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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In nearly all organizations and institutions evaluation is present in some form. This is because any activity undertaken with a purpose logically demands an assessment of the degree to which the purposes are met and the effectiveness of the means of achieving those purposes. Bloom stated, "The theory of evaluation is a theory about how evidence should be gathered and analyzed to appraise the effectiveness of a social institution" (4, p. 284).

Among social institutions, public schools have the most extensive experience with evaluation. Yet even with this background, educators have not developed any definitive methods for the evaluation of teaching performance. This is not due to any lack of research efforts and professional literature on the subject. In fact, Ellena has stated that probably no aspect of public education has been discussed with greater frequency and with deeper concern by both lay citizens and educators than teacher competence—how to identify it, how to define it, how to measure it, how to evaluate it, how to reward it, how to detect and remove obstacles to its achievement (7, p. vii).

The methods of evaluating teachers that have been used in the past, and continue to be used today, are inadequate according to the research, in general. Yet the improvement
of education depends in large part on identifying competent teachers, diagnosing incompetence, and measuring changes in competence validity and reliability.

Current methods of teacher performance evaluation have most often used one or more of the following measures: (1) tests to measure teacher knowledge (e.g., the National Teacher Examinations or minimum competency tests), (2) achievement test scores of students in the teacher's classroom, or (3) ratings of teacher performance in the classroom. Again, the research indicates that these methods, for the most part, have not succeeded in the improvement of classroom instruction.

The public and its elected representatives view teacher performance evaluation as a major problem. Thus, state legislatures throughout the United States are seizing the initiative and trying to mandate more effective evaluation of teachers (25).

In dealing with the evaluation of teaching performance, educators are confronted with a plethora of research and professional literature which fails to provide any definitive methods to accomplish the process. It seems very likely that no panacean process for performance evaluation will be identified due to (1) the variance among students, teachers, and school districts, and (2) the multipally perceived missions of education as they relate to meeting societal
and individual needs. Biddle and Ellena observed, "It is not an exaggeration to say that we do not today know how to select, train for, encourage, or evaluate teaching effectiveness" (3, p. vi).

The importance of the evaluation of teacher effectiveness resides in identifying and developing competent teachers. Openshaw asserted,

One of the requirements of a professional, regardless of the profession of which he is a part, is active participation in the development and enforcement of standards that are fundamental to the continuous improvement of his profession. Such improvement is impossible without evaluation (19, p. 31).

The major emphasis of teacher evaluation, according to many educators and educational researchers, should be improvement of instruction. Howsam observed that administrative decisions concerning the re-employment of faculty are also made through evidence gathered during teacher performance evaluation (16). These rather diverse purposes contribute to the complexity of research in teacher evaluation.

The Problem

The problem of this study was to describe and analyze the policies, processes, and criteria for teacher performance evaluation as they exist in the public schools of Texas.

Purposes

The purposes of this study included the following:

1. To identify the procedures and criteria used for
conducting teacher performance evaluation in Texas public schools,

2. To determine the degree to which teacher performance evaluation procedures and instruments reflect the stated evaluation policies of Texas public schools, and

3. To determine the degree to which teacher performance evaluation instruments used in Texas public schools reflect presage criteria (teacher characteristics) as opposed to process criteria (teacher classroom behavior) as opposed to product criteria (student change or gain) as opposed to general job performance requirements (job expectations).

Research Question

In order to accomplish the stated purposes, attention was focused specifically on the following research questions.

1. What procedures are used for conducting teacher performance evaluation in Texas public schools?

2. Do teacher performance evaluation instruments reflect the stated evaluation policies of Texas public schools?

3. What are the content characteristics of teacher performance evaluation instruments in Texas public schools?

Background and Significance

Until the 1950s, research on teaching tended to focus on identifying the personal characteristics that appeared
to differentiate effective from less effective teachers, and not on finding best teaching practices. Barr's review of the literature points out that most of the earlier studies used supervisors' ratings of teacher characteristics as the measure of teacher effectiveness (1).

Soar, Medley, and Coker (25) found, in their comparative analysis of the Handbook of Research on Teaching, published in 1968, and the Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, published in 1973, that teacher characteristics have not been a major focus of research for many years. They reported that the first handbook had one chapter on the subject and the second had only a few lines.

Quirk, Witten, and Weinberg, in a 1973 study (25), correlated weighted total common scores on the National Teacher Examinations with students' gains on achievement tests and with supervisors' ratings of teachers' competence. They found that National Teacher Examination scores did not predict success in teaching as measured either by students' achievement gains or from supervisors' ratings of teachers' competence. This finding is cogent given the current interest in such measures as the National Teacher Examination as criteria for employment as a teacher or for entry into teacher education programs.

Many states, including Texas, have mandated teacher competency tests for certification. These tests are designed
to measure minimum literacy and subject matter knowledge. It will be interesting to note whether or not these tests improve student outcomes or if there will be any correlation between scores on competency tests and student gains. Indeed, according to a review of the literature at this time, research has failed to establish the validity of written tests of professional knowledge as predictors of student learning.

Many attempts have been made in the literature to identify teacher characteristics which are related to student achievement. A focus on the characteristics of teaching as a determinant of success is known as presage. Ryans (23) conducted a study in which he attempted to identify certain personality patterns of teachers that have a discernible influence on pupil behavior. This study involved some 6,000 teachers in 1,700 schools. He found that certain types of teacher traits such as warm, understanding, friendly, responsible, businesslike, stimulating, systematic, and imaginative, are significantly related to teacher success in many situations and can be evaluated objectively. However, he also found that these qualities are not absolutes, but are interacting and may vary depending upon educational philosophy, pupil characteristics, and other factors. Getzels and Jackson (12) concluded that while the Ryans' study was impressive, many of the issues (e.g., personality
patterns of teachers that have a discernible influence on pupil behavior) raised in previous teacher characteristic studies applied to this study. Fattu noted that attempts to identify effective teachers in terms of characteristics "appear largely sterile in terms of usability for evaluation or selection purposes" (8, p. 22). Kerlinger (15) also warned that the desirable traits of teachers are not absolutes. He felt that an evaluator's own underlying biases about good teaching often reflect that person's opinion about good or bad teaching. This basic educational orientation needs to be taken into consideration, identified, and perhaps evaluated. Kerlinger noted that individuals with progressive attitudes toward education choose person-oriented traits in selecting traits that they believe to be desirable in teachers, whereas educators with traditional attitudes toward education choose task-oriented traits that are congruent with traditional educational beliefs. Subjectivity such as this imposes certain limitations on attempts to evaluate teaching in terms of teacher characteristics.

The second major evaluative basis which is used to evaluate teacher performance is that of specific behaviors of the teachers during the teaching act or process. Smith stated that a major breakthrough in the training and evaluation of teachers "occurred when teaching behavior was conceived to be a complex of skills that could be identified
and practiced systematically under specific conditions" (24, p. 68).

Beller (2) divided teacher behavior into three areas which he contended must be evaluated. These included role, style, and technique. Teacher role refers to behavior which concerns the duties, responsibilities, and functions of the teacher. Style concerns personality traits and teacher attitudes which are not a planned component of the teacher role. Characteristics such as friendly or unfriendly, warm or cold, sensitive or insensitive, relaxed or tense, intimate or detached are style variables. Technique of teaching refers to specific strategies employed by the teacher to accomplish certain objectives or carry out the role.

Rosenshine and Furst stated that,

The specification of behavior represents a radical shift from the traditional, vague objectives of providing meaningful experiences; educating the whole child; and providing for individual differences. The focus on denotable actions is praiseworthy (22, p. 38).

Gage (11) urged that teacher attributes and teacher behavior should be in small measurable units. By this, he is referring to adequate, concrete, objective, universal criteria for teaching ability that are specific in nature and not overly broad or general. These attributes, however, remain difficult to observe and evaluate objectively. Researchers such as Flanders (9) are quick to point out the difficulty in accurately identifying and
measuring teacher behaviors which influence student outcome measures.

It seems logical that, since the classroom is the focal point of the educative process, it is the place to evaluate teaching. Morsh and Wilder concluded, however, after reviewing evaluative research from 1900 to 1952, that "no single, specific, observable teacher act has yet been found whose frequency or percentage of occurrence is invariably and significantly correlated with student achievement" (97, p. 4).

Boocock stated that, "... from what is now known, there is no one type of teacher, teaching, or classroom organization that produces the best results with all students in all areas of academic endeavor" (5, p. 41).

A major problem in the development of teacher performance evaluation systems based on teacher behavior is the lack of agreement on how to measure behavior. Process or classroom observation is one of the most widespread means because the classroom is where teaching occurs. It seems logical for the classroom to be the focal point of the evaluative process. However, Musella noted the limitations of direct classroom observations as "insufficient observation time upon which to base judgement," "inadequacy of recorded observations as valid and reliable samples of the total teaching experiences of the teacher," and "uncertainty of the validity and reliability of the observers" (18, p. 18).
Any administrator who has observed or visited several classes or teachers notes that there are differences in the learning taking place as well as differences in other related variables. Rosenshine (21) divides observational techniques into two groups based upon the amount of inference required of the observer. Category or objective counting systems are considered "low-inference" techniques, while rating scales are considered "high-inference" methods.

Yevish (27) suggested that the real problem in teacher performance evaluation seems to be in the notion that teacher performance observation in the classroom will tell us something about the student, what he is learning, and how valuable the learning is. Yevish observed that no study has ever been conducted that establishes the superiority of classroom observation as a supervisory technique over other techniques. Further, if observation is an act of taking notice, and if the wrong things are noticed, for example, the teacher instead of the student, or instruction instead of learning, then observation as a technique of supervision may become a misleading exercise.

A third major basis for the evaluation of teaching performance is student change or product. As Bloom noted, "One of the major assumptions of evaluation is that education exists for the purpose of changing the thoughts, feelings, and actions of students" (4, p. 7). Evaluation may thus be
conducted to appraise the extent to which the teacher is producing these changes in students. Morsh and Wilder concluded, after their review of the research from 1900 to 1952, that evidence of student gains "... appears to offer one of the best criteria thus far used" (17, p. 33), but they also noted that the problem of relating specific teacher behavior or teacher traits to student achievement has not been resolved.

Medley found that evaluation in terms of student gain can be useful for administrators who must make personnel decisions, but it helps very little in diagnosing specific teaching flaws and identifying methods of improving the instructional abilities of an individual teacher. "Thus, for the purpose of improving instruction, process evaluation (an analysis of teaching performance or behavior in the classroom) is far superior to product evaluation (an analysis of teacher effectiveness through an assessment of student achievement)" (16, p. 33). Barr pointed out that each teacher chooses his own individual purposes, means, and methods of instruction, and these usually vary greatly from teacher to teacher. Because of this, it cannot be stated with certainty that changes in student achievement can be attributed to a certain teacher or a specific aspect of teacher behavior. Another difficulty arises out of the fact that "many of the outcomes of learning and of teaching are
poorly or inadequately measured" (1, p. 8). However, Barr goes on to say that "one of the very best measures of a teacher's effectiveness will be found in how well his students do in subsequent course work" (1, p. 8).

There is very little in the literature or research concerning the fourth major basis for teacher performance evaluation. This cluster is known as general job performance requirements or job expectations. Horvat (13) defines this criteria type as standard job expectations not directly associated with classroom teaching behavior. He maintains that these are criteria that should apply to all employees and are not necessarily related to the teacher's classroom teaching ability. Horvat further maintains that one can be a good teacher, but a bad employee, and that many more teachers are terminated for failure to meet non-teaching institutional criteria than for incompetence in teaching. He notes that school districts have a legal and administrative right to impose such criteria. However, this is certainly an area that needs further investigation since it has not been explored in the literature.

In 1978, the Education Research Service (6) carried out a study in which they attempted to determine teacher performance evaluation practices throughout the United States. Part of the survey asked about "the uses made of the summative evaluation reports" (reports that lead to
decisions on whether to retain or dismiss a teacher). The Education Research Service received responses from 363 school districts. The four most frequently mentioned purposes of teacher evaluation included helping teachers improve their teaching performance (349 responses), deciding on renewed appointment of probationary teachers (328 responses), recommending probationary teachers for tenure or continuing contract status (326 responses), and recommending dismissal of unsatisfactory tenured or continuing contract teachers (317 responses). Wood and Pohland suggested in their study that the purpose listed most often, helping teachers improve their teaching performance, is "fundamentally different from the other three and, more importantly, that this purpose is not clearly operationalized in the evaluation instruments currently used in many school districts" (26, p. 1). Their findings are based on an investigation of the evaluation instruments of seventy-one New Mexico school districts which participated. Further, they found that instruments put much more emphasis on organizational maintenance than on improving teacher classroom performance.

Similarly, Reavis (20) found in a 1975 Texas study of 163 schools that 138 or 85 percent reported that a stated purpose of their teacher performance evaluation policy was to provide teachers with specific suggestions for improving teacher performance. In 80 schools, or 49 percent, a stated
purpose was to serve as a basis for retention or dismissal. One school listed as a purpose of teacher evaluation the determination of promotion or salary increments.

Fox (10) reported that in a 1972 Missouri study of 147 schools, 145 or 99 percent reported that a stated purpose of their teacher performance evaluation policy was to improve instruction. In 106 schools, or 72 percent, a stated purpose was to provide evidence for dismissal.

A Datrix search of existing research and a thorough search of the recent literature and research did not identify any information dealing with the problem identified for this study. This study should be of great value to educators and school districts in the State of Texas as it will help them understand the procedures that are used for teacher performance evaluation and to determine the focus of teacher performance evaluation instruments, both collectively and individually.

Teacher performance evaluation goes hand-in-hand with accountability. Accountability in education begins and ends with human performance. In schools, it is people that are accountable, not books, supplies, equipment, or buildings. Any program of accountability must, therefore, be based on performance evaluation of educational personnel.

Better teacher performance is not a localized effort. Rather, it is a national movement. Teacher performance or
accountability is discussed in the United States Congress, almost every state legislature, and by thousands of boards of education. It is regarded by most as a necessary reform to improve performance of school personnel. Teacher performance evaluation is being tied to legislatively mandated merit pay and career plans. Teacher performance evaluation is a central issue in Texas due to such controversial issues as the enactment of Texas Senate Bill 341 (term contract non-renewal act) and Governor Mark White's Committee on Education which led to the passage of Texas House Bill 72 (comprehensive educational legislation regarding school finance, transportation, curriculum and special programs, students, teachers, and administrators). One of the provisions of this bill is a uniform state-wide teacher performance evaluation system known as the Texas Teacher Appraisal System. The system itself is supposedly designed to be a practical, usable system that can be applied fairly to teachers in all subjects and grade levels and provide information for improvement of instruction, career ladder assignments, and which may be used for contract renewal decisions.

The press for better teacher performance will not subside. Citizens across the country are questioning whether or not schools are doing an adequate job of educating students. Thus, if public confidence in the schools is to be strengthened, teacher performance evaluation must become a high priority. Quality education can only be established through
strong teacher performance evaluation programs. These evaluative programs must be examined now in terms of fairness and validity in order to improve schools in the most effective manner.

Definition of Terms

Teacher performance evaluation is a formal and systematic approach utilized in determining the relative competence of a teacher.

Presage criteria are characteristics of the teacher such as personal traits (traits related to task of teaching, traits related to the teacher as a person), personal characteristics (physical fitness, grooming, voice-speech), and general characteristics-attitudes (positive attitude toward teaching, professional attitude, teacher attitude).

Process criteria include a complex set of behavior variables that interact and combine to comprise the activities of persons as they go about doing what is required of teachers; actual classroom teaching behaviors.

Product criteria include student achievement and the appraisal of student performance; evaluation of teacher effectiveness through an assessment of student attitudes and performance.

General job performance requirements are standard job expectations for any employee that are not directly
associated with classroom teaching behavior (interpersonal relations with community, school staff, students; administrator-manager role--student control, reporting-record keeping, classroom environment; aesthetic-physical, classroom management; organizational compliance, response to supervision, assumption of non-teaching responsibilities, organizational perspective--helps reach school objectives).

Teacher evaluation process is a formal and systematic approach utilized in assessing the competence of a teacher.

Limitations

1. This study focuses exclusively on the instruments, policies, and criteria used to measure or determine the quality of teacher performance. Very little is known about how the instruments are used, whether they are the only bases of assessment or what use is made of the information. In like manner, nothing is known about the skills, preparation, values, or attitudes of the evaluators.

2. The analysis is exclusively quantitative and descriptive. Such qualitative indicators as the value or priority a school administrator may assign to any given aspect of teacher performance is also not known. Also, while it is reasonable to infer that the number of items in a given category in the category system may correspond well with its perceived importance, this may or may not be the case.
Basic Assumptions

1. It was assumed that the decision rules and category system used in classifying the data from the teacher performance evaluation instruments for the purpose of the content analysis were valid and reliable.

2. Only Texas public schools of 1,000 or more average daily pupil attendance have been studied as it was assumed that school districts of this size had the staffing and financial resources to keep abreast with current teacher performance evaluation policies, procedures, and instruments.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Teacher performance evaluation is an important part of any school's attempt at goal achievement. Teaching must be evaluated to help the school in achieving its organizational goals. Teachers have been given major responsibility for certain aspects of educating society's young people. Because of this, there is great interest in the process of teacher performance evaluation. In most schools today, evaluation is both formal and mandatory. Fattu stated that teacher performance evaluation is an attempt to assess "... one of the most complex phenomenon (sic) that we are privileged to study" (12, p. 2).

In order to effectively investigate teacher performance evaluation as it relates to this study, the literature is reviewed according to the following topics: (1) the status of teacher performance evaluation, (2) purpose for teacher performance evaluation, (3) criteria for teacher performance evaluation (to include presage criteria or teacher characteristics, process criteria or teacher classroom behavior, product criteria or student change or gain, and general job performance requirements or job expectations), and (4) methods for teacher performance evaluation.
Status of Teacher Performance Evaluation

There has been a concern for identifying effective teachers. Public demand for evaluation and accountability has become widespread and is increasing. The rising cost of education is resulting in closer scrutiny of the functions of the schools by the taxpayers. In a 1969 survey of teacher evaluation procedures in school systems with enrollments of 16,000 or more students, the Educational Research Service found that of the 235 systems that responded, only seventeen had not established formal procedures for evaluating teachers (28).

In many states today, teacher performance evaluation has become mandated either by legislation or by state bureaus. Florida became one of the first states to require by legislative mandate, teacher performance evaluation in 1957 (36). The Stull Act of California in 1971 mandated each school district to establish a uniform system of evaluation and assessment of all certified personnel. School districts were provided a copy of the state guidelines and then were left on their own to develop teacher performance evaluation instruments and techniques (31).

Thiel (45) found, in his 1976 study of state statutes concerning accountability, assessment, and professional-personnel evaluation, that there is no standard model being used by legislatures in the development of laws in these
areas. His study also found that state legislatures that have enacted legislation concerning accountability and assessment in education have failed to provide guidelines or the resources for the implementation and administration of the legal statutes.

Currently, forty states have established minimum competency testing programs for public school teachers covering the basic skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic (32). The National Teacher Examination is also now used in thirty states for certification and hiring of teachers (30).

Thus, it is apparent that the public is demanding a more formalized approach for teacher performance evaluation than was used previously.

Vander Werf (46) asserted that all teacher performance evaluation instruments should be valid, objective, and reliable. He found that teachers have little or no faith in evaluation instruments or in the methods used in administering them. According to Vander Werf, any rating schemes that call for critical appraisal of individual teacher performance tend to create a gap between administrators and the classroom teacher.

Purposes for Teacher Performance Evaluation

Practically every thinker and writer on the subject of teacher performance evaluation begins the discussion with the
purposes of teacher evaluation. There is almost unanimous agreement that the major purposes are generally two, including (1) evaluation of teaching performance to facilitate the improvement of instruction, and (2) evaluation of teaching performance to facilitate institutional-administrative decision making (whom to promote, whether to grant tenure, whether to give salary increases based on merit, etc.).

Certain problems immediately arise. Logically, according to Macdonald (24), one could argue that the two purposes are not mutually exclusive; and that the same data can be used for both purposes. On the surface, this appears to be a valid concept. However, Macdonald further maintains that the psychology and sociology of the teacher makes this logic doubtful. From the perspective of the teacher, the context of each purpose is much different. Macdonald maintains that the two purposes should never be mixed, and that teachers should be aware at all times of the separate purposes for which data are being collected.

Educators also state various other reasons for engaging in teacher performance evaluation. Bolton identified nine purposes of teacher performance evaluation from his review of the literature and school district manuals of procedure.

1. Improvement of teaching. Improvement of teaching may be brought about by changing the performance of the individual, by stimulating self-evaluation, or by changing the conditions of work. It may be easier to change the conditions of work (e.g., by removing certain students from a given room, by grouping teachers, or by providing flexible furniture) than to
change the performance of an individual, and the results may be comparable. The point is that one should be aware of various ways of improving teaching as well as changing the behavior of the teacher.

2. Rewarding superior performance. Paying people differently is done either to keep people from being ineffective or to motivate them to be superior performers. The literature is mixed regarding the effectiveness of such practice, and many school districts work hard to reward superior performance by means other than differential pay.

3. Modifying assignments. Modification of assignments can be either voluntary or involuntary, within the system or outside the system. Thus, there are four distinct types of assignment change: (a) a voluntary change within the system would be considered a transfer; (b) an involuntary change within the system is sometimes called an honorable transfer; (c) a voluntary change to a position outside the system would be resignation; and (d) an involuntary change to a position outside the system is a release. All of these entail administrative decisions, and many districts require that an evaluation process contribute to the decisions.

4. Protecting individuals and the organization. Basically this purpose is designed to protect against unfair criticism, with the assumption that evaluative information can provide a basis for that protection.

5. Validating the selection process. If used for this purpose, evaluation provides feedback regarding whether teacher performance matches predictions about performance made at the time of selection.

6. Satisfying policy, law. Where school board policy or the state law requires teacher evaluation, this purpose is stated or implied.

7. Improving decisions. Several types of decisions can be improved by evaluative information, e.g., broad public decisions such as bond issues and changes in basic curriculum; policy decisions made by the board of education such as the emphasis to be placed on various activities or resources; and operational decisions by administrators having to do with such things as modification of objectives or procedures or determining new ways of implementing procedures.

8. Providing a basis for career planning. An evaluator may work with an individual so that strengths and weaknesses are understood in relation to opportunities for the future. Some individuals need to be encouraged because of their leadership potential, while others may need to face their weaknesses realistically and plan accordingly.
9. Contributing to morale and cooperation.
When this purpose is being accomplished, communication will be such that a high level of trust is developed between evaluator and evaluatee (4, pp. 55-56).

Brighton maintained that the purposes of teacher evaluation are

(1) to assess the overall school program to determine how well it is progressing toward avowed goals, (2) to provide a basis for improving instruction, (3) to motivate teachers to render their highest level of professional service, (4) to help teachers succeed in their chosen profession, (5) to provide a basis for making administrative decisions, (6) to provide a basis for developing effective personnel policies, (7) to implement a merit pay program, and (8) to keep records and reports for administrative officers and boards of education (7, p. 12).

Redfern stated three purposes of teacher performance evaluation as the

(1) assessment of the status and quality of performance, (2) identification of those aspects of performance which are below standard and need improvement, and (3) stimulation of the growth and development of the individual (35, p. 117).

Beller listed the following purposes of teacher performance evaluation:

(1) to determine whether the objectives of education are being achieved, (2) to identify effective and ineffective teachers, to help administrators in the assignment, promotion, or other changes in the status of teachers, (3) to contribute to the improvement of education by providing a basis for in-service training and for supervisory activities, (4) to provide a source for motivation and self-improvement, (5) to give evidence of the quality of services rendered and thereby justify to the community the investment of public funds in educational institutions, and (6) to determine to what extent educational programs produce changes which are compatible with the goals of the culture (2, pp. 125-126).
Horvat (18) found that, in general, teachers performance is evaluated in order to accomplish one or more of the following purposes: (1) to help—to help and assist teachers to improve their performance; (2) to judge—to enable administrators-board to make judgments with respect to such matters as retention or dismissal, promotion, retraining, or merit pay plans; (3) to maintain quality control—similar to purpose (2) but with a school-wide or district-wide, rather than individual perspective; (4) to manipulate teachers—may be related to purpose (1) but sometimes more devious than honest attempts to help improve teaching performance, (5) to use for public relations purposes—to "point pride" to how well our district's teachers teach; or (6) to comply with state agency, legislative, or local board mandates—usually this purpose will include one or more of the other five purposes.

Although the goals of teacher performance evaluation may differ according to point of view, the purposes are often very similar. Redfern emphasized the instructional function, whereas Beller and Brighton noted the administrative as well. Howsam (19) concentrated on both functions by alluding to the fact that administrators have to employ, assign and reassign, retain or dismiss, grant or deny tenure, determine salary, and consider for promotion. Meanwhile, supervisors also must decide on the necessary form and content
of instructional assistance for individual and groups of teachers.

A majority of the studies in performance evaluation support the position that teacher performance evaluation is a process that should be used mainly to improve instruction. Popham (33) reported that there have been occasional interest peaks in the assessment of teacher evaluation since the beginning of the 1900s and that we are experiencing such an interest at this time. The National Education Association (37) found that the main reason for teacher performance evaluation was to help in improving instruction. Barr (31) analyzed 209 rating scales and placed the items into ten categories for judging teacher competency. More items were placed in the instruction category than any of the others. Quinn's (34) study reported that school district administrators believe that the improvement of instruction is the main purpose of teacher performance evaluation. Thus, the purposes for teacher performance evaluation center around "helping" versus "judging" teachers.

Criteria for Teacher Performance Evaluation

The amount of literature on teacher performance evaluation criteria is enormous. There are literally hundreds of articles and documents dealing with theories of teacher evaluation, models of teacher evaluation, forms for teacher
evaluation, and examples of teacher evaluation processes. This is not to mention the even larger amount of material on evaluation in general.

The guiding principle of this section is to focus on four main clusters of criteria, i.e., presage criteria (teacher characteristics), process criteria (teacher classroom behavior), product criteria (student change or gain), and general job performance requirements (job expectations). Literature concerning classroom observational instruments is also examined. These four clusters of criteria have been focused on in order to adequately review the literature as it applies to this study.

Probably the best known study concerning teacher characteristics or presage as a basis for evaluation is Ryans' (41) exhaustive study of over 6,000 teachers in 1,700 school systems. This study attempted to relate certain personality patterns of teachers to teacher behavior and student response. Ryans stressed that the qualities of good teachers are not absolutes, but are interacting traits that may differ in their merits depending upon educational philosophy, pupil characteristics, course level and content, and other factors (41). Getzels and Jackson (14) praised the quality of Ryans' work, but warned that there are issues to be raised in attempting to predict or determine teacher effectiveness through the use of teacher characteristics.
Smith saw little value in considering presage as a
criteria for teacher evaluation.

The first source of confusion is to be found in the
failure to distinguish teaching behavior from teacher
characteristics. This is to be seen in our use of the
term "teacher effectiveness" instead of the expression
"modes of diagnosis and treatment" and is to call
attention to the teacher himself rather than the means
he uses to attain objectives. It is one thing to talk
about the effectiveness of the teacher as a person and
it is quite another thing to speak of the effects of
particular ways of dealing with pupils and materials
of instruction. . . . It seems reasonable to assume
that the effects of instruction depend more upon tested
means than upon personal qualities of the teacher (43,
p. 68).

"Tested means" apparently refers to teacher or student
behavior.

Hamachek (17) asserted from his research that the
evidence concerning teacher effectiveness is quite clear
when it comes to sorting out good or effective from bad or
ineffective teachers on the basis of personal characteristics.
In his article, he outlines the qualities or characteristics
of a good teacher such as empathy, a good sense of humor,
the ability to "see themselves as good people," warmth,
respect, knowledge of subject matter, enthusiasm, etc.

Process criteria or actual classroom teaching behaviors
have been described by Ryans (42) as a complex set of
behavior variables that interact and combine to comprise the
activities of persons as they go about doing what is required
of teachers. These activities take the form of motivating
and reinforcing behaviors, organizing and managing behaviors,
presenting and demonstrating behaviors, evaluating behaviors, and counseling and advising behaviors.

Product criteria or student achievement is another criterion on which teacher performance evaluation is based. Bolton (5) found that since the goal of teaching is learner development, the teacher should be accountable by providing evidence that learning has occurred. He contended that the most satisfactory criterion for teacher performance evaluation is product, whereby the results of instruction rather than the process, is emphasized.

Carver (10) found that the measures of the student outcomes ordinarily used in school research may not show the true impact of school differences. For example, most measures of academic achievement have selected test items to maximize the discrimination among a student population at a given time rather than to measure change in performance over time for a student population or to be responsive to specific changes in the school program. There are other technical questions about the proper test metric to be used to measure change in learning, since researchers have presented detailed arguments for and against the use of grade-equivalent scores, percentile scores, raw scores, and standardized scores (11). Also, there has been a call for tests that more accurately cover the material actually presented in the classroom since proper school evaluations
may need a more careful overlap of curriculum as taught and curriculum as tested. Much work remains to be done before evaluators can settle upon the best outcome measures to be used in evaluating teaching effectiveness based on student achievement.

McNeil and Popham (25) felt very strongly that effectiveness in teaching is best exemplified by criterion measures which assess pupil growth. They reported that there is evidence that this kind of information is overlooked in favor of subjective impressions of the teacher which are more concerned with the teacher's personal attributes and instructional techniques. These measures include such tools as contract plans and performance tests and are very much needed for instructional accountability and improvement.

Conversely, Glass (15) reported great danger in using student achievement, particularly results on standardized achievement tests, to evaluate teachers and their performance. He felt that this type of evaluation is invalid and unfair because although such instruments may uncover blatant basic skill weaknesses, they are not designed to "reveal the variety of ways in which teaching and learning can be creative, favorably opportunistic, and uniquely meaningful to students" (15, p. 11).

In Levin's (23) review of research concerning teacher evaluation, he found that although some school districts
have used student achievement as a basis for teacher evaluation, the technique is used infrequently. He found practically no research on the use of this method of evaluation and viewed the dangers and disadvantages as clear. These included teaching to the test, the loss of long-range objectives in favor of short-term gains or test scores, and the extent to which teachers' abilities to produce gains in students' learning is stable. His conclusion was that the use of student achievement to evaluate teacher performance was not particularly desirable.

Brophy (8) conducted a study attempting to link student achievement to teacher performance evaluation. He found too much variability from one year to the next in teachers' production of student learning gains, particularly regarding standardized achievement tests, to justify their use in evaluating teachers.

Biddle (3) also pointed out the complexity of the teaching-learning process and the number of intervening variables that could affect student achievement. Certainly measures of student achievement have their place in the performance evaluation of individual teachers. The research does show, however, that they should be used with appropriate caution.

Rosenshine (39) reviewed the literature and found few studies which contained data on stability in teacher
effectiveness in producing student learning gains over a long period of time. He suggested that teacher effectiveness in producing student learning gains is not a stable trait. A teacher who produces large gains in students this year is not necessarily going to do the same the following year.

Brown (9) found that although correlating student achievement to teacher evaluation appears to be a natural process with self-evident criteria, it is not. The key is how the teacher's role is perceived. If the main role is to help students learn, then product measures are related. On the other hand, if the primary role is to furnish a good learning environment, then student achievement measures may be a good source of information, but not a very direct measure of teacher effectiveness.

Characteristics of students, such as ability, motivation, and interests, and the variability of classroom environments affect student achievement and make interpretation of achievement scores difficult, at best. Home background, the peer group, intellectual capacity, and store of knowledge at the beginning of the school year are some of the variables or influences on students' learning that teachers have little or no control over. Also, comparing teachers across contexts is difficult because classroom environments vary dramatically in the support services available, the kind of leadership
present, and the community environment. Measures of student achievement in the evaluation of teachers should be used cautiously. Selected tests must really be influenced by instruction and are not mainly aptitude or intelligence measures; tests need to measure the content which is taught; and finally the tests must be reliable.

Soar, Medley, and Coker (44) rejected the argument that student achievement is the most logical criterion on which to evaluate teachers. Their argument focused on student variability (specifically intelligence quotient, store of knowledge at the beginning of the year, peer group, and home environment), the regression effect (in which raw gain of students is found by subtracting fall scores from spring scores yielding spuriously high and low gains) and the limitations of achievement tests (in which teachers focus their efforts on raising students' test scores; thus, the test itself soon comes to determine instructional content). Likewise, Glass (15) predicted such behavior in his essay on the correlation of student product to teacher evaluation.

The last major criteria type to be examined, known as general job performance requirements or job expectations, certainly needs to be recognized and researched, as little or no research has been conducted regarding this criterion area. For purposes of this study, general job performance
requirements have been identified as those variables associated with the administrator-manager role, social role, professional role, and organizational membership role.

In a 1979 study in New Mexico, Wood and Pohland (48) determined the content characteristics of the teacher performance evaluation instruments in use in the eighty-eight school districts of the state. With regard to the variables already identified to be included under job expectations, the researchers found that the instruments required the evaluator to pass judgment on the teacher's entire work world. Items relating to the teacher's social role (interpersonal relations with students, staff, and community), administrator-manager role (student control, classroom management, and reporting-record-keeping activities), professional role (academic and professional qualifications, attitudes, and development), and organizational membership role (conformity to organizational rules and normative expectations) made up almost 40 percent of the items on the instruments. Clearly these items represent a decidedly organizational maintenance thrust rather than a teaching improvement function.

Horvat (18) defines general job performance requirements as a standard cluster of job expectations not directly associated with classroom teaching behavior or "what the teacher does outside the classroom." These include such
variables as, "makes effective use of school records, pupil personnel services, and parental conferences," "is punctual and dependable," "supports the administration and board of education," "attends student and parent activities," and "demonstrates professional attitudes." The criteria in this particular cluster should apply to all employees, be the same for all teachers, and not be "overly trivial." Horvat maintains that all school districts have the legal right to use these criteria, however, they do not necessarily measure or reflect teaching ability.

Wise and Darling-Hammond (47) make note of the fact that over the past year or so there have been concerns about the quality of teachers and teaching in American schools. Performance evaluation of educational personnel is obviously a difficult and complex process. Gephart and Ingle stated that,

The evaluation of teaching is an interesting process. Its literature suggests that it is a complicated process, that few people are satisfied by the way it is done, that very few people know how to do it well, and that those few people don't know how to tell the rest of us how to do it. On the other hand, teaching is evaluated; all of us do it, all the time, and with apparent ease and very little fuss. How can this apparent conflict exist? How can we resolve it (13, p. 1)?

After examining the literature concerning the four major performance criteria clusters (presage criteria, process criteria, product criteria, and general job requirements), it is evident that each has certain strengths and
weaknesses. There is also much disagreement in the literature and research as to the relative value or emphasis which should be placed on each cluster in the teacher performance evaluation process.

**Methods for Teacher Performance Evaluation**

Levin (23) identified six general approaches to teacher performance evaluation in his review of literature. These provide a useful way to categorize the research results.

The six included

1. the use of student ratings of teachers through questionnaires and other survey instruments;
2. evaluation based on observation by a supervisor such as a principal;
3. evaluation using an observation instrument, such as the Flanders Interaction Analysis System;
4. self-evaluation by teachers;
5. evaluation based on gains shown by students on various tests; and
6. evaluation through specially designed "teaching tests" (23, p. 241).

Levin (23) also suggested that there is little systematic information about current teacher performance evaluation practices. Formal programs of teacher evaluation, involving clearly defined criteria and procedures, are rather infrequent. Of the six methods examined above, Levin maintains that the evidence suggests that supervisors' observations are by far the most commonly used technique.

Good and Brophy (16) reported on the following methodological improvements in teacher performance evaluation brought about by increased federal funding for educational
research in general and research on teacher behavior and its effects in particular in the late 1960s and early 1970s: (1) concentrating on in-service teachers, who had developed some consistency of method and style, rather than on pre-service teachers, who were still developing their approaches to teaching; (2) using objectively measured student learning gains as the criterion of effectiveness, not subjective ratings by principals or supervisors; (3) measuring student achievement levels at the beginning of studies as well as the end, so that student entry level could be taken into account in evaluating the learning gains that teachers produced (previous studies often failed to control for this factor, so that the effects of differences in teacher behavior were confounded with the effects of differences in student intelligence quotient or social class); (4) collecting data over a long enough time span to allow the effects of differential teacher behavior to show up in measures of student achievement (such as a term or an entire school year; previous studies were often confined to a unit or even a single lesson); (5) collecting enough data in each classroom to develop a reliable sample of teacher behavior (ten, twenty, or even forty hours of classroom observation, not just one or two brief visits); (6) concentrating on teachers' behavior, especially relating to instruction in the curriculum, not just on teachers' global personal characteristics; (7) measuring teacher behavior by coding specific actions as
they occur and developing a detailed record of classroom events, rather than relying on high-inference ratings of general traits; and (8) taking into account context factors (grade level, subject matter, whole class versus small group versus individualized setting, student social status, etc.) by confining studies to a single context or by separately coding and analyzing data from different contexts.

Analyzing teaching processes or teacher behaviors is, by necessity, an observational-judgemental technique. Direct classroom observation involves the use of the evaluator's judgement about the teacher's effectiveness. This judgement is based on the evaluator's concept of good teaching or his own concept of how a teacher rates on areas already predetermined to be proper criteria of good teaching.

Researchers have used observation instruments extensively in the study of classroom behavior and in attempts to determine specific elements of teaching behavior that affect students' learning. Popham and McNeil commented that,

observations are most beneficial for recording and analyzing the teaching act—not judging it. . . . Effective teaching cannot be proven by the presence or absence of any instructional variable (25, p. 233).

Levin (23) found evidence that indicates that observation instruments can be extremely helpful for providing teachers feedback on certain aspects of their teaching. Observation instruments are most beneficial for recording and analyzing the teaching act, not judging it. He
maintains that "such instruments are reliable and focus on
discrete aspects of the teaching process" (23, p. 242).
Levin does, however, question the effects of the feedback
on teachers' subsequent behavior and whether or not the
teacher will improve or change.

Barr (1) analyzed 209 teacher performance rating scales
and found that factors to be rated fit into ten categories
for judging competency. The categories were instruction,
classroom management, professional attitude, choice of
subject matter, cooperation, personal habits, health,
discipline, appearance of the room, and personal appearance.

Ingills (20), in a study similar to Barr's, reporting
on teacher evaluation in thirty-eight states, found that
rating scale items could be placed in three general
categories: professional relations and attitudes, teaching
techniques, and personal characteristics of the teacher.

Rosenshine and Furst (40) identified three elements
which distinguish various teacher performance observation
instruments: (1) the recording procedure, (2) the scope
and specificity of items, and (3) the format used to code
individual events. They further discussed these elements
to help clarify the differences among instruments.

1. Differences in recording procedures. The scale
used to record the frequency of the behavior is one distinction
among the different observation instruments. When an
event is recorded each time it occurs, the instrument is labeled a category; when an event is recorded only once if it occurs during that period, the recording instrument is called a sign system. Rating instruments are supposed to estimate the frequency of specified events only once, usually at the end of an observational period (the estimations are usually made on a five- to seven-point scale, one end of which represents high frequency, usually containing phrases such as "most of the time" or "strongly agree," and the other end represents low frequency, "seldom" or "strongly disagree."

2. Differences in items. Items are usually classified in three different ways: (a) low-inference, behaviorally specific performance criteria such as "teacher smiled," "students responded;" (b) moderate-inference performance criteria such as "teacher use of students' ideas," "teacher criticizes," "teacher listens carefully to student;" and (c) high-inference performance criteria, e.g., "teacher was enthusiastic," "responsive," "harsh."

3. Differences in format. Multiple coding means that an instructional event is coded according to any number of dimensions. An example of this would be to code an event four ways according to (a) the dominant activity (e.g., lecture, supervised study), (b) the speaker and communication (e.g., teacher answers question, student asks question),
(c) the communication content (e.g., fact, definition, criticism), and (d) the major instructional objective under consideration.

Subdividing gross categories is another technique similar to multiple coding. For example, the category "use of student ideas" can be subdivided into "repetition of student ideas," "summary of what student said," and "comparison of student's idea with another idea."

Quinn (34) examined the rating forms used in fifty-three Connecticut school systems. He studied these rating forms and found that the basic problem encountered with the use of this method of evaluation was the lack of expertise in identifying appropriate and educationally significant objectives and also in defining measurable criteria for these objectives.

Soar, Medley, and Coker (44) noted that rating scales as evaluation devices must have four attributes: (1) they must present each examinee with a standard task (i.e., test makers develop tasks that are representative of domains of knowledge and test forms that are known to be equivalent, however, when they are being observed, teachers are typically told to "continue with whatever you are doing"); (2) they must provide a record of performance; (3) they must have an agreed-upon scoring key; and (4) they must have publicly available norms or standards against which an individual's
performance can be measured. They found that existing rating scales have three inherent problems, "first, rating scales lack the minimum properties necessary for accurately measuring the performance of teachers. Second, such rating scales lack validity. And third, they are highly susceptible to the halo effect" (44, p. 243). In essence, it was felt that rating scales do not reflect the actual competence of teachers, but rather the beliefs of the observers about the nature of what constitutes competent teacher performance. This indicates that rating scales give a better measure of the evaluator's biases than of the evaluatee's performance.

Rosenshine (38) divided teacher performance evaluation instruments into two areas, category systems and rating systems. Category systems were seen as low-inference measures because the items stress specific, relatively objective behaviors and recorded as frequency counts. Rating systems were classified as high-inference measures because they are not as specific. Rosenshine found great confusion in these distinctions because the rating scale instruments vary widely in the specificity of the behaviors to be observed and in the method of recording the frequency of the behavior. He further suggested three major needs for the improvement of teacher performance evaluation instruments: (1) greater specification of the teaching strategies to be used with instructional materials, (2) improved instruments
that look at the context of the interactions and describe classroom interactions in more appropriate units than frequency counts, and (3) more research into the relationship between classroom events and student outcome measures.

Braskamp (6) stated that rating scales or instruments were not enough to carry out a comprehensive performance evaluation of teaching behavior because the research on teaching is inconclusive, and values influence the evaluation of instruction. He recommended that a variety of "publics" (such as students and colleagues) and several methods of evaluation should be used in addition to rating scales. These include interviews, videotapes, classroom visits, content analysis, syllabuses, and examination.

Ingle found that the development of rating scales and checklists demands a clear understanding of the fundamentals of item selection and scaling. He identified the following guidelines as particularly relevant to rating scales.

1. The items chosen should be demonstrably related to effective teaching.
2. For items that fall essentially into the realm of values, general agreement should be reached between those being observed and those doing the observing about the inclusion of such items.
3. Include only behaviors or activities that are observable in the teaching situation.
4. Use low-inference rather than high-inference items.
5. Clearly define the traits to be rated and the scale points to be used.
6. The scale points must be appropriate for the item being rated.
7. Do not ask for more discriminations than raters are able to make.
8. Avoid extremes at the ends of the rating scale. The attributes upon which teachers are rated are generally not characterized by "always" or "never." The use of extremes at the ends of a scale has the effect of reducing the effective scale by two points, because the extremes are rarely checked.

9. With a rating scale, use a total score only if the items on the scale are exemplars of a higher order attribute. For example, if teacher enthusiasm is broken down into a number of specific behaviors, it may make sense to add the points on each item for a total score that represents teacher enthusiasm (21, pp. 113-116).

Ingle also listed some of the advantages of systematic observational techniques as being,

(1) they are directed toward specific aspects of classroom behavior, (2) they provide a common frame of reference for comparing all teachers on the same set of dimensions, (3) they are a convenient method for recording appraisals by the observer, and (4) they facilitate communication between observer and observee.

Some of the disadvantages include the following.

(1) Unless considerable care is taken in construction, the meaning of various scale points can be ambiguous—the term "excellent" is an example.
(2) They are subject to various observer biases: (a) halo effect, (b) leniency or generosity error, (c) severity error, and (d) central tendency errors.

3. There may not be much evidence that the attributes observed relate to student achievement (22, p. 109).

Ingle espouses systematic, structured observation whereby the observer has a guide or structure to follow while doing the performance observation and confines himself or herself to the guide.

Checklists and rating scales are the two most widespread guides for teacher performance evaluation. Checklists are a listing of steps, activities, or behaviors, the presence or
absence of which are to be observed. The observer must indicate whether these behaviors did happen.

Ingle emphasized that a checklist enables the observer to note only whether a given activity or behavior occurred and fails to ask the observer to rate the quality, degree to which, or frequency of occurrence of a particular behavior. This would indicate that checklists provide only part of the information needed in teacher evaluation.

Another type of guide is one that allows the observer to record the number of times a given event occurs (e.g., Flanders Interaction Analysis Observation System). This type of instrument provides a description of what occurs and the number of times it occurs and does not give any indication of the quality of the behaviors observed.

The rating scale is another guide for observing teaching which allows the observer to indicate not only whether the behavior happened, but also to make a qualitative judgement about the behavior or activity.

A National Education Association (27) report, in 1964, found that the building principal was responsible for evaluating teachers in the majority of the 1,100 cases studied. The most common evaluation design employed was some type of checklist rating structure with a minimum of narrative required. In 1972, the National Education Association made the following observation:
the usual approach in teacher evaluation is for the principal to periodically (although not necessarily regularly) fill out a checklist-type form on which he indicates the degree to which a teacher possesses the characteristics and skills listed on the form. Sometimes, particularly in the case of tenure teachers, the evaluation is not preceded by classroom observations and is not followed by a conference between the principal and teacher to discuss the evaluation and how the teacher might improve (29, p. 41).

Rosen studied a large number of teacher performance evaluation instruments and grouped them into the following categories:

1. test instruments which are completed by teachers and which provide an indication of the teacher's proficiency in or knowledge of both general and specific areas in education, 2. self-report attitudinal measures for teachers, 3. evaluation instruments which are completed by students and which may indicate their attitudes toward and/or evaluations of a particular teacher or classroom situation which is dependent upon the teacher, and 4. systematic observational devices which may be used to consider such factors as the teacher's competency, teaching style, characteristics and/or interaction with pupils (37, p. 1).

Popham (33) suggested that the use of observer ratings and even the use of systematic observation is not an accurate method of teacher performance evaluation. He found it dangerous to over-generalize the findings from teacher effectiveness research to the framework of teacher evaluation. Even so, rating scales and observational techniques to assess performance are in widespread use by educational practitioners. In recent years its use in teacher performance evaluation has been called for in greater intensity than in prior decades. Observation is supposedly one way to generate information
about the quality of teaching and is certainly a process-oriented measurement form.

Certainly the literature reflects how complex the teacher performance evaluation process is. There is much disagreement in the literature concerning the criteria on which teacher performance evaluation should be based and the methodology employed. It is, however, a process needed in every school district in the nation. Performance is the achievement of specific objectives that are expressed as performance standards. Evaluation is nothing more than assessing the degree to which those standards are achieved. There is no more effective way to improve the quality of education than through teacher performance evaluation. Excellence in schools is more directly related to the performance of people than to anything else.
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CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This section of the study consists of descriptions of the procedures followed in the collection and analysis of data. The population, selection of the sample, collection of data, and analysis of data are also described.

Population

The population for this study was all Texas public school districts with an average daily public attendance of 1,000 or more students. It was assumed that school districts of this size had the staffing and financial resources to keep abreast with current teacher performance evaluation policies, procedures, and instruments. The participants for this study were selected from the population of public school districts listed at the Texas Education Agency in Austin, Texas. The population included 401 Texas public school districts which is 37 percent of all Texas public school districts.

Collection of Data

In order to accomplish the purposes of this study, a letter was submitted to the superintendents of all Texas public schools with an average daily pupil attendance of
1,000 or more requesting a copy of their official board policy concerning teacher performance evaluation, and a copy of the teacher performance evaluation instruments used in the district (see Appendix A). Also, a statement of the procedures used for conducting teacher performance evaluation was requested if such was not contained in the stated evaluation policy.

It was anticipated that a usable response would be received from 50 percent or 201 of the districts. A minimum number of responses that would be acceptable was 100. For those districts submitting incomplete data, or no data, a follow-up procedure consisted of a letter (see Appendix C).

One month after the initial mailing, 108 public school districts had responded. A follow-up reminder was mailed to the remaining 293 public schools. Of these, 32 responded within one month after the follow-up reminder was mailed. The final number of respondents was 140 districts, which was 35 percent of the population. This response was sufficient to meet the requirements of the study.

Analysis of Data

Content analysis has been described by Berelson as "a research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication" (1, p. 18); by Holsti as a "technique for making inferences by systematically and objectively identifying specified
characteristics of messages" (2, p. 601); and by Stone as 
a "procedure for assessing the relative extent to which 
specified references, attitudes, or themes permeate a given 
message or document" (3, p. 3).

As one of the purposes of the study was to determine 
the degree to which teacher performance evaluation instru-
ments reflect presage criteria, process criteria, product 
criteria, and general job performance requirements, quanti-
tative content analysis based on frequency counts was used 
as the research method. The content items on the teacher 
performance evaluation instruments were analyzed to determine 
the categorical placement of each item. The decision rules 
and category system used in classifying the data were ones 
devised by Wood and Pohland (4). (See Appendix D.)

The original Wood and Pohland study (5) focused on the 
role of the principal in New Mexico schools. Teacher per-
formance evaluation instruments were solicited from eighty-
eight New Mexico public school districts. Of the seventy-one 
districts (80.68 percent) which responded, sixty-five 
submitted rating scales and six submitted open-ended 
instruments. Data from the former only were reported.

Procedurally, Wood and Pohland began by scanning a 
number of the more complex rating scale instruments to 
identify categories into which the 1,928 items would be 
placed and to specify the indicators that would determine
the categorical placement of each item. Reflected in the items was what appeared to be a major concern for the teacher as a person, a professional, an administrator-manager, and a member of the school organization. Hence, a category system was devised based upon roles and role performance and numerous subcategories were identified which allowed for finer within-category discriminations. Second, the adequacy of the category system and attendant decision rules was tested by content analyzing a sample of ten additional instruments. Considerable refinement occurred in the process. Third, Wood and Pohland used three coders to independently reanalyze all of the data on the basis of the final set of categories and decision rules which emerged in stage two. Every occurrence of a given item in an instrument was tallied. The coders agreed on the placement of all items into major categories, however, differences did occur on within-category item placement. Therefore, only the major or aggregated categories were used in their report.

In the Wood and Pohland study, the category system itself consisted of eight major categories. For purposes of the present study, and by definition, presage criteria included personal characteristics; process criteria included the instructional role; product criteria referred to student outcome; and general job performance requirements included administrator-manager role, social role, professional role, and organizational membership role.
The results of the content item analysis of the teacher performance evaluation instruments were presented according to percentage and frequency of criteria items by category. Based on the procedures used by Wood and Pohland, each criteria unit or item was classified into a particular category and the categories were mutually exclusive so that no criteria item could be scored more than once. However, each time the criteria item appeared in an instrument, it was reported as present. Frequency counts were based on the number of times a criteria item appeared and not on the number of instruments in which it appeared. The totals reported in each table represent the number of times an item was reported. The same criteria item may have been contained in several different instruments and, if so, was reported or scored each time. Also, double- and triple-headed items (e.g., "is loyal and dependable" and "shows consideration and tolerance") were coded separately. For example, "is loyal" was counted as one criteria item and "is dependable" was counted as another. The percentages reported in each table reflect a ratio of the number of times a discreet criteria unit or item within a given criteria is reported to the total number of times all criteria units or items within the criteria are reported.

The procedures used for conducting teacher performance evaluation in Texas public schools are described narratively and according to percentage and frequency of their occurrence.
A list of the most frequently mentioned purposes of teacher performance evaluation was derived from the stated evaluation policy of each responding school district. These purposes were reported according to number and percentage of responses and compared to the content item analysis of the teacher performance evaluation instruments to determine if the instruments reflected the stated evaluation policy.


CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The basic purposes of this study were to obtain information in order to identify the procedures and criteria used for conducting teacher performance evaluation in Texas public schools, to determine the degree to which teacher performance evaluation procedures and instruments reflect the stated evaluation policies of Texas public schools, and to determine the degree to which teacher performance evaluation instruments used in Texas public schools reflect presage criteria (teacher characteristics) as opposed to process criteria (teacher behavior) as opposed to product criteria (student change or gain) as opposed to general job performance requirements (job expectations).

To carry out the purposes of this study, attention was focused specifically on the following research questions.

1. What procedures are used for conducting teacher performance evaluation in Texas public schools?

2. Do teacher performance evaluation instruments reflect the stated evaluation policies of Texas public schools?

3. What are the content characteristics of teacher performance evaluation instruments in Texas public schools?
The first research question of this study was stated as follows: What procedures are used for conducting teacher performance evaluation in Texas public schools?

All 140 Texas public school districts which submitted complete data have established written policies for teacher performance evaluation which require observation of the teacher in the classroom, but the number of required observations vary. Some require only one observation per academic year whereas some school districts reported a requirement of as many as five per academic year. Some school districts require the same minimum number of observations for all teachers per academic year whereas other school districts have different requirements for probationary and non-probationary teachers. There are also different classroom observation approaches among school districts, i.e., different persons formally required to conduct teacher performance evaluation, and different practices utilized in teacher performance evaluation.

Data in Table I indicate that, of the school districts which reported that the requirements were the same for all teachers, 51 school districts (50 percent) required only one observation per academic year for the teacher performance evaluation. Requiring two observations were 27 school districts (26 percent) while 17 school districts (17 percent) required three observations. Four observations
were required by 4 school districts (4 percent), and 3 school districts (3 percent) reported a requirement of five. No school districts reported a requirement of more than five. All of these were on an annual basis.

TABLE I

MINIMUM NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS REQUIRED IN DISTRICTS WHERE THE REQUIREMENTS ARE THE SAME FOR ALL TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Observations per Academic Year</th>
<th>Frequency (N = 102)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in Table II indicate that 38 school districts had established different requirements concerning the frequency of observation for probationary (newer teachers or generally first and second year in the district) and non-probationary (experienced teachers or generally more than two years in the district) teachers. No school districts required only one evaluation for probationary teachers, whereas 17 school districts (45 percent) required only one
TABLE II
MINIMUM NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS REQUIRED IN DISTRICTS WHERE THE REQUIREMENTS ARE DIFFERENT FOR PROBATIONARY AND NON-PROBATIONARY TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
<th>Probationary</th>
<th>Non-Probationary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency (N=38)</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

evaluation of non-probationary teachers. Eighteen school districts (47 percent) required two observations for probationary teachers and 16 school districts (42 percent) required two observations of non-probationary teachers. Three observations of probationary teachers were required by 12 school districts (32 percent) while three observations of non-probationary teachers were required by 5 school districts (13 percent). No school district required four observations of non-probationary teachers, whereas 4 school districts (11 percent) required four observations of probationary teachers. Likewise, no school district required five or more observations of non-probationary teachers, whereas 4 school districts (11 percent) required five or more observations of probationary teachers.
Data in Table III reflect specific approaches utilized in classroom observation in the 140 respondent school districts. Of those 140, 65 (46 percent) reported that more than one evaluator observed the teacher.

TABLE III
CLASSROOM OBSERVATION APPROACHES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Frequency (N = 140)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only one evaluator observes the teacher</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one evaluator observes the teacher</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV reveals that in Texas public schools, a major part of the responsibility for teacher performance evaluation lies with the building principal and the assistant principal(s). In all 140 of the school districts, a building administrator was listed as the person formally responsible for completing the teacher performance evaluation. The individual teacher was formally required to be involved (self-evaluation) in 43 (31 percent) of the 140 school districts. Also involved in completing a teacher performance evaluation were central office administrators, reported in 23 school districts (16 percent), and department supervisors,
reported in 46 school districts (33 percent). Use of fellow faculty members (peer evaluation) and student evaluation was formally used in none of the responding school districts.

**TABLE IV**

**PERSONS FORMALLY REQUIRED TO CONDUCT TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Teacher Performance Evaluation</th>
<th>Frequency (N = 140)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Office Administrator</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor-Department Head</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher (Self-Evaluation)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellow Faculty (Peer Evaluation)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (Student Evaluation)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table V indicate that in 119 school districts (85 percent) the teacher receives a personal copy of the completed evaluation. The teacher has the opportunity to add comments to the official copy of the teacher performance evaluation in 128 school districts (91 percent). A formal
conference is held between the teacher and administrator concerning the completed evaluation in 133 (95 percent) school districts. It was found that in seven school districts (5 percent), teachers apparently received no feedback or had no formal conference with an administrator concerning their performance evaluation.

**TABLE V**

**PRACTICES UTILIZED IN TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Frequency (N = 140)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher receives a personal copy of the performance evaluation</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher has opportunity to add comments to official copy of the teacher performance evaluation</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal conference is held between teacher and an administrator concerning completed performance evaluation</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second research question of this study was stated as follows: Do teacher performance evaluation instruments reflect the stated evaluation policies of Texas public schools?

Of the 140 responding Texas public schools which submitted complete data, 101 or 72 percent reported a
two-fold purpose for teacher performance evaluation, i.e., (1) evidence produced shall be used for promoting improved performance of individual employees; (2) evidence shall be used for making decisions concerning employees, including the recommendation to the superintendent for renewal or non-renewal of contracts.

TABLE VI
STATED PURPOSES OF TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Frequency (N = 140)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To improve performance (instruction-learning)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To serve as a basis for retention or dismissal</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining 39 respondents, or 28 percent, reported that the primary purpose for teacher performance evaluation was to improve teaching in order to enhance learning, but made no specific mention of evaluative evidence serving as a basis for retention or dismissal. No school district reported the administrative function as being their sole purpose for teacher performance evaluation.

Thus, all 140 responding Texas public school districts reported that a stated purpose of their teacher performance
evaluation policy was to provide teachers with specific suggestions for improving teacher performance in order to improve instruction.

The third research question of this study was stated as follows: What are the content characteristics (criteria) of teacher performance evaluation instruments in Texas public schools?

The content characteristics of the teacher performance evaluation instruments were analyzed according to the following categories: presage criteria or personal characteristics; process criteria or instructional role; product criteria or student outcome; and general job performance requirements or administrator-manager role, social role, professional role, and organizational membership role.

Within the presage criteria or personal characteristics categories, five subcategories were identified: (1) personal traits, (2) voice-speech, (3) grooming, (4) physical condition, and (5) general characteristics-attitudes.

A closer analysis of the subcategory personal traits yielded four subgroupings: (1) traits related to membership in the organization, (2) traits related to work with students, (3) traits related to the task of teaching, and (4) traits related to the teacher as a person. Table VII indicates the number of times (532) that criteria of the teacher performance evaluation instruments referring to these groupings
TABLE VII

FREQUENCY OF THE INCLUSION OF SPECIFIC PERSONAL CRITERIA RELATED TO ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP, STUDENTS, THE TASK OF TEACHING, AND THE TEACHER AS A PERSON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Criteria</th>
<th>Number of Times Reported</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Traits related to organizational membership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctual-prompt</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependable</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>237</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Traits related to work with students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive attitude toward</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impartial</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VII—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Criteria</th>
<th>Number of Times Reported</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courteous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Traits related to task of teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Number of Times Reported</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resourceful</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Traits related to the teacher as a person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Number of Times Reported</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judgement</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VII--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Criteria</th>
<th>Number of Times Reported</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of humor</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-controlled</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactful</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poised</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally stable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-confident</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discreet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>140</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>532</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

were reported. From these data it can be observed that traits related to organizational membership were reported 237 times or comprised 45 percent of the personal traits reported; traits related to working with students were reported 98 times or 18 percent; traits related to the task
of teaching were reported 57 times or 11 percent; and traits related to the teacher as a person were reported 140 times or 26 percent. Figures 1 through 4 display examples of specific criteria related to the subgroupings within the subcategory, personal traits.

An analysis of the remaining subcategories within the presage criteria cluster, i.e., voice-speech characteristics, grooming characteristics, physical condition characteristics and general characteristics-attitudes indicates that characteristics in the teacher performance evaluation instruments referring to these groupings were reported 336 times, or comprised 39 percent of the personal characteristics category. These data are shown in Table VIII. Figures 5 through 8 provide examples of specific criteria related to the remaining subcategories within the presage criteria or personal characteristics categories.

Table IX presents the percentage and the number of times that traits and characteristics in the teacher performance evaluation instruments referring to each subcategory of the presage criteria or personal characteristics occurs. From these data it can be observed that the subcategory personal traits contained 532 items and thus represented 61 percent of the personal characteristics category. Items included under the other five subcategories accounted for the remaining 39 percent of the personal characteristics category: (1) voice-speech characteristics, 75 times or
Punctual-prompt
1. Performs all required school routines and responsibilities on time.
2. Meets and supervises assigned classes promptly.
3. Dependability and punctuality in meeting assigned responsibility.
4. Demonstrates punctuality and good attendance in adhering to work schedule.
5. Personal characteristics--Punctuality.
6. Never late or absent.
7. Regular in attendance and punctual for assignments.
8. Is regular and punctual for assigned duties.

Cooperative
1. Cooperates with faculty and staff.
2. Personal characteristics--Cooperative.
3. Works and cooperates with staff by seeking and sharing ideas with others.
4. Actively seeks to promote cooperation on all occasions.

Dependable
1. Shows a strong sense of dependability.
2. Personal characteristics--Dependability.
3. Dependability and punctuality in meeting assigned responsibility.
4. Displays dependability in professional matters.

Accurate
1. Work is accurate and neatly done.
2. Displays a high degree of accuracy.

Responsible
1. Shows a strong sense of responsibility.
2. Willing to accept additional responsibility and seeks additional professional responsibilities.
Loyal
1. Works with an interest to better the school; supports the school in words and actions.
2. Loyal and supportive attitude toward staff, administration and total school program.

Adaptable
1. Personal qualities--The teacher . . . is adaptable in the performance of professional duties.
2. Personal characteristics--Adaptability.

Flexible
1. Demonstrates flexibility in the performance of professional duties.

Fig. 1--Examples of specific criteria related to organizational membership traits.
Interested in
1. Demonstrates interest in students.
2. Interested in all aspects of students.
3. Concern exhibited for students and their needs.

Fair
1. Demonstrates fairness in interacting with students.
2. All students are treated fairly and impartially.
3. Fairness is displayed at all times toward students.

Patient
1. Patience is displayed in interacting with students.
2. Demonstrates patience in working with students.

Compassionate
1. Has compassion for each student.
2. Kindness and compassion are displayed in interacting with students.

Positive attitude toward
1. Exhibits positive attitude and enthusiasm in working with students.
2. Exhibits positive attitude toward students.

Impartial
1. Administers necessary rules impartially.
2. Treats students fairly, impartially and with respect.

Considerate
1. Has respect and understanding for all pupils and is considerate of pupil needs.
Tolerant
   1. Is tolerant of students having opposing views.

Sympathetic
   1. Is sympathetic toward feelings of students.

Constructive
   1. Uses a constructive approach with students and their work.

Democratic
   1. Maintains an open and democratic atmosphere in the classroom in which students are free to develop a questioning attitude.

Empathetic
   1. Warm feeling and empathy for students with personal or special problems.

Humane
   1. Humane and sympathetic toward students.

Courteous
   1. Polite when working with students, but firm when necessary.

Fig. 2—Examples of specific criteria related to work with students.
Enthusiastic
1. Enthusiastic and exhibits this in work.
2. Enthusiastically attempts to motivate students.
3. Exhibits much enthusiasm and interest.
4. The teacher shows a vibrant enthusiasm toward teaching, students, and subject matter.

Initiative
1. The teacher takes the initiative to experiment with innovative teaching strategies.
2. The teacher recognizes and initiates recent curriculum ideas.

Resourceful
1. Is resourceful in acquiring materials to assure challenging but achievable work for all students.

Leadership
1. The teacher provides direction and leadership to peers by sharing new curriculum ideas and teaching strategies.

Creative
1. Creative in teaching approaches.

Original
1. The teacher is willing to experiment, display originality, and try new ideas.

Innovative
1. Displays innovative teaching strategies, techniques, and methods.

Dedicated
1. The teacher is dedicated to the task of teaching and challenging the abilities of himself and the individual student.

Fig. 3--Examples of specific criteria related to task of teaching.
Judgement
1. Exhibits wise judgement in choices, planning and carrying out plans with pupils and teaching staff.
2. Makes wise choices and decisions.
3. Has ability to use sound reasoning in making choices or decisions.

Sense of humor
1. The teacher utilizes a sense of humor.
3. Exhibits good disposition and temperament.

Self-controlled
1. Has poise and self-control.
2. Does not allow personal problems to interfere with job performance.
3. Demonstrates good self-control.

Tactful
1. Exhibits diplomacy and perception with pupils and adults.
2. Is tactful in relations with professional personnel, pupils and/or parents.

Poised
1. Has poise and self-control.
2. Displays composure and steadiness.

Sincere
1. Displays sincerity.
2. Genuine and sincere at all times.

Emotionally stable
1. Personal qualities: The teacher . . . maintains emotional stability.
2. Handles professional problems without emotional extremes.

Honest
1. Is honest and straightforward at all times.
2. Displays trustworthiness.
Exemplar
1. Conduct above reproach.
2. Sets an example for youth through exemplary conduct.

Calm
1. Handles situations with patience and calmness.
2. Does not become ruffled when faced with difficult problems/situations.

Self-confident
1. Exhibits great self-confidence and inspires confidence in daily contacts.

Mature
1. Demonstrates maturity necessary to carry out duties.

Friendly
1. Warm, outgoing, kind, free from pretense and friendly with students and staff.

Discreet
1. Uses discretion in handling confidential information and difficult situations.

Fig. 4--Examples of specific criteria related to the teacher as a person.
### TABLE VIII

**FREQUENCY OF THE INCLUSION OF CHARACTERISTICS RELATED TO VOICE-SPEECH, GROOMING, PHYSICAL CONDITION, AND GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS-ATTITUDES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Number of Times Reported</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Voice-speech characteristics</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grooming characteristics</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Physical condition characteristics</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. General characteristics-attitudes</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>336</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE IX

**FREQUENCY OF THE INCLUSION OF TRAITS AND CHARACTERISTICS RELATED TO PRESAGE CRITERIA OR PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Number of Times Reported</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal traits</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Voice-speech characteristics</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Grooming characteristics</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Physical condition characteristics</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. General characteristics-attitudes</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>868</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Voice-speech characteristics

1. Shows proficiency in oral/written language.
2. Verbal messages by the teacher communicate excitement or warmth toward the public.
3. Teacher's verbal communication with colleagues is highly skillful.
4. The teacher's verbal communication with the public is highly skillful.
5. Verbal messages by the teacher communicate warmth or excitement toward colleagues.
6. Teacher's verbal communication with parents is highly skillful.
7. The teacher provides a model of communicative clarity.
8. The teacher shall send and receive messages, thoughts, ideas, or concerns expressed verbally and in writing in a manner that may be transmitted, decoded and adequately understood.
9. Allows the flow of verbal communication to proceed easily between teacher and student.
10. The teacher gives evidence of effective verbal communication with students.
11. The teacher's verbal communication with students is consistent in feeling tone.
12. The teacher's verbal communication with students is highly skillful and contributes positively to the atmosphere of the classroom and the student's acceptance and performance of learning activities.
13. The teacher's verbal classroom communication reinforces the student's positive feeling for learning.
14. Communicates effectively both verbally and nonverbally.
15. Projects voice so that it is pleasing, flexible, and distinct.
16. A command of the English language, clear distinct speech.
17. Uses proper grammar in oral and written communication.
18. Speech volume and tone is appropriate for surroundings.
19. Uses correct pronunciation in oral communication.
20. Expresses self clearly and makes clear explanations to class.

Fig. 5--Examples of specific criteria related to voice-speech characteristics.
Grooming characteristics

1. Properly groomed at all times.
3. Regards appropriate standards of appearance.
4. Neat and clean at all times.
5. Professional/paraprofessional personnel shall dress in a manner that is becoming and fashionable for our profession.
6. Appropriate appearance—sets good, positive examples for students.
7. Personal characteristics—Appearance.
8. The teacher gives careful consideration to appearance, posture, grooming, and dress.
9. The selected attire reflects a professional person dressed for a normal workday.
10. Appropriate appearance.
11. Personal characteristics—Personal grooming.
12. Personal appearance.
13. Good taste in dress and grooming.
14. Abides by the dress code.
15. Always appropriately dressed.
16. Dresses appropriately and is well groomed and poised.
17. Displays good judgement in grooming and appearance.
18. The teacher . . . consistently exhibits an appearance which reflects the education profession.
19. Serves as an appropriate role model to students in appearance.
20. Maintains professional appearance.

Fig. 6—Examples of specific criteria related to grooming characteristics.
Physical condition characteristics
1. Is mentally alert and physically able to perform job functions.
2. Possesses health, energy and drive to effectively teach children.
3. Exhibits vitality and energy.
4. Maintains state of health adequate to demands of position.
5. Is physically able to perform duties.
6. Not handicapped by excessive absences or illnesses.
7. Exhibits adequate energy and drive.
8. Appears vigorous and energetic.
9. Shows the stamina to meet the daily obligations of school life.
11. The teacher maintains a good record of attendance.
12. The teacher is physically alert.
13. The teacher practices good health habits.
14. Maintains a condition of health that enables the teacher to meet the professional expectations of the district.
15. Possesses physical health necessary to meet responsibilities.
17. Exercises professional judgement in absences from work/using sick days for minor illnesses.
19. The teacher models expected health habits.
20. The teacher is aware of own health needs to maintain job requirements/expectations.

Fig. 7--Examples of specific criteria related to physical condition characteristics.
General characteristics-attitudes
1. Exhibits positive attitude in the performance of duties.
2. Professional attitude.
3. Loyal supportive attitude toward school.
4. Exhibits loyal attitude toward profession.
5. Supportive attitude toward staff, administration and total school program.
6. Professional attitude to students, staff and profession.
7. Maintains a positive attitude.
8. Loyalty, dedication, general attitude.
9. Maintains a positive attitude toward assignment.
10. Builds a positive attitude.
11. Displays positive attitude toward teaching.
12. Positive attitude toward teaching and profession.
13. Exhibits a positive attitude toward school policies, philosophies, and expectations within the community.
14. The teacher demonstrates an attitude of professionalism.
15. Shows professional attitude toward teaching.
17. Professional attitude toward students, patrons, staff, and community.
18. Demonstrates positive attitudes.
19. Performs professional duties with positive attitude.
20. Appropriate professional attitude at all times.

Fig. 8--Examples of specific criteria related to general characteristics-attitudes.
9 percent, (2) grooming characteristics, 101 times or 12 percent, (3) physical condition characteristics, 47 times or 5 percent, and (4) general characteristics-attitudes, 113 times or 13 percent.

Within the process criteria or instructional role criteria clusters, seven subcategories were identified: (1) planning and goal setting, (2) diagnosis of and provision for individual differences, (3) instructional process, (4) curriculum and resource utilization, (5) learning environment: psychological, (6) learning environment: physical, and (7) evaluation of students. Table X indicates the 1,191 times that items in the teacher performance evaluation instruments referring to these groupings were reported. From these data it can be observed that items related to planning and goal setting and the instructional process accounted for 56 percent of the process criteria category reported (25 percent and 31 percent, respectively). Items included under the five other subcategories represented the remaining 44 percent of the process criteria category reported: (1) diagnosis of and provision for individual differences items (12 percent), (2) curriculum and resource utilization items (9 percent), (3) learning environment: psychological items (7 percent), (4) learning environment: physical (9 percent), and (5) evaluation (7 percent). Figures 9 through 15 display examples of specific criteria
### TABLE X


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Criteria</th>
<th>Number of Times Reported</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Items related to planning and goal setting</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Items related to diagnosis of and provision for individual differences</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Items related to instructional process</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Items related to curriculum and resource utilization</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Items related to learning environment: psychological</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Items related to learning environment: physical</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Items related to evaluation</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,191</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

related to the subcategories within the process criteria or instructional role.

Within the product or student outcomes criteria cluster, three subcategories were identified: (1) student behavior
Planning and goal setting

1. Lesson plans are complete, legible and understandable with lesson objectives and activities following TEA guidelines appropriate to the content and level.
2. Develops and implements long- and short-range goals and plans for instruction.
3. Develops well-organized, flexible plans.
4. Plans clear and specific lesson objectives in accord with curricular guidelines.
5. Uses organized plans for classwork.
6. Shows evidence of short- and long-range planning by submitting long-range teaching plans and weekly lesson plans at the specified times.
7. Prepares long-range teaching plans that are correlated with state and local guides and policies.
8. Demonstrates effective daily or short-term planning through use of lesson plans.
9. Prepares written lesson plans whose instructional goals and objectives are evident to students and self.
10. Plans and organizes realistic learning activities.
11. Shows evidence of organization, effective planning and preparation for class.
12. Develops new methods and materials to fit the changing curriculum.
13. Sets and implements lesson goals and objectives.
14. Gives the rationale for, develops and uses instructional plans.
15. The teacher plans extensively (daily, weekly, monthly, yearly).
16. The teacher uses available resources when planning instruction.
17. The teacher plans teaching-learning situations in accordance with acceptable principles and practices of learning and evaluation.
18. Plans for classwork—consistent long-range and daily planning; well executed; creative and flexible.
19. Thorough planning of work, daily and long-range goals and objectives.
20. Organization and planning is effective in attaining desired instructional goals.

Fig. 9--Examples of specific criteria related to planning and goal setting.
Diagnosis of and provision for individual differences
1. Uses a program of study that, as much as possible, meets the individual needs, interests, and abilities of students.
2. Recognizes individual differences in pupils and adapts subject matter, materials, and techniques to these differences.
3. Diagnoses individual student differences with regard to educational objectives.
4. Provides for needs of individual pupils.
5. The teacher demonstrates proficiency and knowledge in diagnosing and assessing the learning needs of children.
6. Adapts techniques and materials to individual abilities of pupils.
7. Concerned about students' needs--groups students by ability.
8. Student needs--considers student needs in the selection and formulation of objectives; plans reflect accommodation for individual student differences.
9. Diagnoses individual and class difficulties.
10. Is aware of individual student's problem areas and is willing to work with the student to improve those weaknesses.
11. Effectiveness in the classroom--allows for individual differences.
12. Demonstrates awareness and consideration of individual learning styles, interests, and aptitudes.
13. Students are aware of the objectives of the lesson with the level of instruction altered as necessary to accommodate understanding.
14. Teaching competency--recognizes each child as an individual and provides for individual differences.
15. Teaching techniques and effectiveness--adaptability to individual needs and interests.
16. Directs instruction in response to the unique needs and learning styles of individual students.
17. Provides for individual differences within the learning situation.
18. Provides activities to coincide with students' level of ability, needs, and interests.
19. Strives to know students, sensitive to differences and needs; varies content, materials and activities to meet needs.
20. Provides for individual differences--the student is considered an individual and assignments and work level corresponds accordingly.

Fig. 10--Examples of specific criteria related to diagnosis and provision for individual differences.
Instructional process

1. Uses effective and motivating techniques of instruction.
2. Instructional techniques that motivate students, instill the desire to learn, insure success, require pupil participation, and mastery learning.
3. The teacher demonstrates skills necessary to maintain ongoing instruction.
4. Follows an appropriate sequence of steps which facilitates the acquisition of concepts and development of skills.
5. Utilizes instructional strategies appropriate to the learning situation.
6. Instructional--Teaching techniques.
7. Creative, resourceful presentation of subject matter embracing needs, abilities, and interests of students.
8. The teacher demonstrates competency in implementing the instructional program in such a way as to provide meaningful learning experiences for students.
9. Employs effective choices of learning experiences and techniques.
10. Communicates subject matter effectively--initiates appropriate activities.
11. Instructional skill--implementation of instructional program.
12. The teacher avoids dull routines in favor of many variations in procedures, materials, and activities.
13. Teaching competency--uses a variety of instructional materials and teaching techniques.
14. The teacher demonstrates the desired skill or competence for students and/or summarizes new knowledge.
15. Teaching techniques--challenging and varied approaches; balance of student-teacher participation; provocative questions and discussions.
16. Employs instructional methods and materials that are most appropriate for meeting stated objectives.
17. Uses a wide variety of teaching techniques and materials in presenting the content.
18. Employs creative and imaginative approaches to teaching.
19. Uses meaningful instructional materials and teaching techniques.
20. Prepares and uses an effective variety of methods and materials to present subject matter and encourage student participation.

Fig. 11--Examples of specific criteria related to instructional process.
Curriculum and resource utilization

1. Provides for use of adopted and supplementary materials.
2. Chooses appropriate instructional materials.
3. Employs a variety of instructional media.
4. Utilizes a variety of sources and learning aids in an effective manner.
5. Uses a variety of teaching methods (e.g., project and unit work, demonstrations, audio-visual aids, bulletin and chalkboards, exhibit cases, and homework).
6. Uses community resources.
7. Uses new ideas and developments.
8. Uses instructional equipment and materials in a variety of ways to stimulate interest and curiosity.
9. Uses all available resources for teaching such as media, service center material, library, newspapers, magazines, community resources, people, outdoors, etc.
10. Uses a variety of instructional materials and equipment to suit subject needs.
11. Curriculum--presents subject matter according to established district and state guidelines.
12. Strives to use and/or implement by instruction and action the district's philosophy of education, instructional goals and objectives, curriculum guides, skills continuum, etc.
13. Selects and uses materials which are relevant, current, challenging and appropriate to the subject area and age of the student.
14. Knows where to secure materials and the appropriate time and place to utilize them.
15. Utilization of supplies, materials and equipment.
16. The teacher builds organized source of own materials, models, picture files, work sheets, resource file, etc. He uses materials to contribute to the purposes of the lesson.
17. Instructional--use of teaching aids.
18. Is knowledgeable of and utilizes existing resources.
19. Appropriate materials, equipment, resources are utilized.
20. Resources selected are appropriate to content being taught.

Fig. 12--Examples of specific criteria related to curriculum and resource utilization.
Learning environment: psychological
1. The teacher develops and maintains an environment in the classroom that is conducive to effective learning.
2. The teacher establishes a classroom environment which is orderly and conducive to the implementation of the instructional program.
3. Utilizes procedures and conducts class in a manner that maximizes use of student and teacher time.
4. Maintains a good atmosphere for learning in the classroom.
5. Maintains a positive learning atmosphere in the classroom.
6. Provides opportunities for students to develop their creativity and special talents.
7. Maintains a functional and orderly environment.
8. Pupils and teacher work cooperatively to make the classroom the best learning environment possible.
9. Situations are provided where the following occurs: students feel free to ask questions, students follow directions cheerfully, respect the teacher and are eager to come to school.
10. Attends to routine factors and provides a challenging learning environment.
12. Provides classroom environment where pupils can be happy and cheerful.
13. Instruction: Classroom environment.
14. Develops and maintains a classroom environment conducive to effective learning within the limits of the resources provided by the district.
15. Classroom atmosphere is maintained to keep students comfortable and not ill at ease.
16. Maintains a classroom atmosphere that is conducive to learning.
17. Provides organized structure within an appropriate learning environment.
18. Provides atmosphere conducive to learning--seeks to develop positive self-concepts in students.
19. Maintains an open atmosphere in the classroom in which students are free to develop a questioning attitude.
20. Classroom atmosphere encourages a comfortable and eager student reaction.

Fig. 13--Examples of specific criteria related to learning environment: psychological.
Learning environment: physical

1. Provides a proper environment as regards an atmosphere for learning.
2. Provides an attractive and pleasant classroom through displays, bulletin boards, and decorations.
3. Has work areas arranged for maximum pupil stimulation and comfort.
4. Emphasizes the importance of a proper physical learning environment.
5. Careful attention is given to providing an environment conducive to learning.
6. Maintains proper control over the use of school supplies, materials, and equipment.
7. Uses classroom and instructional equipment.
8. Provides wholesome physical environment for learning (bulletin boards, displays, etc.).
9. Manages materials to provide greatest educational benefit.
10. Arranges an attractive and functional classroom environment: (a) learning centers and creative seating are encouraged and used, and (b) student work is displayed.
11. Room environment—bulletin boards are neat, attractive, purposeful and well balanced. The room is arranged in a manner designed for optimum learning.
12. The general room appearance offers a stimulating learning environment.
13. Instructive displays are stimulating and relevant to students.
14. Makes a continuous effort to have a room that is arranged for maximum student stimulation.
15. Furniture and equipment are arranged in a functional “teaching-learning” manner.
16. Prepares attractive displays, bulletin boards, centers, etc. which relate to the unit of study or the objective of the unit.
17. Room appearance shows a functional arrangement that is conducive to good learning.
18. Bulletin boards, pictures, maps, displays, and posters are appropriate, current and purposeful.
19. Classroom environment—care of physical property, maintenance of neat, attractive, and safe classroom.
20. The teacher maintains a physical environment which is conducive to learning.

Fig. 14—Examples of specific criteria related to learning environment: physical.
Evaluation
1. Evaluates student work fairly, considerately, and realistically.
2. Continuous evaluation of students based on a variety of learning experiences.
3. Develops effective evaluative tools.
4. Use of student evaluation, etc. as diagnostic tools to help analyze the effectiveness of teaching techniques.
5. Assesses the accomplishments of students on a regular basis and provides reports as required emphasizing both positive and negative aspects of student evaluation.
6. Prepares tests appropriate to evaluate what has been taught/learned.
7. Uses tests and other evaluation data to reteach, and to enrich as well as to report to pupils and parents.
8. Evaluates the learning experiences of the pupils within the framework of board policies and administrative guidelines.
9. Monitors pupil progress and adjusts the pace accordingly.
10. Checks for understanding by utilizing effective evaluative strategies and techniques.
11. Demonstrates the ability to evaluate effectively.
12. Designs and/or selects procedures for evaluating student progress.
13. Uses suitable student evaluation procedures.
14. Assists students in consistently appraising their own work.
15. Evaluates students' performance promptly and regularly.
16. Consideration of a multiplicity of factors in the total pupil evaluation, such as: study skills, tests, self-direction, interest, classroom participation, special projects and effective methods of teaching.
17. Student evaluation--utilizes tests and/or other means of evaluation for students.
18. Prepares appropriate tests and evaluation activities to measure students' learning and interprets results to students and parents.
19. Informs students of the criteria for the evaluation.
20. Selects appropriate evaluation techniques.

Fig. 15--Examples of specific criteria related to evaluation.
(in-class), (2) student attitudes, and (3) student achievement. Table XI indicates the 161 times that items in the teacher performance evaluation instruments referring to these groupings were reported. From these data it can be observed that the items were fairly well distributed. Items related to student behavior (in-class) accounted for 39 percent of the items reported, student attitudes represented 28 percent, and student achievement made up 33 percent. Figures 16 through 18 display examples of specific criteria related to the subcategories within the product criteria or student outcomes.

**TABLE XI**

**FREQUENCY OF THE INCLUSION OF PRODUCT CRITERIA RELATED TO STUDENT BEHAVIOR (IN-CLASS), STUDENT ATTITUDES, AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Criteria</th>
<th>Number of Times Reported</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Items related to student behavior (in-class)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student attitudes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student achievement</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the general job performance requirements or administrator-manager role, social role, professional role, and organizational membership role, several subcategories
Student behavior (in-class)

1. Students are involved in learning as active participants.
2. Student interest is high through effective instructional strategies.
3. Good student participation.
4. Student interest is aroused.
5. Students work hard and participate actively.
7. Students interact well with one another while learning.
8. Students are exhibiting good work skills.
9. Good study habits are being developed and maintained.
10. Sound working habits are being developed.
11. Students are consistently improving habits of study.
12. Classroom participation of students.
13. Students work with an interest to better the school.
15. Students work to achieve at their optimum levels.
16. Good classroom student response is exhibited.
17. In class, students exhibit a keen interest in what is being taught.
18. Student participation and interest remain high at all times.
19. Fundamental skills and study habits are being developed.
20. Study skills and classroom participation of students are at a high level.

Fig. 16--Examples of specific criteria related to student behavior (in-class).
Student attitudes
   1. Positive attitude on the part of the student toward the learning program.
   2. Evidence motivation of students by students' successful performance.
   3. Students exhibit the desire to learn.
   4. Student motivation is evidenced by programs.
   5. Students show eagerness and enjoyment in learning.
   6. Students exhibit high expectations.
   7. Students respect each other regardless of race, sex, religion, ethnic origin, socioeconomic level or level of achievement.
   8. Students have a love and warmth for each other.
   9. Students have confidence and respect for each other.
  10. Positive self-concepts are exhibited in students.
  11. Eager student reaction is exhibited at all times.
  12. Students appear motivated, have good attitudes, and are stimulated.
  13. Students exhibit respect and understanding for each other.
  14. Students have a mutual consideration for each other.
  15. Pupils are motivated.
  16. Pupils have compassion and patience for each other and the teacher.
  17. Students exhibit tact, good judgement, and good sportsmanship.
  18. Pupils and teachers work cooperatively.
  19. Pupils generally react favorably to teacher's leadership.
  20. Students support the school in words and actions.

Fig. 17--Examples of specific criteria related to student attitudes.
Student achievement
1. Pupils show achievement.
2. Adequate pupil achievement is taking place.
3. General classroom achievement in relation to established standards is evident.
4. Growth in pupil achievement is reflected in teacher records.
5. Pupils required to complete assignments, not "let go" by teacher.
6. Student progress is communicated effectively.
7. Student achievement is on-going.
8. Student progress is evident.
9. Six weeks and semester grades reveal adequate student progress.
11. Student records disclose achievement.
12. Student achievement is reflected through standardized tests.
13. Student progress is revealed in classroom work.
14. Tests and evaluation activities reveal student growth.
15. Records and reports—student achievement.
16. Student academic progress is demonstrated through standardized tests and teacher-made tests.
17. Student growth/achievement is indicated by test results.
18. Cumulative records reveal student growth.
19. Records of pupil achievement are maintained.
20. Records indicate student growth has been achieved.

Fig. 18—Examples of specific criteria related to student achievement.
can be identified under each grouping of items. The administrator-manager role grouping included the following subcategories: (1) student control, (2) reporting-record keeping, (3) classroom environment: aesthetic-physical, (4) classroom management, (5) staffing, and (6) quality control. Table XII indicates the 943 times that items in the teacher performance evaluation instruments referring to this grouping were reported. From these data it can be observed that 386 items or 41 percent referred to student control; 151 items or 16 percent referred to reporting-record keeping; 159 or 17 percent referred to classroom environment: aesthetic-physical; 111 items or 12 percent referred to classroom management; 78 items or 8 percent referred to staffing; and 58 items or 6 percent referred to quality control. Figures 19 through 24 display examples of specific criteria related to the subcategories within the administrator-manager role grouping.

The social role grouping included the following subcategories: (1) interpersonal relations: community, (2) interpersonal relations: school staff, (3) interpersonal relations: students, (4) general interpersonal relations, and (5) interpersonal relations: district personnel. Table XIII indicates the 634 times that items in the teacher performance evaluation instruments referring to this grouping were reported. From these data it can be observed that 113 items or 18 percent of the items reported referred to
TABLE XII

FREQUENCY OF THE INCLUSION OF SPECIFIC ADMINISTRATOR-MANAGER
ROLE ITEMS RELATED TO STUDENT CONTROL, REPORTING-RECORD
KEEPING, CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT: AESTHETIC-PHYSICAL,
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT, STAFFING, AND QUALITY CONTROL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator-Manager Role Items</th>
<th>Number of Times Reported</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Items related to student control</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Items related to reporting-record keeping</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Classroom environment: aesthetic-physical</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Classroom management</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Staffing</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Quality control</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

interpersonal relations: community; 98 items or 16 percent
referred to interpersonal relations: school staff; 185
items or 29 percent referred to interpersonal relations:
students; 78 items or 12 percent referred to general inter-
personal relations; and 160 items or 25 percent referred to
interpersonal relations: district personnel. Figures 25
through 29 display examples of specific criteria related
to the subcategories within the social role grouping.
Student control
1. Maintains effective discipline.
2. Maintains student discipline in all areas of responsibility.
3. Establishes control in the classroom and administers discipline and punishment in accordance with board policies and administrative guidelines.
4. Assumes responsibility for disciplinary measures unless unusual factors are involved.
5. Maintains control.
6. Maintains class control in an atmosphere conducive to learning.
7. Practices positive reinforcement techniques.
8. Uses behavior management techniques which preserve student and teacher dignity.
9. Handles own routine discipline problems effectively.
10. Demonstrates fairness and consistency in discipline.
11. Maintains discipline without harassing, shouting, or deliberately embarrassing students.
12. Develops and consistently maintains reasonable rules of classroom behavior and procedure.
13. Handles his or her own routine discipline in a firm, consistent and fair manner.
14. Develops rules and regulations for classroom management under general supervision of the principal.
15. Uses skill in handling disciplinary problems.
16. Classroom control and management--class control/ability to handle problems/supervision outside classroom.
17. Students know the teacher's expectations regarding their behavior.
18. Minor disruptions, if any, are dealt with routinely. Major behavioral problems, if any, are calmly and effectively attended.
19. Is responsible for maintaining acceptable standards of classroom behavior.
20. Establishes a standard of behavior which students are capable of achieving.

Fig. 19--Examples of specific criteria related to student control.
Reporting-record keeping

1. Maintains accurate and complete records as required by administrative regulations, district policy, and the Texas Education Agency.
2. Submits weekly lesson plans.
3. Maintains accurate attendance records and grade books.
4. Maintains a current inventory.
5. Gives prompt attention to required reports.
6. Keeps accurate records of attendance, grades, etc.
7. Adequate documentation of student performance.
8. Punctual with reports and/or records. Does them accurately and neatly.
9. Punctual and efficient management of school reports.
10. Submits records and reports accurately and on time.
11. Accuracy and promptness in handling reports and records.
12. Attention to clerical responsibilities.
13. Performs duties related to record keeping, reporting, textbook accounting effectively.
15. Maintains accurate, complete and correct records as required by law, district policy and administrative regulations.
17. Meets deadlines for records, schedules and duties.
18. Records and reports—the teacher is consistently accurate, reliable and neat.
19. Keeps neat and accurate records; makes reports clean and detailed; follows instructions.

Fig. 20—Examples of specific criteria related to reporting-record keeping.
Classroom environment: aesthetic-physical

1. Provides a proper environment as regards temperature, lighting, noise level, arrangement, efficiency, and orderliness.
2. Emphasizes the importance of respect for school equipment, materials and the property of others.
3. Proper care is given to equipment and other materials.
4. Maintains proper control over the care and inventory of school equipment.
5. Takes care of classroom and instructional equipment.
6. Room and storage areas are clean, neat, and orderly.
7. The general room appearance is neat, clean, and attractive.
8. The room is left in a neat and acceptable order at the end of each period or day.
10. Takes precautions to protect equipment, materials, and facilities.
11. Furniture is arranged in such a manner that the room is physically attractive.
12. Classroom environment--care of physical property/maintenance of neat, attractive, and safe classroom.
13. Attention to ventilation, heat, and light.
14. Teacher and class take good care of books, equipment, and materials.
15. Room appearance shows organized housekeeping.
16. Provides a classroom that is physically well maintained and cared for.
17. Keeps the classroom and the school comfortable, clean and attractive, and has the students to do likewise.
18. Care of resources--equipment--materials.
19. Facilities are always well maintained, clean, and neat.
20. Care of room and equipment serves as a model to teacher's students.

Fig. 21--Examples of specific criteria related to classroom environment: aesthetic-physical.
Classroom management
1. Classroom mechanics show good patterns of organization.
2. Manages routine well.
4. Develops and maintains an effective system for classroom management.
5. Keeps classroom well organized.
6. Classroom management—utilizes student time effectively.
7. Maintains good classroom organization.
8. Has good class management.
9. Classroom routines are handled effectively.
11. Manages materials and class time to provide greatest educational benefit.
12. Classroom management is organized and systematic.
13. Organizes classroom activities to produce a smooth flow of events with minimum confusion or waste of time.
14. Organization is such that little time is lost in transition from one activity to another.
15. Attendance to routine duties.
16. Establishes and maintains procedures and routines consistent with school rules.
17. Develops rules and regulations for classroom management under general supervision of the principal.
18. Performance items—organization and management.
19. Clarity and efficiency of classroom routines.
20. Good classroom procedures and routine are evident.

Fig. 22—Examples of specific criteria related to classroom management.
Staffing

1. Makes adequate provisions for substitutes when absent.
2. Use of counselor/previous teachers.
3. Refers student problems for additional guidance help.
4. The teacher makes a constant effort to use the human resources within the community to supplement the textbook.
5. Seeks assistance from available resource people when needed.
6. Use of consultant services.
7. Supervises paraprofessionals, aides, and volunteers where applicable.
8. Involves other staff and faculty members in planning.
9. Plans and implements the instructional program in cooperation with other teachers.
10. The teacher plans for use of community members as an instructional resource.
11. Works effectively with support personnel.
12. Seeks assistance of colleagues to enhance teaching.
13. Enrichment of content through use of community members when applicable.
14. Works toward identifying and solving problems related to students in cooperation with the principal and other staff members.
15. Confers with counselors and faculty in regard to planning.
16. Plans for the use of an aide or other assigned personnel where applicable.
17. Uses professional relationships with members of the staff to supplement teaching.
18. Seeks input of faculty members in regard to implementing the instructional program.
19. Substitute teachers have proper lesson plans.
20. Substitutes are provided with necessary plans, equipment, and materials to ensure a productive day.

Fig. 23—Examples of specific criteria related to staffing.
Quality control
1. Resource material is accurate.
2. Duplicated material is legible.
3. Only quality material is given to student.
4. Teacher previews materials before use.
5. Written directions on classroom assignments are clear and concise.
6. Provides for legible materials in the hands of students.
7. Uses good judgement in selecting materials and equipment.
8. Alertness to accuracy of resources used.
9. Before instructional materials are used in the classroom, they are checked for quality and relevance.
10. Is responsible for verifying and maintaining accuracy of instructional material.
11. Materials, activities, presentation are organized, well-ordered and legible.
12. Advocates legibility of student handouts at all times.
13. Teaching materials and learning centers are changed periodically to ensure quality.
14. The teacher determines appropriate materials and equipment to be used in the instructional activities.
15. The teacher sees that materials and equipment selected for use in the learning activities are relevant to the lesson's objectives.
17. Quality control of instructional material is practiced by the teacher.
18. Student handouts and instructional materials are legible.
19. All memos sent home with students are checked for accuracy and proper grammar.
20. Correspondence (student, parent, central office) is accurate and legible.

Fig. 24--Examples of specific criteria related to quality control.
TABLE XIII

FREQUENCY OF THE INCLUSION OF SPECIFIC SOCIAL ROLE ITEMS RELATED TO INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS: COMMUNITY, INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS: SCHOOL STAFF, INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS: STUDENTS, GENERAL INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS, AND INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS: DISTRICT PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Role Items</th>
<th>Number of Times Reported</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Items related to interpersonal relations: community</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Items related to interpersonal relations: school staff</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Items related to interpersonal relations: students</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Items related to general interpersonal relations</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Items related to interpersonal relations: district personnel</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The professional role grouping included the following subcategories: (1) professional qualifications, (2) professional growth, and (3) professional ethics. Table XIV displays the 456 times that items in the teacher performance evaluation instruments referring to this grouping were reported. From these data it can be observed that 202 items or 44 percent of the items reported referred to
Interpersonal relations: community

1. A cooperative and positive attitude is developed with the community.
2. Actively promotes relationship between community and school.
3. Communicates effectively with community.
5. Maintains a professional relationship with the community.
6. Human relations—rapport with community.
7. Willingness to contribute to co-curricular activities and community affairs.
8. Promotes positive public relations with community through effective communications with community members.
9. Promotes positive public relations with community through involvement of community members.
10. Develops appropriate interactions with members of the community.
11. Demonstrates an appropriate teacher-community relationship.
12. Contributes to the community climate in a positive manner.
13. Actively involved in community activities.
15. Attends social functions regularly and makes use of these opportunities to further professional interests.
16. Attends church regularly, is actively involved in the religious community.
17. Outstanding personal-public image.
18. Financially responsible within community; pays obligations on time, is considered a good credit risk.
19. Represents school and campus activities in a positive manner within the community.
20. Interpersonal relationships—acceptance and understanding in the general community.

Fig. 25—Examples of specific criteria related to interpersonal relations: community.
Interpersonal relations: school staff
1. Association with colleagues.
2. Works constructively with other teachers.
3. Cooperates and is willing to work with fellow teachers.
4. Works cooperatively with other staff.
5. Maintains professional relationships with members of the staff and faculty.
6. Maintenance of good teacher-staff relationships.
7. Human relations—rapport with other school personnel.
8. Maintains a professional relationship with colleagues.
9. Admired and respected by staff.
10. Seeks, shares, and respects the ideas of faculty.
11. Maintains a high-level relationship with faculty and staff.
12. Works well with staff.
13. Cooperation and rapport with fellow teachers.
14. Has a mature, professional relationship with others on the faculty.
15. Relates comfortably with faculty and staff.
16. Establishes and maintains good rapport with the professional staff.
17. The teacher works well with his associates.
18. Teacher promotes good will among colleagues.
19. Teacher-staff relations—does not criticize fellow teachers.
20. Teacher should maintain a spirit of mutual respect in teacher-teacher relationships.

Fig. 26—Examples of specific criteria related to interpersonal relations: school staff.
Interpersonal relations: students
1. Rapport with students assigned to his or her class.
2. Teacher-pupil relationships.
3. Develops appropriate interactions with students.
4. Provides for individual and group recognition.
5. General rapport with pupils.
6. Maintenance of good teacher-student relationships.
7. Maintains professional relationship with students.
8. Human relations—rapport with students other than those assigned to him.
9. Has a wholesome personal relationship with students.
10. Relates and interacts well with students.
11. Works to achieve confidence and respect of students.
12. Possesses a feeling of love and warmth for each student regarding interpersonal relations.
13. Rapport with students—warm, outgoing, kind, free from pretense/good rapport.
14. Respects students and their ideas/has student respect/rapport.
15. Teacher enjoys his or her involvement with students.
16. The teacher interacts effectively with the students.
17. There is evidence of an acceptance and understanding between teacher and students.
18. Good understanding exists between teacher and pupils.
19. Pupils react favorably to teacher's leadership because of mutual feelings of trust and respect.
20. Gets along well with students.

Fig. 27—Examples of specific criteria related to interpersonal relations: students.
General interpersonal relations

1. Has respect and understanding/rapport with students, colleagues, community, etc.
2. Actively promotes relationship among colleagues, students, and members of the community.
3. Establishes and maintains good rapport with all.
4. The teacher establishes an early communication with parents and community.
5. The teacher promotes good will both at school and within the community.
6. The teacher interacts effectively with students, faculty, parents, and community.
7. The teacher develops positive relations at all times.
8. Cooperation and rapport with school/community.
9. Rapport with students/parents/staff/administration/community.
10. Actively involved in school/community activities.
11. Professional relationship with all concerned.
12. Relationship with the organization as a whole.
13. Functions effectively with staff, students, and parents.
15. Relations with pupils, patrons, and co-workers.
17. Maintains a professional relationship with all colleagues, students, and parents.
18. Maintains professional relationships with members of the staff, faculty, students, parents, and community.
19. Maintenance of good interpersonal relations.
20. Makes provision for being available to students, parents, colleagues, and community for educational related purposes and maintains open lines of communication.

Fig. 28--Examples of specific criteria related to general interpersonal relations.
Interpersonal relations: district personnel
1. Works effectively with administrators and support personnel.
2. Maintains a professional relationship with administrators and central office personnel.
3. The teacher and principal support each other and have a good relationship.
4. Establishes and maintains good rapport with administration.
5. Works cooperatively with support staff and administration.
6. Supports and cooperates with the principal.
7. Relates comfortably with paraprofessionals.
8. Relates professionally to the principal.
10. Seeks to understand and support the administration.
11. Maintenance of good teacher/administrator relationships.
12. The teacher exemplifies professionalism in relationships and interactions with faculty and administration.
13. Cooperates and works well with administrators.
14. Relations with support staff, school specialists, and administration.
15. Interpersonal relationships—association with administrators.
16. Works constructively with teachers, administrators, community members, and parents.
17. Recognizes the importance of and enjoys a good relationship with auxiliary personnel.
18. Demonstrates an appropriate teacher-administrator relationship.
19. Aids in establishing and maintaining a good relationship with the administration and support staff.
20. Teachers should maintain a spirit of mutual respect in teacher-principal relationship.

Fig. 29—Examples of specific criteria related to interpersonal relations: district personnel.
professional qualification; 163 items or 36 percent referred to professional growth; and 91 items or 20 percent referred to professional ethics. Figures 30 through 32 display examples of specific criteria related to the subcategories within the professional role grouping.

TABLE XIV

FREQUENCY OF THE INCLUSION OF SPECIFIC PROFESSIONAL ROLE ITEMS RELATED TO PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS, PROFESSIONAL GROWTH, AND PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Role Items</th>
<th>Number of Times Reported</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Items related to professional qualifications</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Items related to professional growth</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Items related to professional ethics</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The organizational membership role grouping included the following subcategories: (1) organizational compliance, response to supervision, (3) assumption of non-teaching responsibilities, and (4) organizational perspective. Table XV indicates the 577 times that items in the teacher performance evaluation instruments referring to this
Professional qualification

1. Knows essential as well as related/relevant subject matter.
2. Thorough and extensive knowledge of field; up-to-date.
3. Evidence of broad and specific knowledge of subject matter with adequate general education to support it.
4. Knows subject matter being taught.
5. Exhibits evidence of good subject matter background.
6. The teacher has up-to-date professional knowledge and background for the grade level or field and teaches sound concepts.
7. Demonstrates knowledge, understanding, and skill in the subject areas taught.
8. Knowledge of subject matter and related objectives.
9. Comprehensive understanding and competency in subject or grade assignment.
10. Has a broad background in subject taught.
11. Exhibits a mastery of knowledge and skills which they teach.
12. Demonstrates knowledge of content in teaching area.
13. Teacher exhibits competence in and familiarity with the topic.
14. Thorough knowledge of subject taught.
15. Knowledge of subject matter.
16. Demonstrates knowledge of assigned area.
17. Demonstrates mastery of subject matter.
18. Demonstrates proficiency concerning the subject matter within assigned teaching responsibility.
19. Demonstrates a high degree of knowledge, understanding, and skill with respect to the subject matter areas being taught.
20. Demonstrates a broad current knowledge, understanding, and skill with respect to the subject matter areas being taught.

Fig. 30--Examples of specific criteria related to professional qualifications.
Professional growth
1. Engages in professional study, such as college courses, etc.
2. The teacher endeavors to improve his classroom methods and techniques.
3. Continues to grow through study and opportunities available.
4. Keeps up-to-date on teaching methods and materials.
5. Makes an effort to improve through attending college, workshops, and reading.
6. Seeks new knowledge and attempts to implement it via various professional growth opportunities.
7. Innovative; stays abreast of latest developments through workshops, college courses, professional readings, etc.
8. Open to new ideas/willing to attend workshops.
9. Demonstrates growth in professional knowledge and competence through reading, continued study, research, workshops, travel, writing, and other means.
10. Is receptive to new techniques and ideas.
11. Is continuously growing professionally through graduate study, experimentation, workshops, and/or other activities.
12. Attends approved staff development workshops, reads professional journals, enrolls in university courses, and/or engages in other activities which promote professional growth.
13. Strives to maintain and improve professional growth.
14. Demonstrates an interest in professional growth.
15. Strives for self-improvement.
16. Is receptive to innovative educational ideas and change.
17. Participates in professional growth activities.
18. Demonstrates an interest in acquiring new skills and knowledge.
19. Seeks professional growth through continuing education and staff development.
20. Demonstrates continuing growth of knowledge in subject area.

Fig. 31--Examples of specific criteria related to professional growth.
Professional ethics

1. Guards confidential information.
2. Refrains from unprofessional comments.
3. Displays highest principles and acts consistent with them.
4. Conduct above reproach.
5. Does not make remarks or act in such a way as to be a poor representative of the teaching profession.
6. Exhibits standards of conduct that indicate a definite pride in the teaching profession.
7. The teacher recognizes and practices the established standards of the Texas Education Agency code of ethics and district board policy.
8. The teacher respects the ethics of the profession.
9. Observes professional ethics.
10. Is ethical in discussing or sharing school business or information.
11. Limits comments/discussions regarding students, patrons, and staff to a professional level.
12. Exhibits professional ethics in working with staff.
13. Abides by code of ethics and standard practices.
14. Demonstrates conduct expected of professional personnel.
15. Is ethical in dealings with the profession, the parents, and the pupils.
17. Conversations regarding patrons and staff are confined to an ethical level.
18. Refrains from revealing confidential information regarding pupils and their families.
19. Conducts self in a professional manner consistent with district policy and procedure.

Fig. 32--Examples of specific criteria related to professional ethics.
grouping were reported. From these data it can be observed that 154 items or 26 percent of the items reported referred to organizational compliance; 148 items or 26 percent referred to response to supervision; 138 items or 24 percent referred to assumption of non-teaching responsibilities, and 137 items or 24 percent referred to organizational perspective.

Figures 33 through 36 display examples of specific criteria related to the subcategories within the organizational role grouping.

**TABLE XV**

**FREQUENCY OF THE INCLUSION OF SPECIFIC ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP ROLE ITEMS RELATED TO ORGANIZATIONAL COMPLIANCE, RESPONSE TO SUPERVISION, ASSUMPTION OF NON-TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES, AND ORGANIZATIONAL PERSPECTIVE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Membership Role Items</th>
<th>Number of Times Reported</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Items related to organizational compliance</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Items related to response to supervision</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Items related to assumption of non-teaching responsibilities</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Items related to organizational perspective</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>577</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizational compliance

1. The teacher shows evidence of having a thorough knowledge of school policies and procedures, and follows them completely regardless of whether there is an agreement.
2. The teacher adheres to board policies, teacher handbook guidelines, and administrative rules.
3. The teacher is aware of student handbook policies and insists that the students observe and uphold the rules within it.
4. The teacher should be aware of board policy and be willing to assist in upholding and enforcing school rules and administrative regulations.
5. Observes and upholds school policies.
6. Recognizes the value and need for good school policies.
7. Adheres to established school policy.
8. Offers assistance in formulating administrative decisions.
9. The teacher responds effectively to policies, rules, and regulations.
10. Follows policies and procedures.
11. Assists in upholding and enforcing school rules, administrative guidelines, regulations, and board policies.
12. Supports established administrative policies and directives, and observes proper line of authority.
13. Complies with administrative guidelines.
14. Supports and carries out board policies and administrative procedures.
15. Follows district policies pertaining to individual assignment.
16. Understands and follows school policies and procedures.
17. Compliance with rules and attention to administrative requests.
18. Abides by administrative regulations and board policy.
19. Abides by standard school practices and policies.
20. Establishes and maintains procedures and routines consistent with school rules, administrative regulations, and board policy.

Fig. 33—Examples of specific criteria related to organizational compliance.
Response to supervision

1. Responds ethically to suggestions for improvement.
2. Accepts suggestions.
3. Accepts guidelines and/or instructions and seeks benefits from them.
4. Positive responsiveness to suggestions for improvement.
5. Takes necessary steps to remediate deficiencies.
6. Follows district policy concerning grievances.
7. Responds to supervision in a positive way.
8. Is receptive to constructive criticism.
9. Accepts suggestions and is willing to try them.
10. Takes constructive criticism without being defensive.
11. Accepts positively and implements suggestions presented by supervisors.
12. Adheres to proper lines of supervision.
13. Responds favorably to constructive criticism.
14. Accepts suggestions and evaluations in positive manner.
15. Responds constructively to supervision and guidance.
16. Is responsive to criticism and suggestion.
17. Receptive response to constructive criticism and willingness to seek assistance when necessary.
18. The teacher realizes the necessity for supervision and works toward improvement through implementation of suggestions.
19. Responsiveness to suggestions--accepts constructive criticism in a professional manner and works toward improvement through implementation of suggested actions.
20. Open to ideas of supervisor/open to constructive criticism.

Fig. 34--Examples of specific criteria related to response to supervision.
Non-teaching responsibilities
1. Upholds building responsibilities.
2. Is enthusiastic concerning professional responsibilities out of the classroom.
3. Assumes responsibilities for assigned staff studies, committee assignments, and team effort.
4. Volunteers to give out-of-class aid to pupils who need make-up work or extra time in instruction and other related activities.
5. Participates when assigned out-of-class responsibilities.
6. Is regular and punctual for assigned duties outside the classroom.
7. Participates in school and faculty activities.
8. Attends all faculty meetings unless excused by principal.
9. Performance of other duties as assigned by the principal.
10. Willingness to do his or her share of committee and detail work.
11. Seeks additional professional responsibilities; attends many extra-curricular activities.
12. Attends and participates in in-service educational program.
13. Is responsible for co-curricular and supervisory duties assigned.
14. Performs such other tasks and assumes such other responsibilities as assigned.
15. Accepts and performs extra duties and special assignments.
16. Assumes extra duty responsibilities.
17. The teacher performs a fair share of non-instructional tasks.
18. Performance of non-class assignments/contribution to co-curricular activities.
19. Contributes to committee work and faculty meetings, either voluntarily or on assignment.
20. Non-instructional activities--group and activity sponsorship; student teacher program.

Fig. 35--Examples of specific criteria related to assumption of non-teaching responsibilities.
Organizational perspective
1. The teacher aids in accomplishing the goals and objectives of the school.
2. Is supportive of local school programs and policies.
3. Works for the overall good of the school.
4. Assists in overall functioning of the school.
5. Supports the school as a whole in accomplishing its goals.
6. Works with an interest to better the school.
7. Supports the school in words and actions.
8. Loyalty to school system.
9. Supportive of school policies, philosophies, programs, and expectations.
10. Strives to implement by instruction and action the district's philosophy of education and instructional goals and objectives.
11. Understands and supports school policies and procedures.
12. Supports the district's philosophy of education, instructional goals and objectives, curriculum guides, skills continuum, etc.
13. Supportive toward staff, administration and total school program.
14. Supports the local school district's philosophy and objectives.
15. Loyalty to school program.
16. Supports school policies.
17. Supports the needs of his particular school.
18. Supports and upholds the school's instructional goals, objectives, and methods.
19. Supports established policies, directives, objectives, and programs.
20. The teacher demonstrates thorough knowledge of school policies and programs, and follows and supports such policies and programs completely, regardless of whether he agrees with them.

Fig. 36--Examples of specific criteria related to organizational perspective.
Table VI indicates the percentage and number of times that items contained in each grouping of the general job performance requirements or administrator-manager role, social role, professional role, and organizational membership role were reported. From these data it can be observed that of the items reported, those referring to the administrator-manager role accounted for 943 items or 36 percent of the general job performance requirements; social role contained 634 items or 24 percent; professional role accounted for 456 items or 18 percent; and organizational membership role contained 577 items or 22 percent.

TABLE XVI

FREQUENCY OF THE INCLUSION OF GENERAL JOB PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS ITEMS RELATED TO ADMINISTRATOR-MANAGER ROLE, SOCIAL ROLE, PROFESSIONAL ROLE, AND ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP ROLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Job Performance Requirements</th>
<th>Number of Times Reported</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Items related to administrator-manager role</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social role</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Professional role</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Organizational membership role</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XVII and Figure 37 refer to the distribution by category of items-traits-characteristics reported in the teacher performance evaluation instruments. General job performance requirements or those items associated with the administrator-manager role, social role, professional role, and organizational membership role were reported 2,610 times or 54.04 percent; process criteria or instructional role were reported 1,191 times or 24.66 percent; presage criteria or personal characteristics were reported 868 times or 17.97 percent; and product criteria or student outcomes were reported 161 times or 3.33 percent of the total frequency and percentage contained in the teacher performance evaluation instruments.

**TABLE XVII**

**FREQUENCY OF THE INCLUSION BY CATEGORY OF ITEMS IN TEACHER EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Times Reported</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Items related to general job performance requirements</td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Items related to process criteria</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Items related to presage criteria</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Items related to product criteria</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>4,830</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 37—Distribution by category of items—traits—characteristics in teacher performance evaluation instruments (percentage and frequency or number of times reported by category in teacher performance evaluation instruments). Percentages based on N = 4,830 total criteria items.
In comparing the content item analysis of the teacher performance evaluation instruments in order to determine if the instruments reflected the stated evaluation policy, it was found, that whereas 100 percent of the responding school districts reported that the improvement of instruction was a primary purpose of teacher performance evaluation, the category related to that purpose, process criteria, accounted for only 24.66 percent of all the items-traits-characteristics in the instruments.

Table XVIII indicates specific or similarly worded criteria reported by at least 100 school districts. These represent the most frequently reported criteria.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Number School Districts Criteria Reported In</th>
<th>Percent Total Districts (N=100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Maintains effective discipline</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teaching competency—uses a variety of instructional materials and teaching techniques</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Demonstrates knowledge, understanding, and skill in the areas taught</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Maintains professional relationship with students</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Plans clear and specific lesson objectives in accord with curricular guidelines</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Proper care is given to equipment and other materials</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Maintains accurate and complete records as required by administrative regulations, district policy, and the Texas Education Agency</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Demonstrates an interest in professional growth</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Responds constructively to supervision and guidance</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Observes and upholds school policies</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Exhibits positive attitude in the performance of duties</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Number School Districts Criteria Reported In</td>
<td>Percent Total Districts (N=100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Chooses appropriate instructional materials</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Maintains a professional relationship with the community</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Understands and supports school policies and procedures</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Develops and maintains an effective system for classroom management</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Provides for needs of individual pupils</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF THE STUDY AND FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purposes of this study were to identify the procedures and criteria used for conducting teacher performance evaluation in Texas public schools, to determine the degree to which teacher performance evaluation procedures and instruments reflect the stated evaluation policies of Texas public schools, and to determine the degree to which teacher performance evaluation instruments used in Texas public schools reflect presage criteria (teacher characteristics) as opposed to process criteria (teacher behavior) as opposed to product criteria (student change or gain) as opposed to general job performance requirements (job expectations).

The samples for this study were selected from the population of public schools listed on computer at the Texas Education Agency in Austin, Texas, and included all Texas public schools with an average daily attendance of 1,000 or more. The methodology of the study included a letter which was submitted to the superintendents requesting a copy of their official board policy concerning teacher performance evaluation, and a copy of the teacher performance evaluation instruments used in the district. Also, a statement of the
procedures used for conducting teacher performance evaluation was requested if not contained in the stated evaluation policy. This was conducted during the spring and summer of 1984.

Quantitative content analysis based on frequency counts was used as the research method on the teacher performance evaluation instruments. Analysis of the procedures used for conducting teacher performance evaluation was accomplished by presenting them narratively and according to percentage and frequency. The degree to which teacher performance evaluation instruments and procedures reflected the stated evaluation policies of the responding school districts was accomplished by analyzing the stated evaluation policies which contained the purposes of teacher performance evaluation, and comparing these purposes to the content item analysis of the teacher performance evaluation instruments.

Summary of Findings

The following is a summary of the findings of this study, organized in terms of the research questions.

Research Question 1. What procedures are used for conducting teacher performance evaluation in Texas public schools?

1. All school districts have established written policies for teacher performance evaluation which require observation of the teacher in the classroom.
2. Among those school districts where the minimum number of observations were the same for all teachers whether probationary (new teachers or generally first and second year in the district) or non-probationary (experienced or generally more than two years in the district), the number of observations was usually two or less per year.

3. Among those school districts which differentiated between probationary and non-probationary teachers in terms of classroom observations, more frequent observation was required of probationary teachers.

4. About half the school districts reported only one evaluator observed the teacher and half reported more than one evaluator observed the teacher.

5. All school districts reported that the principal-assistant principal(s) was the primary source or person formally required to be utilized in completing the teacher performance evaluation.

6. Fully one-third of the school districts also utilized supervisor-department heads in the formal teacher performance evaluation process.

7. Teacher self-evaluation was reported in one-third of the school districts.

8. Peer and student evaluation were utilized in no school districts.

9. Most school districts informed the teachers of the criteria upon which they were evaluated by providing the
teachers with personal copies of the teacher performance evaluation instrument, giving the teachers an opportunity to add comments to the evaluation, and providing the teachers with the results of the performance evaluation through a formal conference with an administrator. However, it was found that in seven school districts, teachers apparently received no feedback or had no formal conference with an administrator concerning their performance evaluation.

Research Question 2. Do teacher performance evaluation instruments reflect the stated evaluation policies of Texas public schools?

1. All school districts reported that a primary or stated purpose of teacher performance evaluation was to improve the performance of individual teachers in order to improve instruction-learning.

2. Seventy-two percent also reported that a stated purpose of teacher performance evaluation was to serve as a basis for retention or dismissal; 28 percent made no specific mention of evaluative evidence serving as a basis for retention or dismissal.

3. No school district reported that the only stated purpose of teacher performance evaluation was to serve as a basis for retention or dismissal.

4. Although the primary purpose of teacher performance evaluation in Texas public schools is stated as being the
improvement of teaching performance, the category related to this role, process criteria or teacher behavior, accounted for only 24.66 percent of all the items in the teacher performance evaluation instruments.

Research Question 3. What are the content characteristics of teacher performance evaluation instruments in Texas public schools?

1. Over half of the presage criteria or personal characteristics category was made up primarily of items related to personal traits rather than items related to such areas as voice-speech, grooming, physical condition, and general characteristics-attitudes.

2. About half of the items related to personal traits were traits related to organizational membership such as punctual-prompt, cooperative, dependable, accurate, responsible, loyal, adaptable, and flexible.

3. Within the process criteria or instructional role, items related to planning and goal setting and the instructional process itself accounted for over half of the process criteria category.

4. As far as the product criteria or student outcomes category is concerned, the items were rather equally distributed between student behavior, student attitudes, and student achievement.

5. Items related to student control made up about half of the items in the administrator-manager role.
6. As far as the social role is concerned, items related to interpersonal relations with students and interpersonal relations with district personnel made up about half of the category.

7. The professional role category was further broken down into the subcategories of professional qualifications, professional growth, and professional ethics with the items distributed fairly evenly. There were slightly more items related to professional qualifications than to the other two subcategories.

8. The organizational membership role items were also almost evenly distributed among items related to organizational compliance, response to supervision, assumption of non-teaching responsibilities, and organizational perspective.

9. About one-third of the general job performance requirements items related to the administrator-manager role, whereas items related to the social role, professional role, and organizational membership role were fairly evenly distributed.

10. Overall, items related to general job performance requirements accounted for over half (54 percent) of the items contained in the teacher performance evaluation instruments. Process criteria (instructional role) made up 25 percent of the items; presage criteria (personal
characteristics) had approximately 18 percent of the items; whereas, product criteria (student outcomes) accounted for only 3 percent of the items in the teacher performance evaluation instruments.

11. As far as specific criteria is concerned, all of the school districts reported examples concerning discipline and teaching competency or using a variety of instructional materials and teaching techniques. Over 90 percent of the school districts also reported specific criteria concerning knowledge of subject matter, maintaining a professional relationship with students, and planning clear and specific lesson objectives in accord with curricular guidelines.

12. About two-thirds of the examples of specific criteria reported by at least 100 school districts were associated with the general job performance requirements cluster.

Conclusions

The findings of this study warrant the following conclusions.

1. The value of teacher performance evaluation in accountability is reflected by the practice in all school districts of making teacher performance evaluation mandatory for all teachers and requiring teacher performance evaluations at least annually. This includes probationary, term, and continuing contract teachers.
2. Although a large number of school districts require only one observation of the teacher in the classroom annually, the view that mandatory multiple observations of the teacher in the classroom are necessary for effective teacher performance evaluation is shared by many school districts throughout the State of Texas. Also, the use of more than one evaluator to observe the teacher is a common practice in many school districts.

3. The view that probationary teachers require more frequent classroom observation for purposes of teacher performance evaluation than do non-probationary teachers is shared by a substantial number of Texas public schools.

4. The building principal is the key person involved in the formal teacher performance evaluation process.

5. Although all school districts state the supervisory function of the improvement of instruction as a major purpose of their teacher performance evaluation policy, a large number of school districts utilize teacher performance evaluation for the administrative functions of serving as a basis for retention or dismissal.

6. If in reality teacher performance evaluation were construed as the improvement of instruction or teacher performance, it should be predictable that process criteria (teacher behavior) would account for the majority of items in the evaluation instruments. However, these items
accounted for only about one-fourth of the total number of items in the teacher performance evaluation instruments.

7. The teacher performance evaluation instruments required the evaluator to pass judgement on the teacher's entire work world. Items pertaining to general job requirements accounted for over 50 percent of the items on the instruments. This clearly exhibits a maintenance rather than teaching thrust.

8. According to research and the stated policies of school districts, maintenance-emphasizing data appear to be largely irrelevant to the manifest purpose of improving teaching performance or classroom instructional behavior and thus provide little leverage for affecting change in classroom teaching practices.

9. The data gathered on current teacher performance evaluation instruments appears to be highly pertinent to maintaining the school as an organization and appears to be quite helpful in making personnel decisions.

10. Teacher performance evaluation instruments in Texas public schools are much more heavily weighted toward assessing teachers in their multiple roles rather than the many aspects of teaching.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were derived based upon the findings of this study.
1. More items on teacher performance evaluation instruments should focus on the teacher's in-class teaching role and fewer on what has been identified as broader organizational maintenance functions.

2. Texas public schools should closely analyze their respective teacher performance evaluation instruments in terms of content item analysis to determine exactly what is being measured in the classroom.

3. Since all Texas public schools recognize the principal or building administrator as the primary evaluator, this person must have adequate training as an evaluator. Such training should include understanding the total process of personnel evaluation as well as specific evaluation methods. It might well include emphasis on the importance of teacher evaluation of principals.

4. Further study needs to be done to determine, if given the results of this study, how much the principal's role is that of instructional leader as opposed to that of manager of a complex organization.

5. Further study also needs to be done to determine why Texas public schools put such emphasis on general job requirements. Is this emphasis justified in maintaining the school as an organization and it is useful in making personnel decisions? Is it logical and legitimate to put such emphasis on maintenance emphasizing data that appear to be only tangently related to the role of classroom teaching performance?
APPENDICES
Dear Superintendent:

I am currently involved in a doctoral dissertation study in the Department of Public School Administration and Supervision, College of Education, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas. This study is being conducted to identify the procedures and criteria used for conducting teacher performance evaluations in Texas public schools. It is believed that the results of this study will provide Texas public schools with some valuable information which will assist administrators in handling this important activity.

In order to accomplish the purposes of this study, I must ask you to send me a copy of your official board policy concerning teacher performance evaluation and a copy of the teacher performance evaluation instrument(s) used in your district. I will also need a statement of the procedure(s) used for conducting teacher performance evaluation if not contained in the stated evaluation policy. I realize that this is a lot of material to ask you for, but I hope you will be willing to help me conduct this potentially very valuable study.

Also, please indicate if you would like me to reimburse you for any copying costs and postage as this will vary from district to district and is difficult to anticipate. Since it is late in the school year, your prompt response will be appreciated. If you would like to receive a content item analysis of your individual teacher performance evaluation instrument, please indicate this and I will be happy to furnish you with this information.

As a professional administrator, I will be careful to handle this data in a professional manner. Your response will be strictly confidential.

Once again, thank you so much for your help.

Sincerely,

John J. Horvat
Professor of Educational Administration
North Texas State University

T. W. Marlin, Jr.
Dear Superintendent:

Enclosed is a copy of the content item analysis of your school district's individual teacher performance evaluation instrument which you requested.

Please note that the content items on the teacher performance evaluation instrument were carefully analyzed to determine the categorical placement of each item. The decision rules and category system used in classifying the data were ones devised by Wood and Pohland (Wood, Carolyn J. and Paul A. Pohland, "Decision Rules and Category System Used in Classifying the Data for 'Teacher Evaluation and the Hand of History,'" paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California, 1979). In the Wood and Pohland study, the category system consisted of eight major categories. For purposes of this analysis, presage criteria will include personal characteristics; process criteria will include the instructional role; product criteria will refer to student outcomes; and general job performance requirements will include administration-manager role, social role, professional role, and organizational membership role.

The content item analysis of your school district's individual teacher performance evaluation instrument should aid in determining to what degree your instrument reflects your stated evaluation policy and what you want to measure.

Once again, thank you very much for providing me with the material needed to help me with my doctoral dissertation study.

Sincerely,

T. W. Marlin, Jr.

John J. Horvat
Professor of Educational Administration
North Texas State University
Content Item Analysis of Teacher Performance Evaluation Instrument

Percentage* and Frequency of Items by Category in Current Teacher Performance Evaluation Instrument:

Presage Criteria (Personal Characteristics):
N = %

Process Criteria (Instructional Role):
N = %

Product Criteria (Student Outcomes):
N = %

General Job Performance Requirements (Administrator-Manager Role, Social Role, Professional Role, Organizational Membership Role):
N = %

*Percentages based on N = items.
Dear Superintendent:

In May you received a letter requesting a copy of your official board policy concerning teacher performance evaluation and a copy of the teacher performance evaluation instrument(s) used in your district. I also requested a statement of the procedure(s) used for conducting teacher performance evaluation if not contained in the stated evaluation policy.

At present, I have received either none of the requested material or an incomplete set of material by return mail. Please take a few minutes to provide me with the information requested in order to help me conduct this potentially very valuable doctoral dissertation study.

Sincerely,

T. W. Marlin, Jr.
Appendix D

Decision Rules and Category System Used In Classifying the Data for "Teacher Evaluation and the 'Hand of History'"

Decision Rules

I. Determination of which instrument would be used when a district submitted more than one:

A. The form presently in use was analyzed rather than one under development.

B. The instrument which appeared to be more general with reference to instructional level was analyzed. If instructional level was difficult to determine, the one with the most items was chosen.

II. Unit of Analysis

A. Each content unit or item was classified into a particular category. These categories were mutually exclusive so that no item could be scored more than once. However, each time the item appeared in an instrument, it was scored as present. Frequency counts were based on the number of times a content item appeared, not on the number of instruments in which it appeared.

B. Double- and triple-headed items were difficult to code as one item, e.g., "shows initiative and enthusiasm" and "shows responsibility, dependability,
honesty." Therefore, each trait or behavior was coded separately. For example, "shows initiative" was counted as one item and "shows enthusiasm" was counted as another.

**Category System**

An attempt to accomplish a detailed analysis of the item content yielded a scoring system consisting of numerous subcategories subsumed under each of the major categories. Even though the data for this study were reported only in terms of the eight major categories, the original coding system is reproduced here to enable others to better understand the category definitions and the indicators used to determine which content items were placed into each category.

I. Instructional Role--When the teacher introduces or undertakes an activity with the intention that students will learn something as a consequence.

A. Planning and Goal Setting

1. Has weekly lesson plans with definite objectives
2. Consistent and Careful Planning
3. Adequate preparation of lesson plans
4. Sets attainable goals for students
5. Develops short- and long-range goals

B. Diagnosis of and Provision for Individual Differences
1. Demonstrates understanding of child growth and development

2. Knowledge of how children learn

3. The teacher preassesses the students to determine their needs

4. Individuals' dominant learning styles are considered in lesson preparation

5. The teacher uses available information, such as standardized tests, guidance information, preassessment information, etc., to prescribe learning activities

6. In developing basic knowledge, understanding, and skills, the teacher employs materials and techniques appropriate to the varying abilities and backgrounds of the pupils

C. Instructional Process

1. Challenges students to think, inquire, and analyze

2. Demonstrates ability to interpret and present curricula in a stimulating manner

3. Teaches at the level of students

4. Guides student activities

5. Gives opportunities and encouragement for student interaction

D. Curriculum and Resource Utilization

1. Makes effective use of chalkboard or other visual aids

2. Organizes learning materials

3. Variety of resource materials used

4. Demonstrates resourcefulness and utilizes available facilities

5. Uses community as much as possible
E. Learning Environment: Psychological

1. Sparks wide range of creativity
2. Skill in directing student participation and motivation
3. Motivates learning
4. Maintains a friendly atmosphere
5. Maintains a classroom climate conducive to learning—freedom but not chaos

F. Learning Environment: Physical

1. Has work areas arranged for maximum pupil stimulation and accomplishment
2. Classroom arrangement (Displays, Bulletin Boards)
3. Provides sufficient instructive displays

G. Evaluation

1. Evaluates and checks results effectively
2. Uses varied techniques in evaluation of student progress
3. Evaluates learning experiences with students (as individuals and as groups)

II. Administrator-Manager Role—This role differs from actual teaching in that it refers to the teacher's ability to manage and control the behavior of students; to give attention to aesthetic, housekeeping and physical qualities of the classroom environment; and to act in a responsible manner with reference to reporting and record keeping requirements. These may be thought of as necessary but not sufficient conditions to be met for productive teaching to occur.
A. Student Control
   1. Handles discipline problems appropriately
   2. Is able to maintain discipline—in classroom
   3. Accepts the responsibility to maintain discipline outside the classroom—hall, playground, campus

B. Reporting—Record Keeping
   1. Keeps records neatly (and accurately)
   2. Record keeping, grades, attendance, etc.
   3. Records (includes textbook lists; grade books; inventory)

C. Classroom Environment: Aesthetic—Physical
   1. Keeps room neat, attractive, and in order
   2. Is concerned about heat, light and ventilation
   3. Physical classroom environment

D. Classroom Management
   1. Maintains classroom organization and management
   2. Establishes efficient classroom routines
   3. Good organization and planning
   4. Takes care of materials and facilities

E. Staffing
   1. Calls for substitute on time
   2. Provides for substitute teacher: adequate lesson plans, charts, etc.
   3. Teacher seeks and uses the advice and assistance of "specialists" to supplement his own teaching
   4. Makes use of consultant personnel if needed

F. Quality Control
   1. Places only legible quality materials in the hands of students
III. Social Role—Interpersonal relationships the teacher has with a variety of people.

A. Interpersonal Relations: Community
   1. Maintains positive school-community relations
   2. Interpersonal relations with community
   3. Membership in community groups
   4. Interprets effectively the school programs and policies
   5. Makes friends for the school and profession

B. Interpersonal Relations: School Staff
   1. Relations with colleagues
   2. Is willing to share ideas and materials
   3. Cooperates readily with associates for continuous improvement of the school
   4. Relations with administrative personnel
   5. Treats other (non-certified) staff with respect and understanding

C. Interpersonal Relations: Students
   1. Teacher-pupil relationship
   2. Treats each student fairly without favoritism
   3. Observes due process

D. General Interpersonal Relations
   1. Relations with all concerned
   2. Relationship with students, parents, co-workers

E. Interpersonal Relations: District Personnel
   1. Works cooperatively with other school or district personnel
IV. Professional Role--Items in this category refer to the teacher's academic preparation, his or her mastery of the subject matter content and ethics.

A. Professional Qualification

1. Is academically competent in assignment
2. Professional preparation
3. Knowledge of subjects(s)
4. Knows subject matter and books being used

B. Professional Growth

1. Interest in self-improvement
2. Participation in teachers' meetings, workshops, institutes
3. Professional growth
4. Professional activities
5. Participates in professional organizations

C. Professional Ethics

1. Teacher is ethical
2. Does not discuss problems of students, school and profession except when necessary professionally
3. Adheres to accepted ethical and social standards of the community and the profession

V. Organizational Membership Role--When an item indicates that teachers are expected to exhibit attitudes and behaviors in concern with the overall goals of the organization, to be sensitive to criticism and to exhibit behaviors sanctioned by the school organization.
A. Organizational Compliance

1. Adheres to school board policy
2. Is on duty when/where supposed to be
3. Seeks to understand and abide by all school rules and regulations
4. Supports and enforces school policy, rules, regulations

B. Response to Supervision

1. Accepts and uses constructive criticism
2. Attempts to follow suggestions
3. Response to supervision; suggestions for improvement

C. Assumption of Non-Teaching Responsibilities

1. Willingly accepts additional assignments and responsibilities
2. Assumes assignments and extra duties willingly
3. Accepts and fulfills a fair share of out-of-class responsibilities

D. Organizational Perspective

1. Helps reach school objectives
2. Teacher cooperation
3. Sees his or her responsibility in relation to the total school program
4. The teacher demonstrates support of the system objectives, goals, and regulations.

VI. Student Outcomes--Items on the rating scale instruments which evaluate teacher effectiveness indirectly through an assessment of student attitudes and/or performance.
A. Student Behavior (In-Class)
1. Response of students
2. Interest of students
3. Pupil participation
4. Good work habits are being developed

B. Student Attitudes
1. Pupils take responsibility seriously
2. Motivation of students
3. Pupils exhibit an attitude of mutual respect and tolerance

C. Student Achievement
1. Growth in achievement of pupils
2. Teacher records of pupils reveal growth

VII. Personal Characteristics

A. Personal Traits: Psychological-Behavioral

1. Traits Related to Organizational Membership
   a. Punctual/prompt   e. Responsible
   b. Cooperative      f. Loyal
   c. Dependable       g. Adaptable
   d. Accurate         h. Flexible

2. Traits Related to Work with Students
   a. Interested in     h. Tolerant
   b. Fair             i. Sympathetic
   c. Patient          j. Constructive
   d. Compassionate    k. Democratic
   e. Positive attitude toward l. Empathetic
   f. Impartial        m. Humane
   g. Considerate      n. Courteous
3. Traits Related to Task of Teaching

a. Enthusiastic
b. Initiative
c. Resourceful
d. Leadership
e. Creative
f. Original
g. Innovative
h. Dedicated

4. Traits Related to the Teacher as a Person

a. Judgment
b. Sense of Humor
c. Self-controlled
d. Tactful
e. Poised
f. Sincere
g. Emotionally Stable
h. Honest
i. Exemplar
j. Calm
k. Self-Confident
l. Mature
m. Friendly
n. Discreet
o. Alert
p. Perseverant
q. Patriotic
r. Open-Minded
s. Reasonable
t. Optimistic
u. Faces Problems
v. Good Mental Health
w. Positive Self-Concept

B. Personal Characteristics: Physical Fitness

1. Appears to be well
2. Has the stamina to maintain regular attendance and meet school obligations
3. Physical and Mental Health

C. Personal Characteristics: Voice-Speech

1. Projects tonal quality appropriate to the teaching situation
2. Regulates voice volume for effective communication
3. Has good enunciation
4. Uses proper, acceptable language

D. Personal Characteristics: Grooming

1. Dresses Appropriately
2. Is well groomed
3. Personal appearance and grooming
E. General Characteristics-Attitudes

1. Positive attitude toward teaching
2. Teacher attitude
3. Professional attitude
4. General attitude toward job, school system, community

VIII. Other

1. Other
2. Rapport: Subject Centered
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