process which is restricted by limited time and resources for observing the entry-year teacher. Whether items are deleted, moved to another category, or added to the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument, proper use and understanding of the criteria could do the following:

1. Enhance accomplishment of the educational goals of the local school district.
2. Contribute to the personal and professional growth of teachers.
3. Provide the catalyst for a communication process that could effect change in college preparation programs and in administrator supervision skills.

Clearly, the various approaches to evaluation of the entry-year teacher are unlikely to contribute equally to each of these outcomes. Yet, the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument does appear to provide a common framework and a similar set of definitions about teaching.

#### Recommendations

1. Research, according to the National Education Association

(1964) suggests that only about one-third of the teachers who are rated or evaluated report any changes resulting from the written evaluation. Further research should focus on changes which occurred for the entry-year teacher as a result of the Entry-Year Assistance Committee's written evaluations.

2. Since House Bill 1706 includes a staff development component for the Entry-Year Assistance Committee, research should address the practices undertaken to relate a staff development plan to the entry-year teacher. Rationale for such a study is supported by Spivey (1976), who contends that evaluation is a continuing and not a one-shot process. The evaluation should serve as a starting point for the writing of new objectives.

3. While the Entry-Year Committee members have congruent perceptions of the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument, the committee process needs to be examined. Self-evaluation should be an important part of the evaluation process (Feldvebel, 1980). Research should focus on methods by which Entry-Year Assistance Committees promote self-evaluation by the entry-year teacher in the process of using the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument.

4. Since observation of the entry-year teacher is a key element in the Entry-Year Committee requirements, research should focus on what process assessment instruments were used by committee members in observing the entry-year teacher. In addition to the instruments being used, the research should ascertain the amount of time the three committee members are involved in observing the entry-year teacher.

5. Since the Entry-Year Assistance Committee is charged to recommend the entry-year teacher for certification, research should

focus on how closely the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument criteria parallel to the respective school district's teacher evaluation criteria. Such a study might give additional insight into how and to what degree the instrument is being used to address effective teaching.

6. Since classroom management is of particular concern to administrators, research should be undertaken to determine how the Entry-Year Committee is providing assistance to entry-year teachers.

7. The continued success of this evaluation system will be effective in direct relation to the amount of training received by all the participants. The Entry-Year Assistance Committee members are the key to making a difference in the on-the-job improvement of entry-year teachers. Training emphasizing the importance of the role of the committee as they use the Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument will enhance the entry-year process.

In summary, regardless of what specific purpose a given evaluation might have, the primary function of all evaluation is communication. The Entry-Year Assistance Program is a vehicle to put a communication system in place in school districts employing entry-year teachers. The Entry-Year Teacher Observation Instrument is an evaluation tool which swings away from ranking the teacher, differentiating among teachers, and determining salary incentives and toward a flexible process that can assure that real communication will take place.

Educators who are members of Entry-Year Assistance Committees have the responsibility to observe, evaluate, and provide feedback to the entry-year teacher in terms of their competence and perceptions. Consequently, instruments used as a guideline for evaluating entry-year



teachers should be designed to detect and record teacher performance that are validated (Peterson, 1983). Once the validation is complete and this process is in place, with experienced committee members doing their jobs, entry-year teachers will be better served. Most important of all, the students in Oklahoma's schools will profit from having studied with better-prepared teachers.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, B., Johnson, A., Okey, L., and Capie, C. "Principals, supervisors, and beginning teachers: their opinions regarding competencies for the professional certification of teachers." (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Canada, March, 1978.)
- Barr, A. S. Characteristic Differences in Teaching Performance of Good and Poor Teachers of Social Studies. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Pub. Co., 1929.
- Barr, A. S. "Teacher efficiency." In Encyclopedia of Educational Research, R. L. Ebel, ed. New York: Macmillan, 1941.
- Best, J. Research in Education, 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Bolton, D. L. Selection and Evaluation of Teachers. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1973.
- Bownie, N. M. and Heath, R. W. Basic Statistical Methods. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.
- DeVaughn, J. E. A Manual for Developing Reasonable, Objective, Non-Discriminatory Standards for Evaluating Administrator Performance. State College, Mississippi: Mississippi State University, Educational Services Center, 1971.
- Dewey, J. "Theory of valuation." International Encyclopedia of Unified Science. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939, 2(4), p. 13.
- Dolores, M. "Perceptual research: A whole with many parts." In Bier, W. C., DiMichael, S. G., and McCall, R. J., eds, Perception in Present Day Psychology. Chicago: American Catholic Psychological Association, 1965, pp. 3-35.
- Dyer, H. How To Achieve Accountability in the Public Schools. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1973.
- Ellett, J. R., Capie, C., and Johnson, A. "Assessing teacher performance." Educational Leadership, December, 1980, pp. 219-220.

- Evans, E. D. Transition to Teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1976.
- Feldevibel, A. M. "Teacher evaluation: Ingredients of a credible model." The Clearing House. Washington, D.C.: 1980, 53, pp.
- Flanders, N. A. and Simon, A. "Teacher effectiveness." In Ebel, R. E., ed., Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 4th ed. New York: Macmillan, 1969, pp. 1423-1434.
- Gallup, G. H. "The 14th Annual Gallup Poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools." Phi Delta Kappan, September, 1982, 64(1), p. 38.
- Getzels, J. W., Lipham, J. M., and Campbell, R. F. Educational Administration as a Social Process: Theory, Research, Practice. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.
- Haefele, D. L. "The teacher perceiver interview: How valid?" Phi Delta Kappan, 1978, 59, pp. 683-684.
- Hughes, J. M. Education in America, 2nd ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of Behavioral Research, 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973.
- Levin, B. "Teacher evaluation--A review of research." Educational Leadership, December, 1979, 37(3), p. 244.
- Lewis, J. J. Appraising Teacher Performance. West Nyack, New York: Parker, 1973.
- Manatt, R. P., Palmer, K. L., and Hidlebaugh, E. "Evaluating teacher performance with improved rating scales." NASSP Bulletin, 1976, 60(401), pp. 23-24.
- Mazur, J. L. Due Process in Teacher Evaluation. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1980.
- Millman, J., ed. Handbook of Teacher Evaluation. Beverley Hills, California: Sage, 1981.
- National Education Association. "The evaluation of classroom teachers." (NEA Research Report, Washington, D.C., 1964.)
- Natriello, G. A Summary of Recent Literature on the Evaluation of Principals, Teachers, and Students. Stanford, California: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University, 1977.
- Oklahoma State Department of Education. Rules and Regulations for Teacher Consultants. Oklahoma City: State Department of Education, 1982.

- Oldham, E. N. Evaluating Teachers for Professional Growth: Current Trends in School Politics and Practices. Arlington, Virginia: National School Public Relations Association, 1974.
- Oxford English Dictionary. London: Oxford University Press, Amen House, 1933.
- Peterson, D. "Legal and ethical issues of teacher evaluation: A research based approach." Educational Research Quarterly, 1983, 17(4), pp. 6-15.
- Phi Delta Kappa National Study Commission on Evaluation. Educational Evaluation and Decision Making. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock, 1971.
- Popham, J. W. Educational Statistics. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.
- Popham, J. W. Evaluating Instruction. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
- Redfern, G. B. Evaluating Teachers and Administrators: Putting the Pieces Together. Westerville, Ohio: Ohio School Management Institute, 1978.
- Report by the National Commission on Excellence. A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. April, 1983.
- Ryan, D. W. and Hickcox, E. S. Redefining Teacher Evaluation. Toronto, Ontario: OISE Press, 1980.
- Ryans, D. G. "Assessment of teacher behavior and instruction: observation and assessment of teaching." Review of Educational Research, 33, October, 1963, p. 423.
- Ryans, D. G. "Notes on the criterion problems in research, with special reference to the study of teacher characteristics." Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1957, 91, pp. 33-61.
- Schalock, H. D. "Issues in the conceptualization and measurement of teaching behavior." (Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois, 1967).
- School Laws of Oklahoma, Sec. 142. Oklahmoma City: State of Oklahoma, 1982, p. 98.
- Sord, B. H. "Teaching effectiveness." Phi Kappa Phi Journal, 1973, LIII(1), pp. 61-62.
- Spivey, J. R. "A model for teacher evaluation." NASSP Bulletin, September, 1976, 60(401), pp. 40-44.
- Tuckman, B. W. Conducting Educational Research, 2nd ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Jovanovich, 1978.

- Van Dalen, D. B. and Meyer, W. J. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Vinacke, E. W. Foundations of Psychology. New York: American Book Co., 1968.
- Walberg, H. J., ed. Evaluating Educational Performance. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1974.
- Ware, C. T., Jr. "Individual and situational variables affecting human performance." Human Factors, 1964, 6, pp. 673-674.
- Worthen, B. R. and Sanders, J. R. Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1973.

#### Personal Communications

- Folks, J. Personal interview, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, May and June, 1983.
- Emmons, R. Personal interview, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, June, 1983.
- Leach, J. Personal interview, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, June, 1983.
- Robinson, D. Personal interview, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, June, 1983.
- Wisniewski, R. Comment to Oklahoma Commission on Assessment and Planning, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, June, 1983.

#### Legal Reference

- Oklahoma Statutes Supplement, O.S. 70-6-155, 1980.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

STATE DEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

## State Department of Education

Associate  
Deputy Superintendents  
JACK STRAHORN  
TOM CAMPBELL  
JOHN FOLKS

LESLIE FISHER, Superintendent  
LLOYD GRAHAM, Deputy Superintendent  
2500 North Lincoln Boulevard  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

Assistant Superintendents  
MURL VENARD, Finance  
J. D. GIDDENS, Instruction  
FRED JONES, School Lunch

### MEMORANDUM

TO: Mary Merritt

FROM: Ramona W. Emmons, Ph.D. *RE*  
Assistant Administrator  
Teacher Education/Staff Development

DATE: June 8, 1983

SUBJECT: Your Request for Information

The appointed committee to assist the State Department of Education in developing the Observation Instrument for the Entry-Year Assistance Program functioned from February, 1981 through June, 1981.

CW





APPENDIX B

ENTRY-YEAR TEACHER OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT



**GUIDE FOR THE ENTRY-YEAR COMMITTEE IN  
ORGANIZING THE SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES**

ACTIVITY	MONTH	PURPOSE
COMMITTEE MEETING I	AUGUST, SEPTEMBER, OR PREFERABLY WITHIN 20 WORKING DAYS AFTER THE ENTRY YEAR TEACHER IS ASSIGNED (ACTUAL TEACHING DAYS)	INTRODUCTION, ELECT CHAIRPERSON, ESTABLISH A COMMUNICATION SYSTEM, ESTABLISH SCHEDULE, REVIEW THE EVALUATION FORM, AND DISCUSS "MEANINGFUL PARENTAL INPUT."
OBSERVATION I AND OBSERVATION II	OCTOBER, NOVEMBER, DECEMBER, OR BETWEEN THE 30TH AND THE 100TH DAY OF EMPLOYMENT.	INDEPENDENT VISITATION.  COMPLETE FIRST OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT.
COMMITTEE MEETING II	DECEMBER OR BETWEEN THE 70TH AND 100TH DAY OF EMPLOYMENT.	REVIEW PROGRESS AND FORMULATE RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE TEACHING PERFORMANCE OF THE ENTRY YEAR TEACHER.
OBSERVATION III	JANUARY, FEBRUARY, MARCH, OR BETWEEN THE 100TH AND THE 150TH DAY OF EMPLOYMENT.	INDEPENDENT VISITATION  COMPLETE SECOND OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT.
COMMITTEE MEETING III	BETWEEN APRIL 10 AND THE LAST DAY OF THE SCHOOL YEAR OR BETWEEN THE 150TH AND 180TH DAY IF THE ENTRY YEAR TEACHER ASSIGNMENT IS CONTINUED INTO THE SECOND YEAR.	MAKE THE RECOMMENDATION FOR CERTIFICATION, A SECOND YEAR OF THE EYAP, OR NONCERTIFICATION AFTER THE SECOND YEAR OF THE EYAP.

**I. Human Relations**

1. Reacts with sensitivity to the needs and feelings of others.
2. Helps students build self-awareness and a positive self-concept.
3. Provides positive reinforcement to students.
4. Interacts and communicates effectively with parents and staff.
5. Treats students firmly and fairly while maintaining respect for their worth as individuals.
6. Develops and maintains rapport with students.
7. Helps students to understand and accept their similarities and differences.
8. Shows awareness of the growth and development patterns characteristic of the group taught.
9. Exhibits a sense of humor.
10. Attempts to include all class members in classroom activities.
11. Accepts and/or uses ideas of students.

**Strengths:**

**Concerns:**

**Recommendations:**

**II. Teaching and Assessment**

1. Organizes time, resources, and materials for effective instruction.
2. Makes a clear and adequate explanation of material presented and procedures followed, and teacher expectations for student involvement.
3. Implements a variety of instructional strategies to motivate students.
4. Encourages class participation through interaction with students and feedback.
5. Recognizes and uses opportunities for impromptu teaching.
6. Utilizes valid testing techniques based on the identified objectives.
7. Exhibits enthusiasm for the subject matter.
8. Demonstrates initiative and responsibility in changing situations.

**Strengths:**

**Concerns:**

**Recommendations:**

**III. Classroom Management**

1. Maintains classroom discipline.
2. Handles disruptive students effectively.
3. Treats students fairly.
4. Provides an environment conducive to learning.
5. Teacher and students have accessibility to materials and supplies.
6. Physical arrangement of room is attractive and safe as circumstances permit.
7. Teacher makes an effort to include all students through participation, eye contact, and feedback.
8. Students and teacher are courteous and respectful to one another.
9. Gives clear, explicit directions to students.
10. Teacher is careful for the safety of the student.

**Strengths:**

**Concerns:**

**Recommendations:**

**IV. Professionalism**

1. Maintains a friendly, cooperative, and helpful relationship with other employees.
2. Exhibits leadership by sharing knowledge and techniques with other faculty.
3. Works effectively as a member of an educational team.
4. Demonstrates evidence of professional demeanor, scholarship, and behavior.
5. Effectively expresses self in written and verbal communication using correct grammar and appropriate vocabulary.
6. Demonstrates appropriate behavior and composure in a variety of situations.
7. Uses current educational theories and practices.

**Strengths:**

**Concerns:**

**Recommendations:**

FORM 003

OKLAHOMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
INSTRUCTION DIVISION

Certification Recommendation

After completion of the Entry Year Teaching Service, from \_\_\_\_\_,  
date

to \_\_\_\_\_,  
date Name (Last, first, middle, maiden)

\_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, is  
Social Security No. Teacher Number School District

recommended by the appointed Entry Year Assistance Committee for: (check one)

YEAR I

YEAR II

\_\_\_\_ An Oklahoma School Certificate      \_\_\_\_ An Oklahoma School Certificate  
\_\_\_\_ An additional year in the      \_\_\_\_ Noncertification in Oklahoma  
Entry Year Assistance Program

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Teacher Consultant \_\_\_\_\_ \*  
print name signature date  
Administrator \_\_\_\_\_ \*  
print name signature date  
Higher Education person \_\_\_\_\_ \*  
print name signature date

-----  
Superintendent \_\_\_\_\_  
signature date

Subscribed and sworn to before me this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 19\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public Commission expires \_\_\_\_\_, 19\_\_.

\*Signature indicates participation in Committee action.

Return by Certified Mail to: Certification Section  
State Department of Education  
2500 North Lincoln Blvd.  
Oklahoma City, OK 73105

09/15/82  
EYAP-HNDBK



APPENDIX C  
QUESTIONNAIRE

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE STANDARD EVALUATIVE CRITERIA  
REGARDING ENTRY-YEAR TEACHERS AS PERCEIVED  
BY MEMBERS OF ENTRY-YEAR ASSISTANCE  
COMMITTEES AND ENTRY-YEAR  
TEACHERS

The Entry-Year Assistance Program has been implemented in Oklahoma school districts employing beginning licensed teachers. This questionnaire is designed to help identify certain perceptions of the evaluative criteria used in the entry-year process. You are familiar with those criteria as a result of your involvement in the Entry-Year Assistance Program in your school.

Do not sign your name. Please check the appropriate square.

1. Your position on the Entry-Year Committee:

- Entry-Year Teacher                       Administrative Representative  
 Consulting Teacher                       Higher Education Representative

2. Year(s) of teaching experience in public schools:

- 0       1-5       6-10       11-15       Over 15

3. Year(s) of teaching experience in institutions of higher education:

- 0       1-5       6-10       11-15       Over 15

4. Year(s) of administrative experience:

- 0       1-5       6-10       11-15       Over 15

5. Current grade level(s) taught:

- Elementary                       Secondary                       Higher Education

6. Level of education:

- Bachelor's Degree       Master's Degree       Doctor's Degree

The categories from the standard observation instrument used in evaluating the licensed entry-year teacher, in alphabetical order, are as follows:

- \_\_\_\_\_ A. Classroom Management  
\_\_\_\_\_ B. Human Relations  
\_\_\_\_\_ C. Professionalism  
\_\_\_\_\_ D. Teaching and Assessment

Please rank order them from 1 to 4 in terms of your perception as to their importance in the evaluation process with 1 being MOST IMPORTANT and 4 LEAST IMPORTANT.

DIRECTIONS: After each of the following statements from the standard evaluative criteria, please circle the letter that most correctly reflects your perception (opinion) as to the validity of that item as a valid descriptor of the Human Relations category of the teaching performance.

The scale is coded as follows: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

HUMAN RELATIONS

- |  |    |   |   |    |
|--|----|---|---|----|
| 1. Reacts with sensitivity to the needs and feelings of others.                                | SA | A | D | SD |
| 2. Helps students build self-awareness and a positive self-concept.                            | SA | A | D | SD |
| 3. Provides positive reinforcement to students.  | SA | A | D | SD |
| 4. Interacts and communicates effectively with parents and staff.                              | SA | A | D | SD |
| 5. Treats students firmly and fairly while maintaining respect for their worth as individuals. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 6. Develops and maintains rapport with students.   | SA | A | D | SD |
| 7. Helps students to understand and accept their similarities and differences.                 | SA | A | D | SD |
| 8. Shows awareness of the growth and development patterns characteristic of the group taught.  | SA | A | D | SD |
| 9. Exhibits a sense of humor.  | SA | A | D | SD |
| 10. Attempts to include all class members in classroom activities.                             | SA | A | D | SD |
| 11. Accepts and/or uses ideas of students.   | SA | A | D | SD |

Please indicate the number(s) of any item(s) which should be eliminated from the Human Relations category of the instrument.

---

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

---

Please indicate additional items which would improve the Human Relations category.

---

DIRECTIONS: After each of the following statements from the standard evaluative criteria, please circle the letter that most correctly reflects your perception (opinion) as to the validity of that item as a valid descriptor of the Teaching and Assessment category of the teaching performance.

The scale is coded as follows: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT

- |  |    |   |   |    |
|--|----|---|---|----|
| 1. Organizes time, resources and materials for effective instruction.  | SA | A | D | SD |
| 2. Makes a clear and adequate explanation of material presented and procedures followed, and teacher expectations for student involvement. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 3. Implements a variety of instructional strategies to motivate students.  | SA | A | D | SD |
| 4. Encourages class participation through interaction with students and feedback.  | SA | A | D | SD |
| 5. Recognizes and uses opportunities for impromptu teaching.   | SA | A | D | SD |
| 6. Utilizes valid testing techniques based on the identified objectives.   | SA | A | D | SD |
| 7. Exhibits enthusiasm for the subject matter.   | SA | A | D | SD |
| 8. Demonstrates initiative and responsibility in changing situations.  | SA | A | D | SD |

Please indicate the number(s) of any item(s) which should be eliminated from the Teaching and Assessment category of the instrument. \_\_\_\_\_

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

Please indicate additional items which would improve the Teaching and Assessment category. \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS: After each of the following statements from the standard evaluative criteria, please circle the letter that most correctly reflects your perception (opinion) as to the validity of that item as a valid descriptor of the Classroom Management category of the teaching performance.

The scale is coded as follows: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

- |  |    |   |   |    |
|--|----|---|---|----|
| 1. Maintains classroom discipline.   | SA | A | D | SD |
| 2. Handles disruptive students effectively.  | SA | A | D | SD |
| 3. Treats students fairly.   | SA | A | D | SD |
| 4. Provides an environment conducive to learning.  | SA | A | D | SD |
| 5. Teacher and students have accessibility to materials and supplies.                                | SA | A | D | SD |
| 6. Physical arrangement of room is attractive and safe as circumstances permit.                      | SA | A | D | SD |
| 7. Teacher makes an effort to include all students through participation, eye contact, and feedback. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 8. Students and teacher are courteous and respectful to one another.                                 | SA | A | D | SD |
| 9. Gives clear, explicit directions to students.   | SA | A | D | SD |
| 10. Teacher is careful for the safety of the student.  | SA | A | D | SD |

Please indicate the number(s) of any item(s) which should be eliminated from the Classroom Management category of the instrument.

---

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

---

Please indicate additional items which would improve the Classroom Management category. \_\_\_\_\_

**DIRECTIONS:** After each of the following statements from the standard evaluative criteria, please circle the letter that most correctly reflects your perception (opinion) as to the validity of that item as a valid descriptor of the Professionalism category of the teaching performance.

The scale is coded as follows: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

**PROFESSIONALISM**

- |   |    |   |   |    |
|---|----|---|---|----|
| 1. Maintains a friendly, cooperative and helpful relationship with other employees.                                 | SA | A | D | SD |
| 2. Exhibits leadership by sharing knowledge and techniques with other faculty.                                      | SA | A | D | SD |
| 3. Works effectively as a member of an educational team.  | SA | A | D | SD |
| 4. Demonstrates evidence of professional demeanor, scholarship, and behavior.                                       | SA | A | D | SD |
| 5. Effectively expresses self in written and verbal communication using correct grammar and appropriate vocabulary. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 6. Uses current educational theories and practices.   | SA | A | D | SD |

Please indicate the number(s) of any item(s) which should be eliminated from the Professionalism category of the instrument.

---

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

---

Please indicate additional items which would improve the Professionalism category. \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX D

CORRESPONDENCE TO SAMPLE

Route 3, Box 311  
Stillwater, OK 74074  
March 18, 1983

Dear Colleague:

Please respond to the enclosed questionnaire based on your experience with and perception of the Entry-Year Assistance Program.

Your task is to determine the validity of the descriptors for each of the categories of the standard evaluative criteria used by the committees in assessing teaching performance. As you respond, keep in mind that your responses indicate your perception of the appropriateness of that descriptor to the evaluation of the Entry-Year Teacher.

While your responses will provide data for a dissertation, your assistance may be of particular importance to the Oklahoma State Department of Education and the Oklahoma Legislature as they make program decisions. Therefore, your careful attention will result in a significant contribution which will be shared state and nationwide.

After you have completed the questionnaire, please use the stamped, self-addressed envelope to return it to me.

Sincerely,

Mary L. Meritt

Encl.



Route 3, Box 311  
Stillwater, OK 74074  
March 18, 1983

Dear Administrator:

Enclosed are three questionnaires with cover letters of explanation for each member of the Entry-Year Assistance Committee for Miss J. Doe and Miss J. Doe, the entry-year teacher. The higher education member's questionnaire was mailed to the college or university.

Please distribute the questionnaires to the committee members and request that they return the questionnaires to you. I have enclosed a stamped, self-addressed envelope for your convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance with this research.

Sincerely,

Mary L. Meritt

Encl.

APPENDIX E

FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Route 3, Box 311  
Stillwater, OK 74074  
April 20, 1983

Dear Colleague:

You should have received a questionnaire asking for your perceptions of the categories and descriptors on the entry-year observation instrument.

At this time, I have not received your responses. In order to satisfactorily complete my research, I need your responses. Please take a few minutes to respond and return your responses in the stamped, self-addressed envelope which I have provided.

Sincerely,

Mary L. Meritt  
Oklahoma State University  
Doctoral Candidate

APPENDIX F

CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE SAMPLE



Department of Education and Psychology  
(405) 248-2200, Ext. 320

CAMERON UNIVERSITY

2800 West Gore Blvd.  
Lawton, Oklahoma 73505

May 9, 1983

Mary L. Merritt  
Route 3, Box 311  
Stillwater, Ok 74074

Dear Mrs. Merritt:

Please excuse the delay in returning your questionnaire. I have enclosed a memo that I sent to our departmental chairman concerning the evaluation instrument. I have also enclosed sheets with regrouped items that I prepared during the fall semester of 1982 and your questionnaire.

It is my opinion that you are addressing a problem that needs consideration. Good luck with the dissertation.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Ellis, Ed.D.  
Associate Professor

KE:mfg

Enclosure

P.S. Karen told me you were serving on P.S.B.

I. Human Relations

- 1A. Reacts with sensitivity to the needs and feelings of others.
- 1B. Helps students build self-awareness and a positive self-concept.
- 1F. Develops and maintains rapport with students.
- 3H. Students and teacher are courteous and respectful to one another.
- 1G. Helps students to understand and accept their similarities and differences.
- 1H. Shows awareness of the growth and development patterns characteristic of the group taught.

Strengths

Concerns

Recommendations

## II. Teaching and Assessment

2A. Organizes time, resources, and materials for effective instruction.

2B. Makes a clear and adequate explanation of material presented and procedures followed, and teacher expectations for student involvement.

3I. Gives clear, explicit directions to students.

4E. Effectively expresses self in written and verbal communication using correct grammar and appropriate vocabulary.

1D. Interacts and communicates effectively with parents and staff.

2C. Implements a variety of instructional strategies to motivate students.

2F. Utilizes valid testing techniques based on the identified objectives.

4G. Uses current educational theories and practices.

2G. Exhibits enthusiasm for the subject matter.

2H. Demonstrates initiative and responsibility in changing situations.

4F. Demonstrates appropriate behavior and composure in a variety of situations.

1C. Provides positive reinforcement to students.

1J. Attempts to include all class members in classroom activities.

3G. Teacher makes an effort to include all students through participation, eye contact, and feedback.

2D. Encourages class participation through interaction with students and feedback.

2E. Recognizes and uses opportunities for impromptu teaching.

1K. Accepts and/or uses ideas of students.

### Strengths

### Concerns

### Recommendations

### III. Classroom Management

- 3D. Provides an environment conducive to learning.
  - 3A. Maintains classroom discipline.
  - 3B. Handles disruptive students effectively.
  - 1E. Treats students firmly and fairly while maintaining respect for their worth as individuals.
  - 3C. Treats students fairly.
- 
- 3E. Teacher and students have accessibility to materials and supplies.
  - 3F. Physical arrangement of room is attractive and safe as circumstances permit.
  - 3J. Teacher is careful for the safety of the student.

#### Strengths

#### Concerns

#### Recommendations



Mary..apologies for the lateness--I do know how frustrating things can be for dissertation writers when respondents don't respond!!!! Also, please excuse my "excessive doodlings" on your survey sheets but, I for one, am glad that you are examining this evaluative form--I do realize that it is difficult to create such a tool in a limited amount of time, but hopefully the content will be carefully examined and REDONE BEFORE FALL COMMITTEES BEGIN!

Personal remarks as to tool content and useability:

- .some building principals used it as a "check sheet" and gave very little thought to what THEY CONSIDERED QUALITY TEACHING and what they CONSIDERED TO BE CHARACTERISTICS THAT THEY PERCEIVE AS VITAL IN NEW TEACHERS!
- .I would strongly suggest,if the categories are kept, that items be carefully examined as to order within categories--it appears that items are placed "helter skelter" with no clustering!
- .I, personally, believe that more attention should be given to teaching and assessment (CERTAINLY WITHIN THIS CATEGORY SHOULD BE SEVERAL ITEMS WHICH RELATE TO THE OPPORTUNITY THAT THE EYT HAS IN DEVELOPING PLANS AND LESSONS-using a variety of teaching materials and techniques- APPROPRIATE FOR THE CHILDREN WITH WHOM SHE/HE WORKS) I found some poor teaching being done as a result of the "school policies" or demands of the building principal! Someway, this MUST BE INCORPORATED INTO THIS EY evaluation form. Also, reword "valid" test ing techniques to include both informal and formal measures
- 'I found, in the writing of 29 EYT evaluations , that there was considerable overlap in items within categories and in items across categories--suggestions arenoted on the form
- .how were the items chosen? (by the way, Mary, I am VERY GLAD that the Classroom Management category was not placed first in the packet--it seems to be the category in which MANY principals show keen interest!!!!)
- .after my initial draft, prior to typing my observations on the EYT's form, I would review my thoughts --I often found that I would have difficulty identifying the category for which I THOUGHT I HAD WRITTEN REMARKS (items within categories not clearly delineated????!!!!)

Mary, I don't know what you intend to do with data gathered from responses, but if it is to be used to revise the current tool or to create a more workable one, you might check Phi Delta Kappa's publications. The last few years they have some very good "school climate" publications-- 1974-75 School Climate Improvement, etc.

If I can be of help, call, Mary

*Roberta B. Miller*  
624 - 7122/7123