

A SURVEY OF THE STATUS OF TEACHER RATING IN ALL AAA  
AND AAAA HIGH SCHOOLS IN TEXAS

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of  
Southwest Texas State College  
in Partial Fulfillment of  
the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Donald E. Mauldin, B.A.  
(San Angelo, Texas)

San Marcos, Texas

August, 1964

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to the members of his thesis committee, Dr. E. M. Richardson, Dr. Pat Norwood, and Dr. B. Helton, for their help and assistance in preparing this thesis.

Special tribute is paid to Dr. Richardson, chairman of the committee, whose advice and guidance were invaluable in the preparation of this study.

The writer is also indebted to the many principals of class AAA and class AAAA high schools of Texas who took time from their busy schedules to complete and return the questionnaires on which this survey is based.

Donald E. Mauldin

San Marcos, Texas

August, 1964

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	1
Importance of the Problem . . . . .	1
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	6
Definition of Terms . . . . .	7
Sources of Data . . . . .	8
Organization of the Study . . . . .	9
II. TYPES OF RATING INSTRUMENTS . . . . .	10
A Brief History of Rating . . . . .	11
Methods of Rating . . . . .	15
Summary . . . . .	38
III. THE ADVISABILITY OF RATING TEACHERS . . . . .	41
Some Arguments against Rating . . . . .	41
Some Arguments for Rating . . . . .	45
Summary . . . . .	52
IV. DUTIES AND TECHNIQUES IN THE USE OF TEACHER RATING . . . . .	54
Techniques of Gathering Data . . . . .	54
Duties of the Administrator in Rating . . . . .	64
Use of the Results of Rating . . . . .	82
Summary . . . . .	85
V. THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT . . . . .	88
Development of the Instrument . . . . .	88
Contents of the Instrument . . . . .	89
Selection and Quantity of Schools Surveyed . . . . .	96

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Chapter	Page
VI. RESULTS OF THE SURVEY . . . . .	99
Response to the Survey . . . . .	99
Principals' Opinions of Rating . . . . .	100
Facts about the Rating Programs . . . . .	111
Facts about Hiring and Dismissing Teachers . . . . .	129
VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	130
Conclusions . . . . .	130
Recommendations . . . . .	133
APPENDIX . . . . .	137
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	150

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS REGARDING THE FEASIBILITY OF RATING TEACHERS . . . . .	101
II. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS REGARDING THE PURPOSE OF RATING TEACHERS . . . . .	104
III. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS REGARDING THE INVOLVEMENT OF TEACHERS IN RATING . . . . .	106
IV. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS REGARDING CONSIDERATIONS IN RATINGS AND FOR A RATING PROGRAM . . . . .	108
V. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS REGARDING PERSONS WHO SHOULD MAKE RATINGS . . . . .	112
VI. PERSONS WHO RATE TEACHERS IN CLASS AAA AND CLASS AAAA HIGH SCHOOLS IN TEXAS . . . . .	114
VII. METHODS OF RATING TEACHERS IN CLASS AAA AND CLASS AAAA HIGH SCHOOLS IN TEXAS . . . . .	116
VIII. METHODS OF GATHERING DATA FOR RATINGS IN CLASS AAA AND CLASS AAAA HIGH SCHOOLS IN TEXAS . . . . .	120
IX. FREQUENCY OF RATINGS IN CLASS AAA AND CLASS AAAA HIGH SCHOOLS IN TEXAS . . . . .	122
X. METHODS OF INFORMING TEACHERS OF THEIR RATINGS IN CLASS AAA AND CLASS AAAA HIGH SCHOOLS IN TEXAS . . . . .	124
XI. LENGTHS OF TIME INTERVENING BETWEEN RATINGS AND INFORMING TEACHERS OF RATINGS IN CLASS AAA AND CLASS AAAA HIGH SCHOOLS IN TEXAS . . . . .	125
XII. PER CENT OF TEACHERS RATED ABOVE AVERAGE IN CLASS AAA AND CLASS AAAA HIGH SCHOOLS IN TEXAS DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR 1963-1964 . . . . .	127
XIII. PURPOSES FOR WHICH RATINGS ARE USED IN CLASS AAA AND CLASS AAAA HIGH SCHOOLS IN TEXAS . . . . .	128

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. EXAMPLE OF A PUPIL-RATING CARD . . . . .	23
2. EXAMPLE OF A POINT-SCORED RATING CARD . . . . .	28
3. EXAMPLE OF A FIVE-POINT FORCED-CHOICE RATING SCALE . . . . .	30
4. EXAMPLE OF AN INSTRUMENT FOR SCORING OBSERVED CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR . . . . .	60
5. EXAMPLE OF AN INSTRUMENT FOR RECORDING GENERAL OBSERVATIONS OF CLASSROOM VISITATIONS. . . . .	62
6. EXAMPLE OF A SELF-EVALUATION RATING INSTRUMENT . . . . .	138
7. EXAMPLE OF A FOUR-POINT FORCED-CHOICE RATING INSTRUMENT . . . . .	140
8. EXAMPLE OF A FIVE-POINT FORCED-CHOICE RATING SCALE AND DESCRIPTIVE REPORT INSTRUMENT . . . . .	142
9. EXAMPLE OF A FIVE-POINT FORCED-CHOICE RATING SCALE AND GENERAL STATEMENT INSTRUMENT . . . . .	145
10. EXAMPLE OF A CLASSROOM OBSERVATION RECORD FOR USE BY AN ADMINISTRATOR . . . . .	148
11. EXAMPLE OF A TEACHER VISITATION REPORT FOR USE BY A DEPARTMENT HEAD OR FELLOW TEACHER . . . . .	149

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Only by constant effort can the teaching profession maintain and improve the quality of instruction. Only by the maintenance and improvement of the quality of instruction can the schools of Texas and of America propagate the development of the type of citizen on which rests the future of the country and of the world. The methods of determination that quality teaching is being done are of utmost importance to the writer and, therefore, form the basis for the topic of this thesis.

#### Statement of the Problem

The problem under scrutiny here is the determination of the status of teacher rating in Texas, particularly in the class AAA and class AAAA high schools of Texas. Only by the determination of where one now stands can one determine where he should go.

#### Importance of the Problem

As is illustrated in a research memo by the Research Division of the National Education Association, "The resolutions of the National Education Association recognize

that it is a major responsibility of the teaching profession to evaluate the quality of its services."<sup>1</sup> As further explained in this same document, the responsibility of the individual teacher in the process of continued self-improvement is not diminished or enhanced by the presence or absence of a formal rating plan.<sup>2</sup>

Rating always present.--Teachers have always been evaluated by the general-impression method, as has been pointed out by Ward G. Reeder, Professor Emeritus of Education of Ohio State University.<sup>3</sup>

Stephen J. Knezevich, Professor of Educational Administration at Florida State University, states that teachers have been and have continued to be rated by various individuals and groups including school administrators, supervisors, pupils, committees, and lay citizens.<sup>4</sup>

B. J. Chandler, Professor at the University of Virginia, and P. V. Petty, Professor at the University of

---

<sup>1</sup>National Education Association, Research Division, Guidelines for the Evaluation of Classroom Teachers, p. 4.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 7.

<sup>3</sup>Ward G. Reeder, The Fundamentals of Public School Administration, p. 183.

<sup>4</sup>Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Education, p. 382.

Arkansas, declare that "evaluation in some form is always present."<sup>5</sup>

"Everyone agrees that evaluation of some sort is made in every school," states Herbert Zimites, Research Associate at Bank Street College of Education in New York.<sup>6</sup>

Emery Stoops, Professor of Educational Administration and Supervision at the University of Southern California, and M. L. Rafferty, Jr., Superintendent of Schools of Needles, California, concur with this seemingly ubiquitous opinion. The following statement from them also points out that since rating is done, it is better for it to be done well:

All teachers are rated. They will be rated by their students and by the parents of the community, whether they like it or not, and regardless of whether there is a formal rating system utilized by the school district which employs them. Their relative status in the community and in the school depends upon this highly informal and sometimes grossly unfair evaluation, based upon secondhand information and subject impressions. It is apparent that, since teachers are inevitably rated in one way or another, it would be best to accomplish this through some agreed-upon and logically defensible method of evaluation.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>B. J. Chandler and P. V. Petty, Personnel Management in School Administration, p. 263.

<sup>6</sup>Herbert Zimites, "Teacher Selection and Personality Assessment," The National Elementary Principal, LXI (November, 1961), 22.

<sup>7</sup>Emery Stoops and M. L. Rafferty, Jr., Practices and Trends in School Administration, p. 424.

Indication of merit in practice of rating.--The fact that a practice is not widely used does not necessarily mean that it is unsound. Chandler and Petty explain, however, that it is usually safe to assume that there is some commendable feature about any practice which enjoys widespread popularity.<sup>8</sup> Even though practices may have many shortcomings, it is wise to know something about them, including their prevalence and the good and bad points of each.

Importance of the identification of quality teachers.--The identification of qualified and quality teachers is one of the most important tasks of education, as has been expressed by David G. Ryans, Professor of Education at the University of California, and later at the University of Texas.<sup>9</sup> Excellent material resources are ineffective, even though the school has an appropriate curriculum, if the teachers are inadequate. The educational program is only as strong as its teachers.

Increasing importance of teacher rating.--The increasing importance of rating of teachers is evidenced by the various

---

<sup>8</sup>Chandler and Petty, op. cit., p. 265.

<sup>9</sup>David G. Ryans, "The Investigation of Teacher Characteristics," The Educational Record, XXXIV (October, 1953), 371.

ways in which it is mentioned in the resolutions passed by the National Education Association conventions from 1915 through 1961. Excerpts from those resolutions, printed in a research memo by the National Education Association, Research Division, show this idea clearly.<sup>10</sup> In 1915 a resolution was passed which was strongly worded in opposition to rating. In 1956 the opposition was to merit rating as it applied to salary scheduling. However, this resolution, as adopted, admitted that "it is a major responsibility of the teaching profession, as of other professions, to evaluate the quality of its services."<sup>11</sup> The 1959 version asserted that this responsibility covered all professional personnel. Several areas which needed investigation and experimentation in the field of evaluation were enumerated in the 1960 resolution. The 1961 version added that "American education can be better served by continued progress in developing better means of objective evaluation."<sup>12</sup>

The Department of Classroom Teachers, the largest department of the National Education Association, has also

---

<sup>10</sup>National Education Association, Research Division, National Education Association Statements and Publications on Teacher Evaluation, pp. 3-4.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 3.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., pp. 3-4.

shown increasing interest in, and approval for, rating. In 1948 a resolution adopted by this group stated that rating should be used only during the probationary period because no just system of rating had yet been found. In 1953 this statement was altered to say only that no just system of rating had yet been found to use as a basis for salary scheduling. No change was made in this attitude between 1953 and 1961.<sup>13</sup>

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education urged that teachers should meet certain standards in order that they might retain their positions. A resolution to that effect was adopted in 1957.<sup>14</sup>

In 1960 a resolution adopted by the American Association of School Administrators stated that "some progress had been made in identifying effective teaching procedures."<sup>15</sup>

#### Limitations of the Study

General background information.--The first part of this paper gives a general background of rating. Many types of rating devices are explored in anticipation that any or all of them may be present in the schools studied. In some cases

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., pp. 5-6.

practices or devices are explored even though significant evidence of their use is not expected.

Merit rating only incidentally involved.--This study has been designed to deal with rating in general, with no exploration into salary schedules linked to ratings, except as they may be incidentally involved.

Principal's part in rating explored.--The senior high school principal's use of rating has been the focal point for this study. The prediction in advance of teaching efficiency was not explored, as it was thought by the writer that it was not usually the job of the high school principal to hire new personnel.

Restricted to class AAA and class AAAA senior high schools.--This investigation has been restricted to the following two areas: (1) What use has been made of ratings of teacher efficiency in the class AAA and class AAAA high schools in Texas? (2) What are the opinions of the principals of these same schools regarding rating and its use?

#### Definition of Terms

The following definitions have been devised for purposes of this study.

Rating.--Rating is teacher rating or an evaluation of some kind of the efficiency with which a teacher performs his duties.

Rating instrument.--A rating instrument is a device designed to be used for stating the strong and weak points of a teacher and his work. Provision is usually made for indicating the degree of strength or weakness.

Formal rating.--A teacher is formally rated if a definite account, usually in writing, is made of his rating, either in words or by a score.

Externally administered rating.--When a teacher is rated by someone other than the teacher himself, the process is known as an externally administered rating.

#### Sources of Data

Background information.--The review of literature for this study was taken from publications from 1940 through 1963. The use of periodicals was confined primarily to articles published after 1955.

The survey. Questions in the survey were based on the ideas which were expressed in the survey of literature. The answers to those questions were elicited from principals of class AAA and class AAAA high schools in Texas.

## Organization of the Study

Chapters II, III, and IV present a review of literature in which the opinions of authorities are explored regarding the types of rating instruments which are in existence or which can logically be developed, the advisability of using rating devices, and the manner in which they can and should be used.

In Chapters V and VI the views of principals now in service in the two largest classes of high schools in Texas, AAA and AAAA, are presented in regard to these same areas. The extent to which rating is now used in these schools and the ways it is used, as well as the extent and ways it is used by the principals, are also explored.

The actual status of rating and rating instruments in these schools is concluded in Chapter VII. Recommendations for the improvement of their use are also included here. If these recommendations are enacted, it is felt by the writer that the quality of education in Texas can be enhanced to some degree.

## CHAPTER II

### TYPES OF RATING INSTRUMENTS

Almost any activity is subjected to some form of evaluation, at least in the mind of some individual affected by the activity, as has been pointed out in Chapter I. The activities performed by teachers in connection with their duties are no exceptions. The problem then, as expressed by Chandler and Petty, is to make such appraisal as objective as possible.<sup>1</sup> The presence of many large school systems today demands that school administrators depend upon some type of rating device to assist them.<sup>2</sup>

In this chapter, the most prevalent methods of rating and the outstanding types of devices used with these methods are presented, together with strong and weak points of each. It is necessary that an understanding of these be accomplished before the investigation can be truly meaningful.

---

<sup>1</sup>Chandler and Petty, op. cit., p. 260.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 264.

## A Brief History of Rating

### Development of Viewpoints

The evaluation of man's efforts goes far back into recorded history. Carl J. Megel, President of the American Federation of Teachers in 1962, says,

An eminent Chinese philosopher, Sin Yu, of the Wai dynasty, in the year 200 A.D., complained: "The Imperial rater of nine grades seldom rates men according to their merit, but always according to his likes and dislikes."<sup>3</sup>

Evaluation of teaching in the early history of the United States.--The early history of evaluation in the United States has been described in a publication of the Department of Classroom Teachers and Research Division of the National Education Association.<sup>4</sup> During the early history of this country, evaluation was performed by a group of town selectmen who would visit a teacher, watch the progress of the lessons, and question the pupils to determine their progress. Since the curriculum was narrow and ideas about the way

---

<sup>3</sup>Carl J. Megel, "Summarization of Policy and Conclusions of the Chicago, March 17, Merit Rating Conference of the American Federation of Teachers," The American Teacher Magazine, XLVI (April, 1962), 3.

<sup>4</sup>Department of Classroom Teachers and Research Division of the National Education Association, Teacher Rating, p. 3.

teaching should be done were well fixed, evaluation of a teacher's efficiency was fairly simple. As communities grew, curriculums expanded and the job of rating became more complex. As the task became more exacting, it was turned over to professional educators.

Scope of evaluation enlarged.--Raymond Morgan of Johnston Central High School in Pennsylvania has explained that the idea of rating which at first was very narrow in focus was later expanded to cover the teacher as a person as well as a classroom leader.<sup>5</sup> Eventually a third area was added so that the teacher was also rated as a co-worker and colleague.

Theory of preparation and experience.--Many schools now operate under the theory that efficiency results from preparation and experience.<sup>6</sup> It is assumed that a direct positive relationship exists between the number of years of professional training and competence and between the number of years of experience and teaching performance.

---

<sup>5</sup>Raymond Morgan, "Accentuation in Evaluating Teaching Personnel," National Business Education Quarterly, XXVI (May, 1948), 26-27.

<sup>6</sup>It appears that this is the theory under which the state of Texas officially operates, since the minimum salary scale is based on the number of years of experience and the degrees held.

James P. Steffensen, a specialist for employed school personnel administration in the Office of Education in Washington, says that most salary schedules today are based on a combination of training and experience, probably because they are easily identified and measured.<sup>7</sup> He criticizes the practice because training is not usually recognized above a set level and the quality of experience is not considered.

#### Notable Studies

Study by J. L. Merriam.--In 1905 J. L. Merriam used 1,185 normal school graduates in an attempt to show the relationship between teaching ability and scholarship. He found some correlation between teaching ability and success in practice teaching, psychology, history and principles of education, methods courses, and academic courses, in that order.

Dwight E. Beecher, Research Associate with the New York State Education Department and Coordinator of Research for the Buffalo, New York, Public Schools, reported that Merriam's findings have been substantiated by later research.<sup>8</sup>

Score card by Edward C. Elliott.--As further reported by Beecher, Edward C. Elliott developed a score card in 1920

---

<sup>7</sup>James P. Steffensen, "Teacher Evaluation and Salary Policy," School Life, XLIV (October, 1961), 22-23.

<sup>8</sup>Dwight E. Beecher, The Evaluation of Teaching, pp. 5-6.

which consisted of forty-two traits, each of which was to be judged on a numerical scale, with the resulting sum providing the rating.<sup>9</sup> Its significance lay in the fact that it utilized the combined results of a number of earlier studies.

Rugg Rating Scale.--Also in 1920, H. O. Rugg developed a rating scale designed to be self-administered.<sup>10</sup> A response of low, average, or high was required for each of a large number of questions. Beecher says that this scale was important because it was "one of the earliest to be designed for self-appraisal."<sup>11</sup>

Study by F. B. Knight.--The reliability index of mutual ratings of teachers, superintendents, and pupils was found to be .89 by F. B. Knight in 1922, according to a report by Beecher.<sup>12</sup> However, the reliability index was much lower for correlation between the rating of teachers and pupils than it was for that of teachers and superintendents. This

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., pp. 32-33.

<sup>10</sup>H. O. Rugg, "Self-Improvement of Teachers through Self-Rating: A New Scale for Rating Teachers' Efficiency," Elementary School Journal, XX (May, 1920), 670-684.

<sup>11</sup>Beecher, op. cit., p. 33.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

seemingly discredited, to some extent, the use of pupils in rating teachers.

Study by T. C. Yeager.---In 1935 Teresa C. Yeager made a study and devised a scale for measuring the attitudes toward teachers and the teaching profession, which she claimed to have a reliability index of .88. Beecher says that this study was unique in that it was based on the ideas of high school seniors and adults in occupations other than teaching.<sup>13</sup>

#### Methods of Rating

The methods of evaluation range from the informal procedures that are seldom called evaluation to the highly developed formal rating devices. Both formal and informal ratings may serve valuable purposes, as the National Education Association, Research Division, explains.<sup>14</sup>

#### Informal Methods of Rating

General-impression method.---Perhaps the oldest method of rating is the general-impression method. Teachers have been hired and fired on this basis for many years. This method is

---

<sup>13</sup>ibid., p. 13.

<sup>14</sup>National Education Association, Research Division, Guidelines for the Evaluation of Classroom Teachers, pp. 6-7.

employed when the rater uses his subjective judgment in evaluating the individual faculty member's over-all worth without reference to any definite standard. Reeder points out that in recent years there is a trend away from this method as the need for more objective ratings is felt.<sup>15</sup>

Characterization report.--Paul B. Jacobson, Dean of the School of Education at the University of Oregon; William C. Reavis, Professor Emeritus of Education at the University of Chicago; and James D. Logsdon, Principal of Shorewood High School in Shorewood, Wisconsin, describe the characterization report as very similar to the general-impression method.<sup>16</sup>

In this method, the rater is asked to characterize his total impression of the teacher's worth by using a single descriptive adjective or letter. Occasionally the rater is asked to justify his decision by explanatory statements.

Descriptive report.--In utilization of the descriptive report, the rater writes a paragraph or two in which he describes the teacher's merit. This method has been set forth in a joint publication by two divisions of the National

---

<sup>15</sup>Reeder, op. cit., pp. 183-184.

<sup>16</sup>Paul B. Jacobson, William C. Reavis, and James D. Logsdon, Duties of School Principals, p. 482.

Education Association.<sup>17</sup> In its crudest form, this method is slightly more formal than the general-impression method, although it may be carried one step further when the rater is required to write his comments under definite headings or in response to certain questions.

John B. Crossley, Superintendent of the Ventura Union High School District of Ventura, California, suggests the use of a report of this type which calls for statements of points of strength and points where improvement might be made.<sup>18</sup>

Man-to-man comparison.--A method of rating in which the rater compares present faculty members to ones he has previously known is called the man-to-man comparison method. Here the rater calls to mind a very poor teacher, a poorer than average teacher, an average teacher, an above average teacher, and a very good teacher. He then compares the person being rated to each of these to see which one he is most like.

This method, according to a report by the Department of Classroom Teachers and Research Division of the National Education Association, is similar to one tried with army

---

<sup>17</sup>Department of Classroom Teachers and Research Division of the National Education Association, op. cit., p. 9.

<sup>18</sup>John B. Crossley, "Supervision and Rating Are Compatible," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, XLI (October, 1957), 76-77.

officers during World War I.<sup>19</sup> The army version was found to be very unreliable when its results were compared with ratings known to be valid. This fact indicated that man-to-man comparisons may be open to question.

A variation of the man-to-man comparison method is used when a rater ranks teachers according to their general merit from the best teacher down to the poorest. This method is described in a joint report by two divisions of the National Education Association.<sup>20</sup> It contains many of the same elements as the general-impression method.

Weakness of informal methods of rating.--The foregoing paragraphs show one outstanding deficiency which is common to all of these types of informal rating devices; they are excessively subjective. More objective methods than the general-impression method and its innovated forms, the descriptive report and the characterization report, are being sought. Finally, Reeder concludes that the man-to-man comparison method is highly subjective and suggests that ratings made by two persons using this method would probably

---

<sup>19</sup>Department of Classroom Teachers and Research Division of the National Education Association, op. cit., p. 8.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 9.

differ considerably and would therefore result in unreliable ratings.<sup>21</sup>

#### Pupil-Achievement Method

One common, indirect method of evaluation is the change-in-pupil-achievement approach. This method assumes that the effectiveness of the instruction corresponds to a measurable change in the pupils. Although there is much to support this idea, there is considerable room for doubt as to the wisdom of its use, say Ronald F. Campbell of the University of Chicago; John E. Corbally, Jr., of Ohio State University; and John A. Ramseyer of Ohio State University.<sup>22</sup>

Use of achievement tests.--The development of standardized achievement tests is a boon to the practice of measuring teacher competence by pupil achievement. As Reeder explains, arithmetic tests have been used to measure how much arithmetic a student has learned; likewise, in most subjects there are standardized tests to measure the achievement level in that subject.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup>Reeder, op. cit., pp. 188-189.

<sup>22</sup>Ronald F. Campbell, John E. Corbally, Jr., and John A. Ramseyer, Introduction to Educational Administration, p. 108.

<sup>23</sup>Reeder, op. cit., p. 190.

Use of achievement quotient.--Douglas E. Lawson of Southern Illinois University suggests the use of an achievement quotient in determining a teacher's success through his pupils.<sup>24</sup> The achievement quotient is determined by dividing a student's mental age, established by an intelligence test, into his achievement test score and multiplying the resultant figure by one hundred. He seems to feel that an increase in achievement quotient indicates that superior teaching is taking place; however, he does admit that there are many areas of learning which this method would not measure and suggests that it be used only in a supplementary manner.

Fallacies of the pupil-achievement method of rating.--The development of skills, as Reeder explains, is not the only objective of schools, and there are no instruments available to measure the intangible items such as honesty, ambition, and an integration of personality.<sup>25</sup> Allowances must also be made for incidental factors that affect teaching and learning which the tests applied do not measure, as is mentioned by Chandler and Petty.<sup>26</sup> Many factors involving community

---

<sup>24</sup>Douglas E. Lawson, School Administration: Procedure and Policies, pp. 106-108.

<sup>25</sup>Reeder, op. cit., pp. 191-192.

<sup>26</sup>Chandler and Petty, op. cit., pp. 277-279.

problems, home life, and personality difficulties may be overlooked, even though they may have a strong effect on the learning that takes place. Neither is any evidence available to indicate that it is possible to determine what part of a student's knowledge is definitely attributed to a certain teacher.

Chandler and Petty further note that any indirect method of rating has attendant weaknesses.<sup>27</sup> Knowledge on the part of the teacher that pupil-accomplishment rating is being used may cause him to adapt a purely subject-matter approach and thus breach the modern philosophy of education. Measurement devices probably will not take into consideration the strengths and weaknesses of a class since they are designed to be applied to a wide variety of classes.

After noting many of the aforementioned weaknesses, Stoops and Rafferty conclude that rating based on pupil results "should always be administered in the light of partial rather than total evaluation."<sup>28</sup>

#### Rating of Teachers by Pupils

The pupil-rating method of evaluation of teachers, as Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer note, rests on the assumption

---

<sup>27</sup>Ibid.

<sup>28</sup>Stoops and Rafferty, op. cit., p. 432.

that students are competent to judge whether or not they are being well taught.<sup>29</sup>

Unsuppressed opinions needed.--In using this method, one should remember that, as Beecher states, it is necessary to obtain the voluntary, uncontrolled, unrestricted responses of pupils which can be obtained only in confidence.<sup>30</sup> This condition is difficult to achieve in the average school situation. To a certain extent, true pupil response may be obtained by direct observation of their reactions, although this method is evidently limited.

Example of a pupil-rating form.--Except for the fact that many pupil-rating forms call for a statement answer rather than a grade-type of response, the card in Figure 1 is sufficiently typical to illustrate this type of device. It lists a number of items to which the pupil responds by noting how he feels that the teacher performs in relation to each one.

Use by teacher.--A teacher who can secure honest reactions from his pupils may profit considerably by asking for their

---

<sup>29</sup>Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer, op. cit., p. 107.

<sup>30</sup>Beecher, op. cit., p. 41.

**FORM FOR PUPIL EVALUATION OF TEACHERS\***

**Directions**

You are requested to evaluate the teacher by circling certain letters. You are not asked to write anything. Your name is not requested. Please be honest, fair, and sincere. Please circle the appropriate letters after each statement. The letters have the same meaning in this valuation as they have on your grade sheet or report card.

- |                                   |           |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Knowledge of subject           | A B C D E |
| 2. Understanding pupils           | A B C D E |
| 3. Reasonableness in requirements | A B C D E |
| 4. Fairness in marking            | A B C D E |
| 5. Interest in pupils             | A B C D E |
| 6. Human qualities                | A B C D E |
| 7. Sense of humor                 | A B C D E |
| 8. Standards for learning         | A B C D E |
| 9. Interest in rapid learners     | A B C D E |
| 10. Interest in slower learners   | A B C D E |
| 11. Likableness                   | A B C D E |
| 12. General effectiveness         | A B C D E |

\*Clarence A. Weber, Personnel Problems of School Administration, p. 117.

FIGURE 1

EXAMPLE OF A PUPIL-RATING CARD

evaluations, thereby keeping a continual check on the balance of his program. If, however, these evaluations are turned over to a superior, complications are invited, states Lester S. Vander Werf, Dean of the College of Education at Northwestern University in Boston, Massachusetts.<sup>31</sup>

Weaknesses of pupil-rating.--Many investigations have been made on this subject, but the results are conflicting. Reeder concurs with the above statement and then goes on to state that pupil ratings are of value only as a partial basis for rating at the secondary level and of no value at all below that level.<sup>32</sup>

"As might be expected," says Beecher, "pupils' liking for teachers correlate highly with their ratings of these teachers."<sup>33</sup> Stoops and Rafferty agree in stating that often the evaluations of teachers by pupils are "the result merely of popularity factors which are not always correlative with the highest standards of teaching."<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup>Lester S. Vander Werf, "Evaluation of Teaching," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, XI (October, 1956), 81.

<sup>32</sup>Reeder, op. cit., p. 192.

<sup>33</sup>Beecher, op. cit., p. 43.

<sup>34</sup>Stoops and Rafferty, op. cit., pp. 435-436.

Although some early studies show some correlation between ratings of pupils and the ratings of supposed authorities, a report by the New York State Teachers Association states that recent studies contradict this presumption and indicate that pupils and adults do not rate by the same standards.<sup>35</sup> Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer feel that pupils are not acquainted with the duties that most school systems expect their teachers to fulfill.<sup>36</sup>

#### Rating Scales and Score Cards

A check scale, rating scale, or score card consists of a group of observable traits or attributes, each of which is considered to contribute to good teaching, as this variety is described in a research publication on the subject of rating.<sup>37</sup> The teacher is rated on each point according to the directions which accompany the instrument. Different arrangements and ways of grouping items enable some of them to be weighted differently from others.

---

<sup>35</sup>New York State Teachers Association, Progress Report on Continuing Survey of Research on Teacher Evaluation, p. 9.

<sup>36</sup>Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer, op. cit., p. 107.

<sup>37</sup>Department of Classroom Teachers and Research Division of the National Education Association, op. cit., p. 9.

Check scales predominate.--Because of a desire to make ratings more objective, according to Reeder, the score card or rating scale has been given such prominence that several hundred such devices are known to be in use.<sup>38</sup> Jacobson, Reavis, and Logsdon assert that, of the types of rating devices found to be in use, "the check list has the greatest usage."<sup>39</sup>

William C. Reavis and Dan Cooper, who assisted Reavis, made a survey of 1,737 cities ranging in population from 2,500 to 100,000.<sup>40</sup> They found that 99 per cent of the schools surveyed used a rating device and that 75 per cent employed a check scale.

Characterization score card.--A variation of the characterization report is the characterization score card. This method is described in a National Education Association publication. The characterization report calls for the rater to give the teacher a grade of "A," "B," "C," or "D" on each of several character traits.<sup>41</sup> Since definitions of these traits

---

<sup>38</sup>Reeder, op. cit., pp. 185-186.

<sup>39</sup>Jacobson, Reavis, and Logsdon, op. cit., p. 481.

<sup>40</sup>William C. Reavis and Dan Cooper, Evaluation of Teacher Merit in City School Systems, p. 18.

<sup>41</sup>Department of Classroom Teachers and Research Division of the National Education Association, op. cit., pp. 8-9.

are not given, the device is rather subjective and only vaguely fits into the ranks of score cards.

Point-scored rating card.--The score card used in the state of Delaware is a typical example of a point-scored rating card, as may be seen in Figure 2. In using it, the rater scores the teacher in points, the total of which may be one hundred, in the case of a perfect score. The points are distributed among five categories, some of which are weighted differently, and each category is in turn divided into weighted topics. Definitions of terms used on the card are spelled out rather thoroughly on the reverse side of the card. Further subdivisions of points are also listed there to aid the rater in arriving at the number of points for each topic or category. The meaning of the point-score, in letters, is also given on the back of the card. A score of ninety or above classifies a teacher as an "A" teacher, from eighty up to ninety means a "B" teacher, from sixty-five up to eighty indicates a "C" teacher, and all scores below sixty-five mark a teacher as a "D" teacher.

Forced-choice rating scale.--A forced-choice rating scale requires the rater to decide on a definite relative score, usually on a scale of one-to-three or one-to-five points, on each of several items which are thought to be associated

STATE OF DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION DOVER		
TEACHER'S RATING CARD*		
Teacher's Name.....Home Address.....		
School.....District No....Grades Taught.... Year.....		
	Possible Points	Points Earned
I. DEFINITENESS OF AIM.....	20	....
1. Teacher.....	15	....
2. Pupils.....	5	....
II. SKILL AND TECHNIQUE.....	30	....
1. Physical setting.....	5	....
2. Teaching technique.....	25	....
III. CLASS PROGRESS.....	30	....
1. Attitudes and habits.....	10	....
2. Knowledge and mastery.....	15	....
3. Skills.....	5	....
IV. COOPERATION.....	10	....
1. Professional.....	5	....
2. Personal.....	5	....
V. SCHOLARSHIP AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH.....	10	....
1. Scholarship.....	5	....
2. Professional growth.....	5	....
Total.....	100	....
RATING.....	....	....

\*Department of Public Instruction for the State of Delaware,  
Teacher Rating Card.

FIGURE 2  
EXAMPLE OF A POINT-SCORED RATING CARD

with good teaching. Some types make provision for recording a nonapplicable or no-chance-to-observe score which neither enhances nor degenerates the score for the teacher being rated.

One example which has both of these features is the rating scale in Figure 3. It is used in Natick, Massachusetts, according to Warren Himmelberger, a teacher in that city.<sup>42</sup> It is chosen for an example because it combines the common features for this type of instrument with brevity.

Beecher has published a forced-choice rating scale, called The Teaching Evaluation Record, which is based on a four-point scale, plus zero.<sup>43</sup> The zero is checked to indicate that there is no chance for observation. A rating of four is given if the practice or condition involves all or nearly all of the pupils; three, if most of the pupils are involved; two, if the practice or condition involves only a few; and one, if it is inconsistent. The final score for the thirty-two items, each of which is accompanied by an explanatory paragraph, is obtained by dividing the product of four and the number of items observed into the sum of ratings for all items. Space is provided near the end of the instrument for anecdotal information to support the ratings.

---

<sup>42</sup>Warren Himmelberger, "A New Approach to Merit," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, XLV (October, 1961), 14-15.

<sup>43</sup>Dwight E. Beecher, The Teaching Evaluation Record, pp. 5-16.

## TEACHER-EVALUATION SCALE\*

Teacher's Name.....

Directions: Please check the appropriate column at the right on the basis of the following:

- 5--Remarkably outstanding. Extraordinary performance.  
 4--Commendable. Efficient. Strong performance. Worthy of praise.  
 3--Adequate. Satisfies standards and requirements.  
 2--Inadequate. Falls short of standards. Requires constructive supervision and assistance.  
 1--Fails to meet requirements. Does not respond to constructive criticism and assistance. Lacking in either talent or incentive.  
 X--To be checked only when supervisor cannot make a rating because item does not apply.

5 4 3 2 1 X

- A. Effectiveness in the classroom
- |                                                                                                                                                                                                             |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Has thorough knowledge of subject matter.                                                                                                                                                                | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2. Uses well-organized plans for classwork..                                                                                                                                                                | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 3. Uses a well-balanced variety of effective teaching techniques (e.g., project and unit work, demonstrations, audio-visual aids, bulletins and chalkboards, exhibit cases, field trips, and homework)..... | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4. Develops sound working habits for encouraging self-direction and independent thinking.....                                                                                                               | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5. Provides for individual differences by offering a challenge to the full extent of each student's capacity.....                                                                                           | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 6. Offers willingly and selflessly additional pupil assistance.....                                                                                                                                         | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7. Maintains excellent discipline founded on respect and understanding, not fear...                                                                                                                         | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8. Maintains an attractive and healthful classroom.....                                                                                                                                                     | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9. Classroom atmosphere fosters a comfortable and eager student reaction.....                                                                                                                               | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 10. Measures students' progress effectively..                                                                                                                                                               | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 11. Shows fairness, impartiality, and patience in working with people.....                                                                                                                                  | - | - | - | - | - | - |

\*Warren Himmelberger, "A New Approach to Merit," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, XLV (October, 1961), 14-15.

FIGURE 3

EXAMPLE OF A FIVE-POINT FORCED-CHOICE RATING SCALE

	5	4	3	2	1	X
<b>B. Personal Qualifications</b>						
1. Considerate of others--students and colleagues.....	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. Displays the refinement and character expected of the professional person.....	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Uses tact in his dealings with persons within and without the profession.....	-	-	-	-	-	-
4. Uses the English language well (oral and written).....	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. Has poise and self-control.....	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. Has interests outside of the profession which contribute to his effectiveness as a teacher.....	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>C. Professional Attitude</b>						
1. Has high standards of ethics in his dealings with the profession, the parents, and the pupils.....	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. Displays a willingness and enthusiasm to work for the over-all good of the school.	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Is willing to experiment with new techniques and ideas which appear to have promise.....	-	-	-	-	-	-
4. Seeks ways of improving his ability and teaching effectiveness by professional study.....	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. Works co-operatively with fellow teachers and administrators.....	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. Is prompt and accurate in handling records and reports.....	-	-	-	-	-	-
7. Is reliable and conscientious in adhering to the school's time schedule...	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Belongs to and takes an active part in professional organizations.....	-	-	-	-	-	-
(Additional comments)						
Signed.....						

FIGURE 3 (continued)

EXAMPLE OF A FIVE-POINT FORCED-CHOICE RATING SCALE

In experimental work with his instrument, Beecher found that the index of reliability for the same observer was .90 and that for two observers it was .79.<sup>44</sup> He admitted that the rating device was defective to the extent that it was not sufficient to be used as the sole basis for the over-all appraisal of a teacher.

Chief value in identification of strong characteristics.--

The chief value of score cards or rating scales, as Reeder explains, probably lies in their suggestion of items which are thought to be characteristics of efficient teachers.<sup>45</sup> This method reduces the rating of a teacher by an administrator at least to the level of controlled subjectivity.

The forced-choice rating is an improvement over conventional types, state Edwin R. Tolle and Walter I. Murray of Brooklyn College, but even then the user will find it necessary to adapt such an instrument to his local situation.<sup>46</sup>

Weaknesses of forced-choice instruments. After considerable study of rating instruments, A. S. Barr,

---

<sup>44</sup>Beecher, The Evaluation of Teaching, p. 77.

<sup>45</sup>Reeder, op. cit., p. 188.

<sup>46</sup>Edwin R. Tolle and Walter I. Murray, "Forced-Choice: An Improvement in Teacher Rating," Journal of Educational Research, LI (May, 1958), 684.

Professor of Education at the University of Wisconsin, says that these various devices have a relatively high rate of reliability; however, there is nothing to establish their validity.<sup>47</sup> It is not possible to know, he goes on to say, whether unreliable results are due to a lack of relationships among the areas of teaching covered or to a lack of validity on the part of the data-gathering devices.

A recent change in score cards.--A recent change in score cards has resulted in a form which makes provisions for the self-evaluation of the teacher and for the cooperative evaluation on the part of the administrator and the teacher, as is noted by Stoops and Rafferty.<sup>48</sup> This change is in keeping with the trend toward the use of rating devices for the improvement of instruction.

#### Self-Evaluation

If an individual is to improve, he must understand on what it is that he needs to improve. Chandler and Petty note that self-evaluation meets this criterion through the

---

<sup>47</sup>A. S. Barr, "The Measurement and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency: A Summary of Investigations," Journal of Experimental Education, XVI (June, 1948), 216-224.

<sup>48</sup>Stoops and Rafferty, op. cit., p. 427.

encouraging of a teacher to pass judgment on himself and his work by using a guide which enumerates the areas in which a hampering weakness could exist.<sup>49</sup>

Strong points of self-evaluation.---These same authors also point out that the teacher knows best the quality of teaching that he is doing and is the most familiar with his own capabilities.<sup>50</sup> No one else knows exactly what happens in the general, everyday routine of the classroom.

A faculty which has so disciplined itself that it can, without direction from the administration, administer a test to its own members is in a position to profit immensely from such an endeavor. In fact, Stoops and Rafferty say that if it is approached in the proper spirit, "self-evaluation is the most valuable of all."<sup>51</sup>

Devices for self-evaluation.---There have been several instruments devised specifically for the teacher to rate himself; however, none is given as an example as they are very similar to the score cards or rating scales discussed earlier.

---

<sup>49</sup>Chandler and Petty, op. cit., p. 272.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., p. 270.

<sup>51</sup>Stoops and Rafferty, op. cit., p. 427.

Chandler and Petty explain that a conventional rating scale or score card can be, and usually is, used in self-evaluation.<sup>52</sup> The main difference between the application of such a scale administratively and its use in self-evaluation lies in the fact that the teacher being rated must assume the role of rater, and he must do so as objectively as possible.

Teacher-constructed self-evaluation instrument.--Stoops and Rafferty set forth the idea that the maximum results from a self-evaluation instrument will be achieved if it is constructed by the teachers to be rated.<sup>53</sup> Even then, the idea will not be acceptable to some, especially those who truly need self-analysis.

Weak points of self-evaluation.--Although few criticisms of self-evaluation may be found in the literature on this subject, the practice does not escape completely the swirl of controversies which surround the whole field of teacher rating. Since a conventional check scale or score card is often used, the weakness of having items included which are of doubtful validity and the need for the device to be adapted

---

<sup>52</sup>Chandler and Petty, op. cit., p. 272.

<sup>53</sup>Stoops and Rafferty, op. cit., p. 428.

to the local situation still apply. The second of the two is, of course, eliminated when the device is locally originated; however, at the same time, the validity may be left even more open to question. Often, as Chandler and Petty reiterate, rating devices do not sufficiently explain desirable practices, a fact that makes supplementation necessary.<sup>54</sup>

A problem may be avoided by having an understanding that the self-evaluation of the teacher will not be used as a basis for administrative action.

#### Cooperative Rating

The use of cooperative rating.--Cooperative rating is actually an extension of self-evaluation. In using this method, the teacher usually rates himself, the principal or supervising administrator rates the teacher, and the ratings are compared in conference.

Cooperative development of instrument.--Jacobson, Reavis, and Logsdon, who discuss this method, advise that the cooperative instrument be developed jointly by the faculty and administration.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup>Chandler and Petty, op. cit., p. 272.

<sup>55</sup>Jacobson, Reavis, and Logsdon, op. cit., p. 483.

Values of cooperative rating.--Beecher, who also discusses this method, notes that by using cooperative evaluation, the teacher is not only aware of the basis on which he is being rated, but he is also allowed to profit fully from the conclusions that are reached by virtue of its use.<sup>56</sup>

#### A Combination of Devices

As can be ascertained by various passages in this chapter which show that each method and instrument discussed is not sufficient in itself, no one device is the complete answer to the problem of how to evaluate teaching. Many authors suggest that no device or method should be used without supplementation, in order that adequate compensation will be made for any weaknesses. Lawson says, "It is suggested that a combination of devices be used, including self-rating by teachers through the use of scales which they themselves help to construct."<sup>57</sup> He reiterates that "there is no single device for satisfactorily evaluating teachers."<sup>58</sup> A combined report by two divisions of the National Education Association states that because a teacher is influential inside and outside the

---

<sup>56</sup>Beecher, The Evaluation of Teaching, pp. 38-39.

<sup>57</sup>Lawson, op. cit., p. 109.

<sup>58</sup>Ibid., p. 105.

classroom, "it is doubtful that any single basis is adequate."<sup>59</sup> All of the various evaluation methods have their places, but satisfactory evaluation can be achieved only through the use of many techniques, state Stoops and Rafferty.<sup>60</sup> They conclude that "the danger lies in relying too exclusively upon any one technique."<sup>61</sup>

### Summary

Rating in the informal sense is very old, and even the history of formal rating dates back past the turn of the century. Early studies dealt with teaching efficiency and scholarship. Rating scales were investigated in the early years of this century, and investigations of pupil-rating followed soon afterward. Rating investigations in recent years have seemed to branch out into all areas.

The following rating methods have been discussed in Chapter II: (1) general-impression method, (2) characterization report, (3) descriptive report, (4) man-to-man comparison, (5) pupil-achievement method, (6) pupil-rating, (7) rating

---

<sup>59</sup>Department of Classroom Teachers and Research Division of the National Education Association, op. cit., p. 4.

<sup>60</sup>Stoops and Rafferty, op. cit., p. 436.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid.

scales or score cards, (8) self-evaluation, and (9) cooperative rating.

The informal methods of rating--general-impression, characterization report, descriptive report, and man-to-man comparison--are all highly criticized because they are overly subjective.

The pupil-achievement method is criticized because it fails to take into consideration the many outside influences, ignores many worth-while objectives of school other than subject-matter accomplishments, and tends to contribute to the subject-matter approach to teaching.

Pupil-rating is undesirable in that it is difficult to obtain untainted opinions, and pupils almost invariably rate according to their likes and dislikes for a teacher, thus reducing teacher evaluation to a popularity contest.

Check scales are commended for their relatively objective viewpoints and their indications of reliability when used by different observers. They also aid in pointing out to the rater a list of characteristics which have been more or less accepted as indicators of effective teaching. However, the reliability of the indicators has not been proved.

Self-evaluation seems to have the most attributes to commend it, if the purpose of rating is to improve instruction. Adaptation of rating scales for this purpose is acceptable.

If improvement of instruction must be combined with administrative action, then the use of cooperative evaluation seems to be the best solution, which is best accomplished if the teacher rates himself, the administrator rates him, and a conference for comparison is held.

## CHAPTER III

### THE ADVISABILITY OF RATING TEACHERS

The question of whether to rate or not to rate teachers is a controversial one. It is needful that a discussion of the bona fide reasons given by proponents of each side be considered so that the examination undertaken into the current practices in the larger high schools of the state can be understood, and so that a basis may be laid on which to draw the conclusions, which will be stated in Chapter VII.

Chapter II lists many of the reasons for using or not using various devices and methods; Chapter III will attempt to discuss the topic of teacher rating in a more general way.

#### Some Arguments against Rating

The arguments against rating presented here are not all indefensible fallacies. Many of the charges have been countered by numerous writers. It will be evident to the reader, however, that there is some merit to each of these complaints.

#### Inadequacy of Devices

Subjectivity of ratings.--Since years of research have been able to come up with no significant contribution to the

development of an objective method of rating, evaluation must depend largely on subjective judgments, although those judgments should be based as much as possible on objective evidence, according to a bulletin by the National Education Association, Research Division.<sup>1</sup> Megel says, "In spite of the fact that educators have diligently sought techniques which would objectively measure teacher competence, no such device is known."<sup>2</sup>

Lack of agreement on characteristics of a good teacher.---

One of the problems in rating, as a report by the New York State Teachers Association expresses it, is that there is a "lack of agreement on what constitutes good teaching under any given set of conditions."<sup>3</sup> Ruth R. Dugan, Associate Professor of Science at Jersey City State College, puts it another way when she states that there is agreement that not much is known about what the characteristics of an effective teacher are.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>National Education Association, Research Division, Guidelines for the Evaluation of Classroom Teachers, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup>Megel, op. cit., p. 3.

<sup>3</sup>New York State Teachers Association, op. cit., p. 10.

<sup>4</sup>Ruth R. Dugan, "Personality and the Effective Teacher," The Journal of Teacher Education, XII (September, 1961), 335.

This lack of agreement on characteristics was evidenced by a study of eighty-five check scales reported by the Department of Classroom Teachers and Research Division of the National Education Association.<sup>5</sup> These scales revealed that 1,538 separate items were listed, of which 1,282 were present only on one scale. When they were grouped according to meaning, the number was reduced to 168 separate items, a procedure which indicates that some, but not all, of the items were valid.

Inadequacy of consideration of outside influences.-- The control of factors which affect learning, other than the teacher, is not adequately considered, states a report by the New York State Teachers Association.<sup>6</sup> The raw material in a school is a variable, says Megel, and therefore cannot be measured like production in a factory.<sup>7</sup>

Insufficient time for true evaluation.--James Monroe Hughes, Dean of the School of Education at Northwestern University, feels that in order to evaluate an individual,

---

<sup>5</sup>Department of Classroom Teachers and Research Division of the National Education Association, op. cit., p. 9.

<sup>6</sup>New York State Teachers Association, op. cit., p. 10.

<sup>7</sup>Megel, op. cit., pp. 22-23.

the rater must know the teacher well and be acquainted with his generalized prestige.<sup>8</sup> These conditions can be accomplished only over a long period of time during which the attitudes, responsibilities, and professional growth of the individual become known. The average rating does not allow time for these things to be considered.

#### Weakness Involving the Administrator

Bias of administrator.--If the administrator has difficulties with a teacher, he may develop a slanted opinion and not give due consideration for the facts of the matter. One of the important difficulties in teacher rating, as listed in a bulletin by the New York State Teachers Association, is the control of rater bias.<sup>9</sup>

Danger of damaging principal-teacher relationship.--If the relationship between a teacher and his principal has developed to the extent that each has a sympathetic interest in the work of the other, then this relationship cannot be improved, says Hughes, by the intervention of the type of situation

---

<sup>8</sup>James Monroe Hughes, Human Relations in Educational Organization, pp. 320-322.

<sup>9</sup>New York State Teachers Association, op. cit., p. 10.

which surrounds the application of a formal rating device.<sup>10</sup> In fact, it can lead to deterioration of such a relationship.

### Some Arguments for Rating

It has always been known, as set forth in Chapter I of this thesis, that some teachers are better than others in promoting learning, and that teachers are rated whether it is done formally or not. Reeder reiterates this idea when he notes that every teacher is classified as good, excellent, effective, poor, ineffective, or some similar classification at some time by some group.<sup>11</sup> Since such judgments are often biased and inaccurate, it is better for educators to rate teachers by some method which they can justify and which gives some indication of the degree of good or bad performance.

In December, 1953, a study was authorized by the Utah State Legislature for the investigation of merit rating. The results of the study, presented in November of 1958, have been reported by Thomas Stirling, Principal of Thomas Carr High School in Indianapolis, and Lerue Winget, Director of Secondary Education in the Department of Public Instruction

---

<sup>10</sup>Hughes, op. cit., pp. 314-315.

<sup>11</sup>Reeder, op. cit., pp. 180-181.

for the State of Utah.<sup>12</sup> This commission concluded that personnel evaluation is feasible; that, properly conducted, an evaluation program will result in improvement of instruction; and that an extensive period of training is necessary before a school district can handle the problems involved in rating.

#### Reasons for Teacher Approval of Rating

Teacher recognition of the need for rating.--Parents, other citizens, school executives, and even pupils want competent teachers. Even the classroom teachers, who are usually the ones rated, want the school to have good teachers and recognize the need for evaluation for administrative purposes. They are, therefore, not opposed to the practice, according to a collaborative report of two groups in the National Education Association.<sup>13</sup>

Teachers' opinions about rating were surveyed by the National Education Association, Research Division.<sup>14</sup> They found that only about ten per cent of the teachers sampled

---

<sup>12</sup>Thomas Stirling and Lerve Winget, "What Is the Case for and against Merit Rating for Teachers?" Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, XLIV (April, 1960), 94-95.

<sup>13</sup>Department of Classroom Teachers and Research Division of the National Education Association, op. cit., p. 1.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., pp. 18-20.

were opposed to rating. The greatest opposition was found in those cities which did not use rating.

The practice of rating teachers above average was believed to be one reason for the favorable responses which were received. If the teachers had been rated according to the probability curve, those in the lower half would probably have been opposed to the practice.

Another study of opinions of teachers about rating was conducted by Mack A. Ralston, Assistant Professor of Education at Arizona State College.<sup>15</sup> A group of 151 teachers from twenty states were surveyed. Among other things, he found that a significant majority of these teachers believed that a difference in teaching ability exists, that it is possible for teachers and administrators cooperatively to identify that difference, and that outstanding teachers should be rewarded. He also found that the promotion to a position of greater responsibility was the most acceptable form of reward, whereas salary increases were in second place.

Rating as an aid to a feeling of accomplishment.—T. L. Patrick of Newcomb College, Tulane University, says that

---

<sup>15</sup>Mack A. Ralston, "Classroom Teachers and Merit Rating," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, XLI (October, 1957), 78-79.

teachers feel a sense of accomplishment through rating because of the knowledge of progress which they gain through realization of clear goals.<sup>16</sup> For the best response, it is necessary for the rating to be specific and for the teacher to have professional respect for the rater.

Rating as a protection for the teacher.--Formal rating of teachers protects them in two ways, according to one document published by the National Education Association.<sup>17</sup> The administrator is forced to be genuinely familiar with the work of the teacher if he must make a formal, defensible rating. Furthermore, a recorded rating protects the teacher from a dishonest or malicious report. Often a person will make an adverse judgment orally, when he would hesitate to put it in writing. Similarly, formal rating encourages the rating of the work of the teacher, rather than his personality, state Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup>T. L. Patrick, "The Importance of Evaluating the Work of the Individual Teacher," Educational Administration and Supervision, XLII (January, 1956), 5-7.

<sup>17</sup>Department of Classroom Teachers and Research Division of the National Education Association, op. cit., pp. 3-4.

<sup>18</sup>Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer, op. cit., p. 107.

### Reasons for Administrative Approval of Rating

#### A basis other than experience and college preparation.--

Most salary schedules are drafted under the assumption that extra college preparation and more years of experience mean that a teacher is more competent. Reeder asserts that this assumption is many times not applicable, although it does have much merit.<sup>19</sup> Rating provides a basis other than experience and college preparation on which the administrator may rely to determine competence.

Dismissal of teachers.--One of the most troublesome duties of an administrator, as Stoops and Rafferty point out, is that of dismissing a teacher or forcing his retirement.<sup>20</sup> They further note that since the welfare of the pupils must be the prime consideration, these duties must be performed.

James O. Reiels, Assistant Principal at Nicolat High School in Milwaukee, states flatly that "it is a known fact that many incompetent teachers are employed in our school systems."<sup>21</sup> Frederick J. Gibson, Counselor at Broadway Junior

---

<sup>19</sup>Reeder, op. cit., pp. 181-182.

<sup>20</sup>Stoops and Rafferty, op. cit., pp. 426-427.

<sup>21</sup>James O. Reiels, "An Approach to Merit Rating," American School Board Journal, CXLIV (March, 1962), 14.

High School, Everest, Massachusetts, says, "It is impossible to measure the damage accomplished by one teacher who is not discharging his duties to the best of his capabilities."<sup>22</sup>

Although these may be overzealous statements, the elements of truth in them should be sufficient to show that the dismissal of unsatisfactory teachers is a very important duty of an administrator.

A rating plan should be used to provide an objective basis on which to retire or dismiss teachers. Reeder suggests that if no such basis is used, teachers who should be retained may be let go, and conversely.<sup>23</sup>

Observation of probationary teachers.--The use of a rating device can also be a very effective method of maintaining continuous observation of teachers who are on probation, as Reeder has pointed out.<sup>24</sup> In this way the teacher may be advised of his status prior to a possible terminal date.

Improvement of weak teachers.--Because teachers have been recruited from an inadequate supply for many years, there are

---

<sup>22</sup>Frederick J. Gibson, "Education's Weakest Area," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, XLV (December, 1961), 111.

<sup>23</sup>Reeder, op. cit., p. 183.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 182.

many marginal teachers who have acquired seniority or have been placed on tenure, says Victor A. Doherty, Director of the Department of Research and Measurement in the Portland, Oregon, Public Schools.<sup>25</sup> Many weak teachers have deteriorated to the point of being unsatisfactory.

Doherty further suggests that through a rating process a program of improvement could be established for teachers who have suffered deterioration. In this way deficiencies can be pinpointed and a specific remedial program prescribed. It might be required, for example, that the teacher take certain courses in summer school or consult with a psychiatrist. If the teacher should refuse to comply with the recommendations for his improvement, then adequate grounds would exist for dismissal.

Basis for promotion.--One criticism of merit rating is that it assumes that financial reward is the greatest incentive for quality performance. Research shows, according to Walter H. Hellmann, Assistant Superintendent of Schools at Fairfield, Connecticut, that if the income is adequate, promotion to a position of greater responsibility in the

---

<sup>25</sup>Victor A. Doherty, "A Solution to One Problem Created by Tenure," The American School Board Journal, CXLIV (April, 1962), 20.

making of decisions is a stronger incentive for improvement.<sup>26</sup>

Rating may be used in helping to identify those characteristics which it is assumed are needed to fulfill the duties of positions to which a teacher might be promoted, as is explained by Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer.<sup>27</sup>

Improvement of instruction.--As these same authors further point out, the main purpose of any plan to evaluate the work of school personnel is to improve instruction.<sup>28</sup> Although it has not been precisely stated, the indirect purpose of all the aforementioned uses of rating is for the improvement of instruction.

#### Summary

Many persons criticize the use of teacher rating because it is still largely subjective, the characteristics of a good teacher are not thoroughly known, outside influences on the pupil are not generally considered, and the rating is

---

<sup>26</sup>Walter H. Hellman, "The Merit Theme with Variations," The American School Board Journal, CXLIII (December, 1961), 9.

<sup>27</sup>Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer, op. cit., p. 107.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid.

usually based on comparatively brief observations. The dangers that a rater may be biased and that the teacher-principal relationship may be damaged are also suggested by some.

Others recommend rating because it is needed by the administration and accepted by the teachers. Some who favor rating declare that it satisfies a need for a feeling of accomplishment among teachers and protects them from unjustifiable oral criticism by administrators. Many advocates also feel that rating is desirable because it provides a definite basis for review of a teacher's competency; assists in the distasteful task of dismissing, or forcing the retirement of, unsatisfactory teachers; provides a systematic means of observation of probationary teachers; promotes a sound program for the improvement of weak teachers; assists in the selection of individuals for promotions; and aids in the general goal of improvement of instruction in other ways.

It has seemed, to the writer, that adequate evidence has been presented to conclude that there is more to recommend the use of rating than there is to condemn it.

## CHAPTER IV

### DUTIES AND TECHNIQUES IN THE USE OF TEACHER RATING

"The purpose of evaluating teachers is to ascertain the degree of their effectiveness in promoting learning," says Knezevich.<sup>1</sup> It is in recognition of this purpose that this chapter is included. Chapter IV deals with ways in which an administrator may gather data, use it in arriving at a rating, and put the rating to constructive use.

A comprehensive view of these procedures is necessary in order that the wisdom of current practices in the high schools studied may be ascertained.

#### Techniques of Gathering Data

A considerable number of items may be considered in the rating of a teacher. For this reason it may be well to consider a variety of means of gathering evidence in order that no important area will be neglected.

#### General Methods

Consideration of the teacher's objectives.--In preparing to evaluate the work of a teacher, the principal should

---

<sup>1</sup>Knezevich, op. cit., p. 382.

consider the objectives which the teacher has for himself and for his students, as has been suggested by George C. Kyter, Professor of Education at the University of California.<sup>2</sup> The correlation between the objectives of the teacher and the objectives of the school should be strong and positive.

Teacher behavior.--Ryans says that the behavior of a teacher is a key to several areas involved in the effectiveness of his work.<sup>3</sup> A teacher's behavior may be observed in the way that he carries out his duties and participates in activities in the school and in the community. Of course, his classroom exemplifies his behavior as well. The fact that students learn by example, as well as by instruction, forces the rater to consider the teacher's behavior, at least to some extent.

Knowledge of the teacher as a person.--Good teaching is not simply a mechanical process. Arthur W. Combs, Professor of Education at the University of Florida, feels that competent evaluation demands that the evaluator know the teacher as a person.<sup>4</sup> If a teacher is professional, he

---

<sup>2</sup>George C. Kyter, The Principal at Work, pp. 476-477.

<sup>3</sup>Ryans, op. cit., pp. 375-376.

<sup>4</sup>Arthur W. Combs, "Objective Measurement Is Impossible," NEA Journal, LIII (January, 1964), 36.

uses his own personality to adapt to his surroundings in an effective way.

Participation in out-of-school activities.--An administrator sometimes uses a teacher's participation in out-of-school activities as a criterion of teaching competency. The use of such activities should be limited, however, as not all such activities are good indicators of effective teaching.

James W. Popham and Lloyd Scott Stundlee made a study of the relationship of out-of-school activity participation and its relationship to teachers' ratings, under a contract from the United States Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington.<sup>5</sup> They used eight hundred teachers and their respective administrators in the study. Each teacher was rated by his principal, took the Minnesota Teachers Attitude Inventory, and filled out a form which gave the frequency of his participation in a wide range of out-of-school activities.

The only activities which showed a positive correlation with both ratings of administrators and the scores on the tests were these: (1) the number of professional books read,

---

<sup>5</sup>James W. Popham and Lloyd Scott Stundlee, "Out-of-School Activities May Not Measure Teacher Competence," Nation's Schools, LXVI (November, 1960), 97-98.

(2) time spent doing housework, (3) attendance at Parent-Teacher Association meetings, (4) participation in religious organizations, and (5) participation in service organizations. Ratings by administrators showed little relationship to professional education activities, but they did show a relationship to activities of community life.

In addition to the five areas of relationship above, the following were found to relate positively to ratings of administrators, but not to the scores of the Minnesota Teachers Attitude Inventory: current enrollment for credit in college courses, participation in leisure organizations, participation in relief-welfare organizations, participation in individual sports, and participation in team sports.

Effort to improve.--Many times, as noted in a joint publication by two divisions of the National Education Association, evidence of a sincere desire to improve is taken into consideration when a teacher is rated.<sup>6</sup> This practice seems to have merit when it is remembered that if one truly tries to improve, he is much more likely to do so.

---

<sup>6</sup>Department of Classroom Teachers and Research  
Division of the National Education Association, op. cit.,  
p. 7.

### Specific Observation Methods

Pupil progress as a basis for rating.--Pupil progress is used by some administrators as a basis for rating the teachers of the pupils. Usually a standardized achievement test is used to determine whether the students have accomplished as well as is normally expected in the time allotted. As has already been pointed out in Chapter II, even after one has allowed for pupil ability, this method should not be used as the sole basis for rating.

Observation of the teacher in his classroom as a basis.--A rather common practice for administrators is the basing of ratings on the impressions that are gathered from classroom visitation. This rating may be done in three ways. The principal may observe and formulate a mental impression on which to rely in making a rating later, he may take notes on which he bases later judgment, or he may use a form specifically designed to be used in recording classroom observations.

Ryans, while he was in charge of the Center for Research in System Development in Santa Monica, California, developed a Classroom Observation Record which was later published by the American Council on Education.<sup>7</sup> As may be seen

---

<sup>7</sup>Ryans, op. cit., pp. 385-386.

in Figure 4, this instrument calls for the rater to record a score of one-to-seven on each of twenty-two teacher characteristics, with extremes listed for each possibility. A trait of poor behavior is listed to the left of one, and its opposite is listed to the right of seven. In this way the observer may decide where on the scale between the words the observed behavior should be recorded.

This instrument may be used as a rating device in recording teacher behavior and teacher-initiated pupil behavior. It is listed here as an example because of the administrative practice of using some form for classroom observation, separate from the actual rating instrument.

Many principals use a form for recording classroom visitations which is more general and less characteristic of a rating device, although the evidence thus collected may be later used in decisions regarding the formulation of a definite rating. Crossley has devised a record of this type which he believes to be "a satisfactory tool when properly used by the administrator for his evaluation of observation of the teacher in the classroom."<sup>8</sup> As is evident from

---

<sup>8</sup>Crossley, op. cit., pp. 75-76.

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION RECORD*									
9-22-51									
<u>Teacher Characteristics Study</u>									
Teacher _____	No. _____	Sex _____	Class or		Subject _____		Date _____		
City _____	School _____			Time _____		Observer _____			
<u>PUPIL BEHAVIOR</u>								<u>REMARKS:</u>	
1. Apathetic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Alert
2. Obstructive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Responsible
3. Uncertain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Confident
4. Dependent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Initiating
<u>TEACHER BEHAVIOR</u>									
5. Partial	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Fair
6. Autocratic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Democratic
7. Aloof	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Responsive
8. Restricted	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Understanding
9. Harsh	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Kindly
10. Dull	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Stimulating
11. Stereotyped	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Original
12. Apathetic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Alert
13. Unimpressive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Attractive
14. Evading	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Responsible
15. Erratic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Steady
16. Excitable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Poised
17. Uncertain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Confident
18. Disorganized	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Systematic
19. Inflexible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Adaptable
20. Pessimistic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Optimistic
21. Immature	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Integrated
22. Narrow	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Broad

\*David G. Ryans, "The Investigation of Teacher Characteristics," The Educational Record, XXIV (October, 1953), 385-386.

FIGURE 4

EXAMPLE OF AN INSTRUMENT FOR SCORING OBSERVED CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR

Figure 5, this device makes provision for noting the attention that is being given to the environment, as well as for recording an evaluation of the actual instruction taking place. He suggests that it be completed as soon as possible after the administrator has left the classroom, but that nothing should be written during the visitation. This device is not presented as the ultimate instrument for recording classroom observations, but it is presented only as a general example of such devices in use.

The use of an anecdotal record as a data-gathering device.---The use of an anecdotal record as a data-gathering device in the evaluation of teachers is an outgrowth of their use in working with pupils. Observed incidents which illustrate the strong points, as well as the weak points, are recorded on the teacher's record. Beecher feels that, over a period of time, a more valid picture of the teacher will be obtained in this way than could be accomplished if another more formal method of gathering data were used.<sup>9</sup>

Use of commentary.---Hughes suggests that an administrator might ask teachers to make written reports which provide up-to-date records of their experiences, training, scholarship

---

<sup>9</sup>Beecher, The Evaluation of Teaching, pp. 39-40.

**REPORT OF PRINCIPAL'S CLASSROOM VISITS\***

TEACHER.....CLASS.....HOOR.....DATE.....

**I. Physical Characteristics of Classroom:**

1. Ventilation.....
2. Lighting.....
3. Temperature.....
4. Seating Arrangements.....
5. Decorations.....
6. Displays.....
7. Orderliness.....

**II. Teaching:**

1. Are classroom activities in line with stated  
Objectives? .....
2. Student Reactions.....  
.....
3. Work in Progress.....  
.....
4. Evaluation.....  
.....

\*John B. Crossley, "Supervision and Rating Are Compatible,"  
Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School  
Principals, XLI (October, 1957), 75-76.

FIGURE 5

EXAMPLE OF AN INSTRUMENT FOR RECORDING GENERAL  
OBSERVATIONS OF CLASSROOM VISITATIONS

records, and other activities, as a basis for evaluating their professional proficiency.<sup>10</sup> The items included and the relative importance given each will be helpful in aiding the rater to gain insight into the faculty member's competence.

Use of stenographic reports of lessons.--In a few schools, a stenographer is sent to the teacher's classroom and is instructed to record everything that is said, reports Reeder.<sup>11</sup> The transcription is then used as a basis for rating or for supervisory action. This method is very expensive and likely does not enjoy widespread popularity.

Use of tape recordings of lessons.--The practice of making tape recordings of lessons is also suggested by Reeder.<sup>12</sup> These recordings may be used for study of the voice technique of a teacher, as well as of the manner in which he presents his lessons. The machines necessary for the use of this method are available because of their use in the instructional programs of many schools.

Use of the communication system.--Since some schools have a communication system which links the principal's

---

<sup>10</sup>Hughes, op. cit., p. 325.

<sup>11</sup>Reeder, op. cit., p. 184.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

office to each classroom in the building, Reeder also suggests that it is often possible for the principal to listen to, or record, a lesson from his office.<sup>13</sup> He also adds that the teacher should be notified prior to the use of the communication system for evaluation purposes.

#### Duties of the Administrator in Rating

The administrator, according to most literature, is at least partly responsible for teacher rating in his building. If he is to do the rating, it is important for him to understand his duties and prepare himself to accomplish them.

#### Persons Who May Be Raters

The decision as to who will do the rating may be influenced by the purpose of the rating, in some instances. J. B. Sears, Professor Emeritus of Education at Ohio State University, feels that if evaluation is only for the direct improvement of instruction, it should be done by the supervisor and teachers; if it is for administrative purposes, it should be done by the administrator in charge.<sup>14</sup> Not all schools limit the duty of determining ratings to those two

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.

<sup>14</sup>J. B. Sears, Public School Administration, p. 268.

groups and, therefore, other possible raters must also be discussed.

Supervisor.--"Traditionally, judgments have been made by supervisors, as several hundred studies show," says Vander Werf.<sup>15</sup> He goes on to state, however, that he feels that this practice puts too much power in the hands of too few people. A joint report by two divisions of the National Education Association states that the supervisor should not make formal ratings at all, as it is contrary to the modern concept of supervision as opposed to administration.<sup>16</sup>

Fellow teachers.--Another possibility in obtaining ratings is to have them made by fellow teachers since they are a group which will be familiar with the problems faced by the teacher being rated. This practice has been followed for many years in colleges, notes Vander Werf, but its use in public schools is still open to question.<sup>17</sup>

Pupils.--The use of ratings made by pupils has been considered for some time. As has been shown in Chapter II,

---

<sup>15</sup>Vander Werf, op. cit., p. 81.

<sup>16</sup>Department of Classroom Teachers and Research Division of the National Education Association, op. cit., p. 11.

<sup>17</sup>Vander Werf, op. cit., p. 82.

the ratings of pupils are of value only as a partial consideration, if at all.

The teacher himself.--The rating made by a teacher of himself is an excellent device for self-improvement, as has been explained in Chapter II. However, the consensus is against the use of a self-evaluation rating for administrative purposes.

Group judgment.--Another possible practice is to have ratings of the same teacher done by several different people or groups. Darrell S. Willey of New Mexico University and Seldon E. Burks of the Alamogordo Public Schools feel that the practice of rating by a team of three in the Alamogordo Public Schools of New Mexico is a successful one.<sup>18</sup> They rely on the consensus of ratings by the principal, the head of the department, and a peer teacher.

Stoops and Rafferty say that ratings should be made by as many supervisory or administrative personnel as possible, and that it should be done as many times per year as can reasonably be accomplished.<sup>19</sup> The purpose of this theory is

---

<sup>18</sup>Darrell S. Willey and Seldon E. Burks, "Some Factors Pertaining to Merit Salary Planning," The Teachers College Journal, XXXIII (December, 1961), 3.

<sup>19</sup>Stoops and Rafferty, op. cit., pp. 428-430.

to minimize the subjectivity and possible unjustness of a rating by obtaining a consensus.

Principal.--The principal is the one who usually is responsible, at least in part, for rating teachers. This viewpoint is expressed by Crossley in the following statement:

Though no known study is available to justify statistically the statement, it probably can be truthfully said that in the majority of secondary schools in the United States, no member of the education staff other than the principal of the school is charged with the direct responsibility for the supervision of instruction and the rating of teachers.<sup>20</sup>

Patrick concurs with this opinion as he states that the logical person to make an evaluation of the teachers is the school principal.<sup>21</sup> He feels that the principal is the only one with the intimate knowledge which is necessary for effective rating of a teacher's work.

Cooperative evaluation.--Another way of handling the rating situation, as was stated in Chapter II, is to have cooperative ratings made by the administrator and the teacher, separately or together. Emery Stoops of the University of Southern California and James R. Marks of the

---

<sup>20</sup>Crossley, op. cit., p. 73.

<sup>21</sup>Patrick, op. cit., p. 7.

Los Angeles Public Schools caution that evaluation is something to be done with, and not to, teachers.<sup>22</sup>

Stoops and Rafferty return the problem ultimately to the principal when they say,

Districts which for one reason or another have not progressed as far as a co-evaluation program should by all means rely upon their supervising principals for ratings. The worst solution to the rating problem is to do nothing.<sup>23</sup>

#### Local Use of a Rating Instrument

Teaching is more than instructing. Ernest O. Melby, Professor of Education at Michigan State University, believes that "true teaching must result not only in knowledge and skill, but in altered behavior."<sup>24</sup> The necessity of considering the local situation when a rating instrument is chosen is thus evident. The measurement of efficiency of so complex a thing as teaching cannot be adequately considered without regard for its context and its resultant products.

Adoption of policies concerning rating.--In order to have an official rating program, a school system must

---

<sup>22</sup>Emery Stoops and James R. Marks, "What about Teacher Evaluation?" School Executive, LXXVII (September, 1957), 97.

<sup>23</sup>Stoops and Rafferty, op. cit., p. 430.

<sup>24</sup>Ernest O. Melby, "Role of Evaluation in Improving Teaching," Educational Leadership, XV (January, 1958), 218-219.

establish definite policies regarding the instrument and its use. The Tenure Committee, Harvey Kirkland, Chairman, State Council of Education of California, presented a set of policies which they felt should be used by school systems in setting up a rating plan.<sup>25</sup> The report of the committee was adopted on December 9, 1961, by the State Council of Education of California.

The report includes the following recommendations: policies should be established in the district through the joint action of teachers, administrators, and the board of trustees, and be adopted by the trustees; all significant aspects of services of all certified personnel should be evaluated regularly; written copies of the evaluation policy should be distributed to all personnel; evaluation should be in writing, with identical copies provided to all parties concerned at an evaluation conference to be held after each rating; there should be a procedure which permits a teacher to appeal an evaluation. Although these policies do not necessarily constitute an example of the only correct procedure, they do illustrate the need for a concise, specific policy regarding rating.

---

<sup>25</sup>Tenure Committee, Harvey Kirkland, Chairman, The State Council of Education of California, "Evaluation--Key to Tenure," CIA Journal, LVIII (January, 1962), 14-15.

Formulation of objectives.--In the decision of what instrument to use, the first step is to determine the objectives which become the criteria of effective teaching for the local situation, recommends Beecher.<sup>26</sup> Then the decision can be made either to use a published appraisal instrument, if it concurs with these objectives, or to develop one locally.

Criteria for an evaluation instrument.--A special committee for the American Research Association decided that seven criteria should be met by any valid rating instrument.<sup>27</sup> They are as follows:

1. It should be valid or ultimate in emphasis on social values.
2. Items should be easily defined and measured.
3. Observation should be based on items which can be isolated as being effected by teachers.
4. A reasonably short time should be required for measurement of included items.

---

<sup>26</sup>Beecher, The Evaluation of Teaching, p. 80.

<sup>27</sup>H. H. Remmers and others, "Second Report of the Committee on Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness," Journal of Educational Research, XLVI (May, 1953), 648-650. Members of the Committee were H. H. Remmers, A. S. Barr, Burley V. Bechdolt, N. L. Gage, Jacob S. Orleans, C. Robert Pace, and David G. Ryans.

5. Provision should be made for a lapse of time sufficient for evidence to be obtained.
6. Things to be observed should be capable of being compared under different circumstances.
7. The instrument should be so devised as to solicit cooperation from those who are involved.

Use of published evaluation devices.--The objectives stated in published evaluation devices by educational theorists are usually very general, according to Hughes.<sup>28</sup> He believes the reason for this situation lies in the fact that they are devised to serve large numbers and to fit a wide range of situations, which causes them to be vaguely worded. In a circular by the Educational Research Service, it is suggested that these devices are useful chiefly in stimulating local action and in serving as patterns for development of a local instrument.<sup>29</sup>

Local development of a rating scale.--Often a school system wishes to develop a rating scale locally as an attempt to meet the local situation more effectively. If

---

<sup>28</sup>Hughes, op. cit., p. 290.

<sup>29</sup>Educational Research Service, Personnel Evaluation and Promotion, Urban School Districts, p. 3.

this development is done, Tolle and Murray suggest that the following six steps should be and usually are followed:

1. Obtaining narrative data on job performance.
2. Analysis of the initial data and development of a list of job performance characteristics.
3. Obtaining administrative and peer rankings of those for whom the scale is to be developed.
4. Use of the characteristics listed to determine basic indices.
5. Development and administration of an experimental scale.
6. Development<sup>30</sup> of the final rating scale and scoring instrument.

If the approval of teachers of the finished products is desired, then it is better if they are involved in the development. Kenneth J. Rehage, Editor of The Elementary School Journal, says, "Perhaps the single most important aspect of many successful merit plans is that the classroom evaluation forms were developed by the teachers."<sup>31</sup>

The development of the instrument and the use of it should conform to all that is known about promoting a successful rating program. Edward L. Morphet, Professor of Education at the University of California; Roe L. Johns,

---

<sup>30</sup>Tolle and Murray, op. cit., pp. 680-681.

<sup>31</sup>Kenneth J. Rehage, "On Merit Increases," The Elementary School Journal, LXII (November, 1961), 62.

Head of the Department of Education at the University of Florida; and Theodore L. Reller, Professor of Education at the University of California, propose a list of six guidelines for examining an evaluation device and its use. Although subsequent research has caused the investigator to doubt the wisdom of number six, the others are basically sound, and all are presented for consideration in the following paragraphs:

Some general guidelines regarding evaluation are: (1) it should be cooperative, involving teacher and administrator; (2) it should provide for self-evaluation; (3) it should be carefully planned in light of a definition of the desired role of the teachers; (4) it should involve the collection of many data pertaining to the services rendered by the teacher and should not give undue weight to rating of the work of the teacher in the classroom; (5) it should be seen as a constructive effort, extending over a considerable period of time to assist the teacher in improving his work; and (6) it should draw upon wide resources of personnel and not be seen as a principal-teacher relationship only.<sup>32</sup>

#### Involvement of Teachers in Rating

Although several references have already been made in this thesis to the importance of cooperation of the teacher and involvement of the teacher in rating, it seems sufficiently important to warrant further consideration.

---

<sup>32</sup>Edward L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Educational Administration: Concepts, Practices, and Issues, pp. 354-355.

In planning and developing a rating program.--If democratic principles are to be followed, teachers must be involved in planning and developing a rating program. One publication of the National Education Association suggests that teachers should be encouraged to discuss the problem freely, be allowed to present their views through their own representatives, have their views truly considered by the administration, and be informed regularly and completely throughout the process of developing and implementing the rating program.<sup>33</sup>

When a rating instrument is formulated, it should be the result of a multiple effort. Reeder says, "It should not be devised by one person, even though he may be an educational Solomon."<sup>34</sup> The practice of imposing rating on teachers by the administration is responsible for its unpopularity, suggests Beecher.<sup>35</sup> He notes that in places where teachers have cooperatively developed rating with the administration, a much different attitude exists.

In the use of rating.--"On the whole, for fifty years teachers in public schools have been unfriendly to direct

---

<sup>33</sup>Department of Classroom Teachers and Research Division of the National Education Association, op. cit., p. 14.

<sup>34</sup>Reeder, op. cit., p. 188.

<sup>35</sup>Beecher, The Evaluation of Teaching, p. 2.

evaluation by superior officers," says Hughes.<sup>36</sup> This viewpoint should not be perpetuated.

Anthony H. McNaughton of Ardmore Teachers College in Auckland, New Zealand, explains that merit rating, the most objectionable kind, has been operating successfully in New Zealand since 1920.<sup>37</sup> In fact, the state department of education there was opposed to its continued use in 1944, but it was resolutely defended by a majority of teachers involved.

Fears of teachers in regard to rating can, and should be, dispelled. It has been realized for years that security and emotional stability are necessary for an effective learning situation. Some of the same needs are present in the teacher's effective working situation, as is explained by Beecher.<sup>38</sup> Many teachers who are about to be rated feel that their whole future is at stake and that years of preparation may be laid to waste by the effects of an appraisal device.

In order that these fears of the unknown may be dispelled, it is needful that teachers understand fully what is expected of them in the rating procedure and exactly how

---

<sup>36</sup>Hughes, op. cit., p. 313.

<sup>37</sup>Anthony H. McNaughton, "How New Zealand Merit Rates Its Teachers," School Executive, LXXVII (September, 1957), 102.

<sup>38</sup>Beecher, The Evaluation of Teaching, pp. 81-82.

they are to be judged, especially if rating is to be done only administratively. The cooperative atmosphere is best for assuring that a lack of understanding in these two areas will not hinder teachers from doing their best work.

The teacher, too, has responsibilities in assuring the success of a rating program. It is the duty of the administrator to see that each teacher is aware of his duties in implementing the program. The Tenure Committee for the State Council of Education of California suggests the following list of responsibilities for the teacher, which seems to be comprehensive;

#### The teacher

- recognizes evaluation as a means of improving service in the teaching profession; understands and accepts the need for it
- understands the role of the evaluation in the evaluation process
- knows the policies and practices of the local district and takes initiative in clarifying misunderstandings
- knows and follows the adopted education program of the school district
- cooperates in a continuous friendly interchange of ideas and information on teaching program and practice
- exercises a continuous self-evaluation of his teaching service and seeks assistance as needed
- maintains a professional and objective attitude toward evaluation; accepts and uses suggestions

--seeks help and strives for improvement in areas of weakness as noted in the evaluation conference

--works through his professional organization to improve all aspects of the evaluation process.<sup>39</sup>

#### Duties of the Principal in Evaluation

Through an earlier discussion, it has been shown that the principal will usually be directly or indirectly responsible for the rating of teachers under his jurisdiction. He should be fully cognizant of his duties as a rater or director of rating.

Reliability dependent upon qualified observer.--A rating is not reliable unless the one who makes the rating is competent. "The reliability of the examiner should be known as well as that of devices," says Barr. "It is not enough to say that the person concerned is a trained observer."<sup>40</sup> Hughes reiterates, "The evaluation cannot be better than the evaluator."<sup>41</sup> Thus it is seen that it behooves the administrator to ascertain whether he is prepared to assume the role of rater.

---

<sup>39</sup>Tenure Committee, The State Council of Education of California, op. cit., p. 14.

<sup>40</sup>Barr, op. cit., p. 216.

<sup>41</sup>Hughes, op. cit., p. 323.

Need for training.--The job of rater is one which should not be assumed without training. Part of the training for the professional job of being a principal should include preparation for the most important aspect of his work, that of being an instructional leader, as is explained by Patrick.<sup>42</sup>

Need for fairness.--It may seem superfluous to mention that the principal should at all times strive to be fair and unbiased in his evaluations. However, the charge that the principal is biased has been made more than once.

A study of 608 teachers and principals in schools of various sizes near Chicago has been reported by John H. M. Andrews and Alan F. Brown of the University of Alberta.<sup>43</sup> Each principal rated the teachers under his jurisdiction on a subjective instrument devised for that purpose. Principals and teachers were given the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and a score was determined. When a comparison was made by application of a measure of profile similarity, in forty-four of forty-eight cases, no significant relationship was found. The resultant conclusion was that no

---

<sup>42</sup>Patrick, op. cit., p. 8.

<sup>43</sup>John H. M. Andrews and Alan F. Brown, "Can Principals Exclude Their Own Personality Characteristics When They Rate Their Teachers?" Educational Administration and Supervision, XLX (July, 1959), 235-242.

relationship was found between teacher-principal similarities in personality elements and ratings of principals of the effectiveness of those teachers. These results seem encouraging.

Overrating of teachers by principals.--Principals evidently either overrate teachers or regard the term average as something less than it is usually defined.

Robert Lord and David Cole, officially doing research for a teachers college, made a survey of ratings in three school districts.<sup>44</sup> Each principal was instructed to rate the teachers under him on a five-point scale with three being defined as average. In the first district, 80 per cent were rated above average, 13 per cent average, and 8 per cent below average. In the second district, 80 per cent were rated above average, 20 per cent were rated average, and none were placed below average. In the third district, 59 per cent were rated above average, 26 per cent average, and 15 per cent below average. Subsequent research showed that there was evidence of a slightly higher than usual per cent of above average teachers in the second district. No evidence

---

<sup>44</sup>Robert Lord and David Cole, "Principal Bias in Rating Teachers," The Journal of Educational Research, LV (September, 1961), 34-35.

was found to support the superiority claimed by the other two districts.

Need for confidence of staff.--In order for a rating program to be successful, the faculty must have faith in the professional and personal integrity of the administrator. Rehage feels that personal integrity is the primary qualification for a successful administrator and is the most important aspect in gaining the confidence of his staff.<sup>45</sup>

Narrowing subjectivity in rating.--Ratings, as Stoops and Rafferty reiterate, are necessarily subjective, but they should be based on as many items of objective evidence as possible.<sup>46</sup> It is the duty of the rater, says Beecher, to "take time to actually look and listen for selected criterion evidence of strengths and weaknesses" and to "make accurate and adequate records of that which is observed."<sup>47</sup>

Preventing misconceptions.--A principal may promote the rating program by preventing misconceptions about its operation and the individual ratings of the teachers. In the manual

---

<sup>45</sup>Rehage, op. cit., p. 61.

<sup>46</sup>Stoops and Rafferty, op. cit., p. 425.

<sup>47</sup>Beecher, The Evaluation of Teaching, p. 85.

accompanying the evaluation program for the San Diego City Schools, reproduced by the Education Research Service, specific directions are given to the principal as to how he should carry on the rating program.<sup>48</sup> The principal is required to review with his faculty the evaluation program at the beginning of each school year. At that time he provides each teacher with a copy of the evaluation form for examination and study. In this way there is ample opportunity for the teacher to come to understand the program before he participates in it.

The teacher should have an opportunity to see and discuss his rating. The San Diego City Schools require the principal to hold a conference with every probationary teacher and with any other teacher who rates unsatisfactory or who requests a conference. The Tenure Committee suggests that the teacher be given a copy of the completed evaluation form and that both the principal and the teacher be required to sign the form at the time the evaluation conference is held.<sup>49</sup> Stoops and Rafferty conclude that genuinely democratic procedure requires that the employee be told the

---

<sup>48</sup>Educational Research Service, op. cit., p. 30.

<sup>49</sup>Tenure Committee, The State Council of Education of California, op. cit., pp. 14-15.

exact nature of the dissatisfaction with his services, that he be given aid in rectifying the situation, and that he feel free to contact the administrator about his rating.<sup>50</sup>

### Use of the Results of Rating

#### Direct Use by Administration

Possible administrative uses of rating.--As has been discussed in Chapter III, rating has many possible direct administrative uses. It is useful in justifying dismissal of teachers, forcing their retirement, or recommending them for promotions. Rating provides a method of maintaining continuous observation of probationary teachers and establishes a sound background for a program of improvement for weak teachers.

Rating not used as sole basis for dismissal.--"Evaluations should never serve as the sole basis for dismissal," state Stoops and Rafferty.<sup>51</sup> Failure to observe this caution can lead only to a very apprehensive attitude toward rating on the part of the staff. No rating plan has sufficient proof

---

<sup>50</sup>Stoops and Rafferty, op. cit., p. 425.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., p. 438.

of validity to justify its determination of so grave a question without some additional evidence.

Use for improvement of instruction primarily important.---

It has already been established that the primary purpose of evaluation is for the improvement of instruction. Beecher explains that if rating is used at first only as a basis for improvement of deficiencies, then strength and weakness of the process will be understandable to both teachers and administrator.<sup>52</sup> The uses of rating administratively can be added later and will probably be received with more sympathetic understanding on the part of the teacher.

Direct Improvement of Instruction

The whole theory of evaluation, according to a report by the National Education Association, Research Division, is based on the assumption that every teacher can continue to grow professionally and to improve in effectiveness.<sup>53</sup> If rating is done only administratively, then the following cautions should be observed.

---

<sup>52</sup>Beecher, The Evaluation of Teaching, p. 81.

<sup>53</sup>National Education Association, Research Division, Guidelines for the Evaluation of Classroom Teachers, p. 6.

Notification of the teacher.--If a teacher is to profit from his rating, as has been mentioned earlier, he must be notified of the results of the evaluation. Some authors believe that the teacher should be shown his rating by means of a duplicate copy, whereas others express the need for a conference during which the teacher may learn of his rating and discuss it. If a teacher is to profit from the estimation of his strengths and weaknesses, he must know what they are.

The Department of Classroom Teachers and Research Division of the National Education Association made a survey of opinions of teachers about rating. Among other things, it was found that many teachers were not shown their ratings at all and that a considerable number had not even seen a copy of the form on which the ratings were recorded.

In order to benefit substantially from his rating, a teacher must be given his rating early enough in the year to have time to try to improve in areas of deficiency. Some authors suggest that the teacher be rated and notified of his rating several times per year. Crossley says that the teacher should be notified of his first rating not later than the first week of the second semester, as it probably takes at least a semester before a definite opinion can be reached.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup>Crossley, op. cit., p. 76.

Continuous use needed.--"Appraisal of teaching should be a continuing rather than periodic procedure," says Beecher.<sup>55</sup> In fact, "the ideal rating procedure would be a continuous process lasting throughout the school year and embracing teacher work during the summer in such fields as graduate study and travel," explain Stoops and Rafferty.<sup>56</sup> A continuous evaluation program emphasizes that the primary purpose of rating is to improve instruction.

#### Summary

There are several techniques of gathering data on which to base ratings. A rater may rely on his general impression, observation of the teacher's behavior in various situations, knowledge of the teacher as a person, evidence of participation in out-of-school activities, or evidence that the teacher has a desire to improve. All of these methods of collecting data are largely informal, subjective, and general in nature.

More definite means of collecting evidence include determining pupil progress in a subject during the period of instruction by the teacher, visiting the teacher's room during class, maintaining an anecdotal record of incidents

---

<sup>55</sup>Beecher, The Evaluation of Teaching, p. 84.

<sup>56</sup>Stoops and Rafferty, op. cit., p. 437.

involving the teacher, asking for commentary reports by the teacher about himself, reading stenographic reports of a teacher's lessons, listening to tape recordings of lessons, or listening to the classroom procedure over the communication system. No method of gathering data is sufficient in itself, and none is recommended for use without the knowledge of the teacher.

The principal is either directly or indirectly charged with the responsibility of rating teachers. The use of the supervisor as a rater encompasses more than supervisory duties. Fellow teachers are sometimes useful as partial raters, and ratings of pupils may have some value in supplementary use. The teacher as a self-evaluator is a recommended rater in assisting in the improvement of instruction. For rating for purely administrative reasons, such as disciplinary action, the rater probably should be either the principal or some administrative assistant. Where ratings are used both administratively and for improvement of instruction, the use of cooperative ratings by the teacher and the administrator seems to be most highly recommended.

When a rating plan is established in a school system, it should be preceded by the adoption of policies concerning rating and the determination of objectives for the local situation. After criteria for a rating instrument are

determined, published devices may be examined and one selected, or they may be used as examples for designing one of local origin. Literature seems to endorse the development of an instrument locally by the administration and the teachers, cooperatively, where possible.

If teachers cannot be involved in the development of a rating instrument, they should at least be cooperatively active in its use. Teachers should be fully informed as to what the rating program is, how it functions in the local school, and what their responsibilities are in its implementation.

The principal, assuming that he is the rater, should make every effort to assure that he will be a well-trained, well-qualified, attentive, and fair observer. He should base his subjective judgments on objective evidence whenever possible. It is his duty to see that teachers are acquainted with the rating instrument and its use and to notify them of their ratings.

The primary purpose of rating is for the improvement of instruction. This purpose can best be accomplished by a continuous program of evaluation, implemented in a cooperative atmosphere.

## CHAPTER V

### THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

As previously stated, a survey instrument was developed for use in determining the status of teacher rating in the large high schools of Texas. This chapter presents the contents of the survey instrument and tells how it was used.

#### Development of the Instrument

Determination of included items.--Items for inclusion in the survey instrument were determined by a review of the literature examined in Chapters II, III, and IV. Questions were formulated on the basis of two areas: (1) those practices or devices about which literature was either conflicting or nonconclusive were explored; (2) items were included from areas about which literature was definite, in an attempt to determine whether practice and theory agreed.

Revisions.--After the survey instrument had been condensed to a seemingly satisfactory form for the purposes involved, it was examined by an administrator who was not involved in the final study. This administrator was known to have studied several rating devices and to have formally rated teachers in several areas as part of his administrative duties.

After time had been allowed for study, a conference was held with the cooperating administrator in which he explained what each part of the instrument meant as he interpreted it from the written copy. In almost every case the meaning was the same as the writer had intended. A few questions were revised to convey the thought desired, and the instrument was used in this final form.

#### Contents of the Instrument

The survey instrument consisted essentially of three parts: opinions of the principal about rating as it was used in his school and in general, factual questions about the school and the principal, and factual questions about the rating instrument used by the school, if one were used.

Opinion questions.--The principal to whom the survey was sent was asked to respond to each of the following thirty-three questions by checking yes if he agreed with the statement, checking no if he disagreed with it, or leaving it blank if he were undecided:

1. Salaries and promotions should be connected to the ratings of teachers . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
2. The majority of your faculty is in favor of merit rating . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
3. All teachers everywhere are rated by someone, at least in the mind of the administrator . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_

4. All teachers should be formally rated . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
5. All administrators should be formally  
rated . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
6. There is a difference in the quality of  
teaching being done by different  
teachers . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
7. It is possible to define what effective  
teaching is sufficiently well to fit  
nearly all situations . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
8. The practice of rating teachers will  
increase in the next few years . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
9. It is possible to develop a rating system  
which is truly objective . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
10. It is possible for a subjectively based  
rating to be fair to all concerned . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
11. A principal can rate teachers as well by  
relying on his personal judgment as he  
could if he were to use any rating  
instrument yet devised . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
12. The only purpose of an externally admini-  
stered rating device (administered by  
someone other than the teacher being  
rated) is to facilitate direct improve-  
ment of instruction . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
13. The most important purpose of an exter-  
nally administered rating device is to  
facilitate direct improvement of  
instruction . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
14. Externally administered rating devices  
are needed primarily for administrative  
purposes . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
15. The most important rating device for  
facilitating the direct improvement of  
instruction is the self-evaluation type. . . yes\_\_no\_\_
16. About the same per cent of effective  
teachers is present in all subject matter  
areas . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_

17. Effective teaching is basically the same in all situations . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
18. The teaching staff should participate in the drafting of any rating instrument that is to be applied to them . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
19. Formal rating of teachers is needed more in larger schools than in smaller ones . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
20. The present rating instrument used by this institution is satisfactory. (Leave blank if you have none.) . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
21. Ratings made by pupils are very reliable guides in rating teachers . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
22. The ratings of fellow teachers are very reliable guides in rating teachers . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
23. When a teacher is rated, external factors concerning his pupils, such as social background and economic tone of the community, should be considered . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
24. When a teacher is rated, his performance in out-of-school civic activities should be considered . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
25. When a teacher is rated, his performance in activities which indicate his moral character should be considered . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
26. Training in the field of teacher rating should be included in the college program for preparation of administrators . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
27. Teachers should be shown the rating instrument before it is applied to them . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
28. Teachers should be shown their actual ratings . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
29. The rating should be discussed with the teacher . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_

30. There is a positive correlation between the number of years of college training or the number of degrees held and a teacher's effectiveness . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
31. There is a positive correlation between the number of years of experience and a teacher's effectiveness . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
32. Rating teachers causes them to put forth a greater effort . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_
33. Rating teachers has a demoralizing effect upon them . . . . . yes\_\_no\_\_

He was also asked to give his opinion on each of the following five topics by filling in the blank or answering the question:

1. Approximately \_\_\_ per cent are for and \_\_\_ per cent are against it (merit rating).
2. If you answer no (to the question about whether the same per cent of effective teachers is present in all subject matter areas), what area do you consider to be low? \_\_\_\_\_ High? \_\_\_\_\_
3. Did you receive such training (training in the field of teacher rating in college)? \_\_\_\_\_
4. Within what length of time after the rating is made should it be discussed with the teacher (provided the principal answered that the rating should be discussed with the teacher)? 1 day \_\_\_\_ . 3 days \_\_\_\_ . 1 week \_\_\_\_ . 1 month \_\_\_\_ . Other \_\_\_\_ .
5. By whom should the teacher be rated? \_\_\_\_\_

Factual questions about the principal and school.--In addition to the necessary identification information about the class of the school (AAA or AAAA), its name, and the

name of the principal, the following questions were asked about the school and the principal:

1. What is the enrollment of the school?
2. How many teachers are employed?
3. How many teachers were dismissed for incompetency this year?
4. What is the principal's age?
5. How many years of experience has he had as a teacher?
6. How many years of experience has he had as a principal?
7. Does the principal hire new teachers?
8. Does the principal keep a record of visits to classrooms?
9. Are teachers in this school system formally rated?
10. Are administrators formally rated?
11. What per cent of your teachers rated above average this year?

100 per cent \_\_\_\_ 90 per cent \_\_\_\_ 75 per cent \_\_\_\_  
 50 per cent \_\_\_\_ 30 per cent \_\_\_\_ 20 per cent \_\_\_\_  
 10 per cent \_\_\_\_ 0 per cent \_\_\_\_

Factual questions about the rating instrument.--The third part of the survey instrument consisted of thirteen questions about the rating instrument used by the school system. (Instructions were given to omit this section if the school had no instrument in use.)

1. Is your present rating instrument objective or subjective?
2. Was form locally originated? \_\_\_\_ By whom? \_\_\_\_\_
3. How often are teachers rated? \_\_\_\_\_
4. What type of rating instrument is used?
  - a. Change in pupil achievement . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Rating by pupils . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Forced-choice rating scale . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. Man-to-man rating . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - e. Score card . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - f. Anecdotal record . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - g. General statement . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - h. Other \_\_\_\_\_
5. By whom is rating done? If it is done cooperatively, check more than one blank to so indicate.
  - a. Principal . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Teacher himself . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Assistant principal . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. Superintendent . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - e. Assistant superintendent in charge of personnel . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - f. Department head . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - g. Supervisor . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - h. Committee of teachers . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - i. Committee of administrators . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - j. Students . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - k. Other \_\_\_\_\_
6. Is the rating instrument an official one for the district or one used only by this principal?
7. How are teachers informed of their ratings?
  - a. General statements . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Copy of rating . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Conference . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. Not at all . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_

8. How soon are they given their ratings?
- a. Immediately . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Within one day . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Within one week . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. Other \_\_\_\_\_
9. Are evaluation records kept inaccessible to other teachers?
10. What method of data gathering is employed?
- a. Listening over intercom. . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Review of stenographic record of class . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Review of tape recording of class . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. Visits to class taking notes . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - e. Visits to class without taking notes . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - f. Other \_\_\_\_\_
11. Has a "course of instruction" been conducted in your district to train people to rate teachers?
12. What time of year is rating done?
- a. Fall . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. About mid-term . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Spring . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. No set pattern . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
13. For what purpose is the rating used? (If applicable, check more than one blank.)
- a. Improvement of instruction . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Basis of in-service program . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Sole basis for dismissal . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. Partial basis for dismissal . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - e. Basis for salary . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - f. Basis for promotion . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - g. Other \_\_\_\_\_

Additional information requested.--In a letter which accompanied the survey, principals were invited to make additional comments in the space provided on the last page if they had other opinions which they wished to express. The principal was also told that if a school used a locally originated rating instrument, a copy of it was requested by the writer.

Provision for dissemination of information.--The principal was informed in the letter that if he felt that the results of this survey would be beneficial to him, he could so indicate on the survey and the results would be sent to him when they became ready. It was felt by the writer that the results of this study would be of the most benefit if they were placed in the hands of those for whom they have the greatest value: the interested principals of the schools in the groups studied.

#### Selection and Quantity of Schools Surveyed

Selection of schools.--The class AAA and class AAAAA high schools of Texas were selected for study because they constitute a geographical area and represent a school size which is of personal interest to the writer. They also provide a definite group to which to confine the study.

It was thought by the writer that more work in the field of teacher rating has been done in larger schools which are located generally in more urban areas. This presumption also influenced the choice of schools for the survey. Of the high schools in Texas, class AAAA and class AAA are the largest and second largest, respectively.

Chandler and Petty note that large schools find it necessary to rate teachers through some device because it is impossible for one administrative employee to know each teacher and his work as well as would be possible in a small school.<sup>1</sup> Reeder concurs in the following statement:

The attempts at systematic rating of teachers have been made almost entirely in the city schools; they have been made much less frequently in the rural districts, probably because of the greater lack of educational leadership there.<sup>2</sup>

Quantity of schools.--A list of the class AAA and class AAAA high schools was obtained from the Office of the Bureau of Public School Service, Division of Extension, The University of Texas, Austin, Texas. The list was checked against the 1963-1964 Secondary Principals Directory, published by the Texas State Teachers Association, Austin,

---

<sup>1</sup>Chandler and Petty, op. cit., p. 103.

<sup>2</sup>Reeder, op. cit., p. 182.

Texas. The subsequent list showed that there were 103 class AAA and 120 class AAAA high schools in Texas during the school year 1963-1964. This made a total of 223 high schools in the two groups. The principal of each of these high schools was sent a copy of the survey instrument, or a total of 223 questionnaires were mailed.

## CHAPTER VI

### RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

#### Response to the Survey

The quantity of responses.--A favorable response to the survey was exhibited by the principals to whom they were sent. Of the 103 principals of class AAA high schools, 59 completed and returned the questionnaires. This was a response of 57.3 per cent. Of the 120 principals of class AAAA high schools involved, 69, or 57.5 per cent, returned the completed form. Of the total, 57.4 per cent, representing 128 of the 223 principals questioned, returned the completed forms.

The quality of responses.--The interest shown by the responding principals is evidenced by the fact that a considerable number made additional personal comments on the instrument. A majority of the principals participating in this study, 74.2 per cent, indicated that they desired to have a copy of the results of the survey.

Returns from principals of class AAA high schools represented an average of 762.3 students and 39.8 teachers for each school. Returns from principals of class AAAA high schools represented an average of 1,816.0 students and 77.5 teachers per school. If these averages were consistent

for all schools, the principals cooperating in this survey would be in charge of 7,695.7 teachers, which would seem to lend some validity to their judgment.

#### Principals' Opinions of Rating

The feasibility of rating teachers.--As may be seen in Table I, the majority of the principals responding felt that teachers could and should be rated. They also believed that a rating instrument could be helpful in accomplishing this rating.

The majority said that salaries and promotions should be connected to ratings, although they believed their faculties to be opposed to merit rating. Of the principals who rate teachers, 63.4 per cent were undecided as to what per cent of their faculty was for or against it. Of those who do not, 65.7 per cent did not know.

The averages of the per cents given by the forty-six principals who did respond to this question were 27.0 per cent for and 72.9 per cent against merit rating among those who rate teachers, and 23.8 per cent for and 76.3 per cent against it among those who do not rate teachers. There was no significant difference in the per cents given by the two groups. Eight principals felt that the teachers in their schools were about evenly divided on the question.

TABLE I  
OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS REGARDING THE FEASIBILITY OF RATING TEACHERS

Statement	Rate Teachers			Do Not Rate			Total			Per Cent		
	Yes	No	No Ans.	Yes	No	No Ans.	Yes	No	No Ans.	Yes	No	No Ans.
	1. Salaries and promotions should be connected to the ratings of teachers . . . . .	60	28	5	20	10	5	80	38	10	62.4	29.6
2. The majority of your faculty is in favor of merit rating	9	66	18	3	22	10	12	88	28	9.4	68.8	21.9
3. All teachers everywhere are rated by someone, at least in the mind of the administrator . . . . .	92	0	1	35	0	0	127	0	1	99.2	0.0	0.8
4. All teachers should be formally rated . . . . .	87	6	0	19	12	4	106	18	4	82.8	14.1	3.1
5. All administrators should be formally rated . . . . .	86	6	1	22	10	3	108	16	4	84.4	12.5	3.1
6. There is a difference in the quality of teaching being done by different teachers	93	0	0	35	0	0	128	0	0	100.0	0.0	0.0
7. It is possible to define what effective teaching is sufficiently well to fit nearly all situations . . .	63	24	6	22	10	3	85	34	9	66.4	26.6	7.0
8. The practice of rating teachers will increase in the next few years	77	9	7	29	5	1	106	14	8	82.8	10.9	6.2

TABLE I (continued)

OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS REGARDING THE FEASIBILITY OF RATING TEACHERS

Statement	Rate Teachers			Do Not Rate			Total			Per Cent		
	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Ans.
			Ans.			Ans.			Ans.			
9. It is possible to develop a rating system which is truly objective . . . . .	25	60	8	5	24	6	30	84	14	23.4	65.6	10.9
10. It is possible for a subjectively based rating to be fair to all concerned	32	44	17	7	23	5	39	67	22	30.5	52.3	17.2
11. A principal can rate teachers as well by relying on his personal judgment as he could if he were to use any rating instrument yet devised . . . . .	33	50	10	12	18	5	45	68	15	35.2	53.1	11.7
12. Formal rating of teachers is needed more in larger schools than in smaller ones . . . . .	60	29	4	23	11	1	83	40	5	64.8	31.2	3.9

All responding administrators feel that there is a difference in the quality of teaching being done by different teachers, and all but one undecided principal believe that all teachers everywhere are rated by someone, at least in the mind of the administrators.

They also believe that it is possible to define what effective teaching is sufficiently well to fit nearly all situations. However, they do not believe that a truly objective rating instrument can be developed or that a subjectively based rating can be fair to all concerned. These ideas seem somewhat contradictory.

They do not think that a principal can rate teachers as well by relying on his personal judgment as he could if he were to use some rating instruments which have been devised.

Although those who rate teachers are more emphatic, the majority of principals in each group believe that all teachers and administrators should be formally rated.

The principals of the larger high schools of Texas expect the practice of rating teachers to increase in the next few years. Rating is thought by a large majority to be needed more in larger schools than in smaller ones.

The purpose of rating.--The results shown in Table II indicate that a small majority of principals believe that

TABLE II

OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS REGARDING THE PURPOSE OF RATING TEACHERS

Statement	Rate Teachers			Do Not Rate			Total					
	Yes	No	No Ans.	Yes	No	No Ans.	Yes	No	No Ans.	Per Cent		
										Yes	No	No Ans.
1. The only purpose of an externally administered rating device (administered by someone other than the teacher being rated) is to facilitate direct improvement of instruction . . . . .	56	31	6	14	13	8	70	44	14	54.7	34.4	10.9
2. The most important purpose of an externally administered rating device is to facilitate direct improvement of instruction . . . . .	83	3	7	28	3	4	111	6	11	86.7	4.7	8.6
3. Externally administered rating devices are needed primarily for administrative purposes . . . . .	36	46	11	13	15	7	49	61	18	38.3	47.7	14.1
4. The most important rating device for facilitating the direct improvement of instruction is the self-evaluation type . . . . .	44	43	6	16	15	4	60	58	10	46.9	45.3	7.8

the only purpose of an externally administered rating device is to facilitate direct improvement of instruction. However, a resounding majority concur with the idea that the most important purpose of rating is to accomplish this improvement.

Because of the number who were undecided, there was no majority in favor of or against the statement that externally administered rating devices are needed primarily for administrative purposes. However, a near majority, more than concurred, said that they did not agree. Of those who answered, the principals were about evenly divided on the question of whether or not the self-evaluation type of rating device was the most important method in directly improving instruction.

The involvement of teachers in rating.--As may be seen in Table III, administrators in the group participating believe that teachers should be involved in the development and use of rating and that rating is beneficial to them. They also believe that the teaching staff should participate in the drafting of any rating instrument which is to be applied to them. An even larger majority feel that the teacher should at least have an opportunity to see the rating instrument prior to his participation in its use.

Most principals believe that teachers should be shown their actual ratings, and a very strong majority endorse the idea of discussing the rating with them. Of the 108

TABLE III

OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS REGARDING THE INVOLVEMENT OF TEACHERS IN RATING

Statement	Rate Teachers			Do Not Rate			Total					
	Yes	No	No Ans.	Yes	No	No Ans.	Yes	No	No Ans.	Per Cent		
										Yes	No	No Ans.
1. The teaching staff should participate in the drafting of any rating instrument that is to be applied to them . . . . .	66	23	4	30	3	2	96	26	6	75.0	20.3	4.7
2. Teachers should be shown the rating instrument before it is applied to them . . . . .	85	6	2	28	4	3	113	10	5	88.3	7.8	3.9
3. Teachers should be shown their actual ratings . . .	60	21	12	22	7	6	82	28	18	64.1	21.9	14.1
4. The rating should be discussed with the teacher . . . . .	81	6	6	27	3	5	108	9	11	84.4	7.0	8.6
5. Rating teachers causes them to put forth a greater effort . . . . .	64	19	10	20	5	10	84	24	20	65.6	18.8	15.6
6. Rating teachers has a demoralizing effect upon them . . . . .	10	74	9	8	18	9	18	92	18	14.1	71.9	14.1

principals who believed that ratings should be discussed with teachers, most of them thought that discussion should take place within a reasonably short length of time after the rating was given, as is shown by these responses:

	<u>Number</u>
Immediately . . . . .	3
As soon as possible . . . . .	6
Within one day . . . . .	21
Within three days . . . . .	15
Within one week . . . . .	34
Within one month . . . . .	11
Other . . . . .	3
Undecided . . . . .	15

Rating teachers causes them to put forth a greater effort, according to the majority of principals, but it does not have a demoralizing effect upon them.

Considerations in formulating evaluations.--Principals feel that some things are worthy of consideration in formulating ratings and developing the evaluation program, whereas others are not valid, as may be seen in Table IV.

The majority believe that about the same per cent of effective teachers is present in all subject-matter areas and that effective teaching is basically the same in all situations.

TABLE IV

OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS REGARDING CONSIDERATIONS IN RATINGS AND FOR A RATING PROGRAM

Statement	Rate Teachers			Do Not Rate			Total					
	Yes	No	No Ans.	Yes	No	No Ans.	Yes	No	No Ans.	Per Cent		
										Yes	No	No Ans.
1. About the same per cent of effective teachers is present in all subject matter areas . . . . .	65	20	8	16	11	8	81	31	16	63.3	24.2	12.5
2. Effective teaching is basically the same in all situations . . . . .	67	20	6	21	10	4	88	30	10	68.8	23.4	7.8
3. Ratings made by pupils are very reliable guides in rating teachers . . . . .	14	72	7	7	24	4	21	96	11	16.4	75.0	8.6
4. The ratings of fellow teachers are very reliable guides in rating teachers .	10	67	16	6	21	8	16	88	24	12.5	68.8	18.8
5. When a teacher is rated, external factors concerning his pupils, such as social background and economic tone of the community, should be considered . . .	75	13	5	28	4	3	103	17	8	80.5	13.3	6.2
6. When a teacher is rated, his performance in out-of-school civic activities should be considered . . .	57	29	7	22	12	1	79	41	8	61.7	32.0	6.2

TABLE IV (continued)

OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS REGARDING CONSIDERATIONS IN RATINGS AND FOR A RATING PROGRAM

Statement	Rate Teachers			Do Not Rate			Total					
	Yes	No	No Ans.	Yes	No	No Ans.	Yes	No	No Ans.	Per Cent		
										Yes	No	No Ans.
7. When a teacher is rated, his performance in activities which indicate his moral character should be considered . . . . .	83	5	5	32	2	1	115	7	6	89.8	5.5	4.7
8. There is a positive correlation between the number of years of college training or the number of degrees held and a teacher's effectiveness . . . . .	33	56	4	8	23	4	41	79	8	32.0	61.7	6.2
9. There is a positive correlation between the number of years of experience and a teacher's effectiveness . . . . .	55	35	3	18	13	4	73	48	7	57.0	37.5	5.5
10. Training in the field of teacher rating should be included in the college program for preparation of administrators . . . . .	81	10	2	31	2	2	112	12	4	87.5	9.4	3.1
11. Did you receive such training? . . . . .	25	51	17	9	20	6	34	71	23	26.6	55.5	18.0

They do not think that ratings of pupils and teachers are reliable guides in rating teachers. The number against pupil ratings was greater than that against teacher ratings.

Most principals believe that external factors concerning the pupils should be considered in making ratings. They also approve giving weight to the teacher's participation in out-of-school activities and very strongly endorse considering his performance in activities which indicate his moral character in arriving at ratings.

A positive correlation is not thought to exist, according to the respondents, between the number of years of college training or the number of degrees held and a teacher's effectiveness. A slight majority do feel, however, that such a relationship does exist between the number of years of experience and a teacher's effectiveness, although several concur with reservations. Several of those in agreement add such notes as "up to a point," "generally so," "up to a number," "in some cases," "given the same ability and education," and others.

A decided majority feel that training in the field of teacher rating should be included in the college program for preparation of administrators, although most did not receive such training.

Persons by whom teachers should be rated.--According to frequency of answers, principals approve raters in the following order: the principal, the teacher himself, the department head, the supervisor, the superintendent, a committee of several, the counselor, fellow teachers, and students.

As is evident from Table V, the total of per cents of principals favoring all raters was well over 100 per cent. This result was caused by the fact that some principals named several raters. One principal named eight raters, one named seven, two named five, twenty-four named four, twenty-four named three, thirty-seven named two, and thirty-seven named one. Only one responding principal failed to name the principal among the raters, making the principal by far the most frequently suggested rater.

#### Facts about the Rating Programs

Many of the questions on the survey were queries into the rating programs in use in the schools studied. These results are discussed here and are based on the answers from the ninety-three principals reporting that they formally rate teachers.

TABLE V

## OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS REGARDING PERSONS WHO SHOULD MAKE RATINGS

Rater	Rate Teachers	Do Not Rate	Total	
	No. Favoring	No. Favoring	No. Favoring	Per Cent
1. Principal . . . . .	92	25	117	91.4
2. The teacher himself . . .	43	14	57	44.5
3. Department head . . . . .	27	14	41	32.0
4. Supervisor . . . . .	27	11	38	29.6
5. Superintendent . . . . .	13	8	21	16.4
6. A committee of several .	7	6	13	10.2
7. Counselor . . . . .	5	1	6	4.7
8. Fellow teachers . . . . .	3	1	4	3.1
9. Students . . . . .	0	1	1	0.8
10. Other . . . . .	0	1	1	0.8
11. No answer . . . . .	1	4	5	3.9

Quantities of teachers rated.--The examination of all 128 questionnaires returned indicates that in most cases all teachers are rated, as may be seen in the following results:

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
All rated . . . . .	81	63.3
Only those on probation . . . .	6	4.7
Other answer . . . . .	1	0.8
No answer . . . . .	5	3.9
None rated . . . . .	35	27.3

There is no parallel in the rating of administrators. Even in the ninety-three schools which rate teachers, not many rate administrators as may be seen in the following information:

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Rate administrators . . . . .	29	31.2
Do not rate administrators . .	34	34.6
No answer or unknown . . . . .	30	32.3

Raters.--Table VI shows that the following people in the following order are most frequently the raters in the schools studied: the principal, the assistant principal, the teacher himself, the head of the department, the supervisor, the superintendent, the assistant superintendent in charge of personnel, and the counselor. The principal rates teachers in every school not included in the "no answer" group.

TABLE VI

## PERSONS WHO RATE TEACHERS IN CLASS AAA AND CLASS AAAA HIGH SCHOOLS IN TEXAS

Rater	Number of Schools Using	Per Cent of Schools Using
1. Principal . . . . .	86	92.5
2. Assistant principal . . . . .	20	21.5
3. The teacher himself . . . . .	16	17.2
4. Department head . . . . .	14	15.1
5. Supervisor . . . . .	9	9.7
6. Superintendent . . . . .	8	8.6
7. Assistant superintendent in charge of personnel	3	3.2
8. Counselor . . . . .	1	1.1
9. Committee of teachers . . . . .	0	0.0
10. Committee of administrators . . . . .	0	0.0
11. Students . . . . .	0	0.0
12. Others . . . . .	2	2.2
13. No answer . . . . .	7	7.5

The total number of raters exceeds the number of schools because several schools have ratings made by more than one individual. In the schools studied, forty-five have ratings made by one person, the principal; twenty-six have them made by two people; nine have them made by three people; eight have them made by four people; and two have them made by five different people.

Preparation of raters.--A "course of instruction" for raters has been held in a comparatively small number of districts where rating takes place. Such instruction has been provided in twenty-five schools, or 26.9 per cent, and has not been provided in fifty-eight schools, or 62.4 per cent. The remaining ten, or 10.8 per cent, did not answer.

Methods of rating teachers.--Several methods of rating teachers are employed in the class AAA and class AAAA high schools in Texas, as may be seen in Table VII. The most commonly used types of ratings are forced-choice rating scales, general statements, man-to-man comparisons, score cards, anecdotal records, change in pupil achievement records, and ratings by pupils, in order of frequency of use.

The methods of rating exceed the number of schools because one school uses eight different methods, one school uses five, twenty-two schools use two, and fifty-five schools use only one method.

TABLE VII

## METHODS OF RATING TEACHERS IN CLASS AAA AND CLASS AAAAA HIGH SCHOOLS IN TEXAS

Methods	Number of Schools Using Each Method	Per Cent of Schools Using Each Method
1. Forced-choice rating scale . . . . .	35	37.6
2. General statement . . . . .	26	28.0
3. Man-to-man comparison . . . . .	23	24.7
4. Score card . . . . .	14	15.1
5. Anecdotal record . . . . .	10	10.8
6. Change in pupil achievement . . . . .	4	4.3
7. Ratings by pupils . . . . .	1	1.1
8. Others . . . . .	2	2.2
9. No answer . . . . .	12	12.9

Subjective and objective rating instruments.---Principals are equally divided on labeling their rating instruments as subjective or objective. Many principals describe theirs as both, as may be seen in these results:

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Objective . . . . .	37	39.8
Subjective . . . . .	37	39.8
Both objective and subjective .	15	16.1
Use no instrument . . . . .	4	4.3

Origins of rating instruments.---In the schools which were surveyed, all but four of the ninety-three schools in which teachers were rated had some kind of rating instrument. Of the principals of schools using such devices, sixty-six, or 74.2 per cent, indicated that it was locally originated; ten, or 11.3 per cent, indicated it was not; and thirteen, or 14.6 per cent, did not say or replied that they did not know.

The following information shows the authors of the rating devices in the sixty-six schools which have a locally originated one in order of frequencies;

<u>Author</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Group of administrators . . . . .	14	21.2
Committee (unknown content) . . . . .	11	16.7
Superintendent . . . . .	10	15.2
Office of the director of personnel . .	8	12.1
Group of administrators and teachers .	5	7.6
Principal . . . . .	2	3.0
School board . . . . .	2	3.0
Director of curriculum . . . . .	1	1.5
No answer or unknown . . . . .	13	19.7

Of the eighty-nine schools which use rating instruments, sixty-nine, or 77.5 per cent, use one which is official for the district; and fifteen, or 16.9 per cent, have one used only by that principal. The principals of the remaining five, or 5.6 per cent, did not say.

Several examples of the rating instruments used in the class AAA and class AAAA high schools in Texas are given in the Appendix of this study. Although they are only a few of the ones sent to the writer by principals of various schools, they are sufficient to illustrate the types. Figure 6 is the self-evaluation device used by the Waco Independent School District. Figure 7 is the forced-choice rating scale used by the Wichita Falls Independent School District. Figure 8 is the combination forced-choice rating

scale and descriptive report used by the Dallas Independent School District. Figure 9 is the combination forced-choice rating scale and general statement device used by the Austin Independent School District.

Methods of gathering data.--Several methods of gathering data were found to be in use in the schools which were studied. Since one principal listed five methods, four listed four, thirteen listed three, thirty-four listed two, and thirty-seven listed only one, the total number of methods employed exceeded the number of schools.

The most common method given was visiting class without taking notes. Visiting class and taking notes was the second most common method listed, and it was often mentioned in conjunction with the more informal visits without notes. Other methods used, in order of frequency, were listening over the intercom, personal contacts, and review of stenographic records of classes, as has been shown in Table VIII.

The following results show that the number of principals who keep records of visits to classes exceeds the number who do not:

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No Answer</u>
Number	52	34	7
Per cent	55.9	36.6	7.5

TABLE VIII

METHODS OF GATHERING DATA FOR RATINGS IN CLASS AAA AND CLASS AAAA HIGH SCHOOLS IN TEXAS

Methods	Number of Schools Using Each Method	Per Cent of Schools Using Each Method
1. Visits to class without taking notes . .	69	74.2
2. Visits to class taking notes . . . . .	51	54.8
3. Listening over intercom . . . . .	8	8.6
4. Personal contacts . . . . .	6	6.5
5. Review of stenographic record of class .	5	5.5
6. Review of tape recording of class . . . .	0	0.0
7. Others . . . . .	19	20.4
8. No answer . . . . .	7	7.5

An example of one of the devices used by principals who record observations during classroom visits is the seemingly typical one shown in Figure 10 of the Appendix. It is used for recording classroom visits made four times per year by the principal or assistant principal of Aldine Senior High School of the Aldine Independent School District.

Another example of a classroom visitation record from this same school is shown in Figure 11 of the Appendix. Once each six weeks it is used both by the head of the department when he visits each teacher in his section and by each teacher when he makes a random visit to another classroom. All forms are turned in to the principal, who completes a third and different form for contract purposes.

Frequency of ratings.--The practice of rating teachers once per year was by far the most common as may be seen in Table IX. The second most common number of ratings was two per year, with three and four per year ranking third and fourth, respectively. Ratings once every two and three years were mentioned next in frequency, with continual rating and the existence of no set pattern listed the fewest number of times.

TABLE IX  
 FREQUENCY OF RATINGS IN CLASS AAA AND CLASS AAAA  
 HIGH SCHOOLS IN TEXAS

Rating Pattern	Number	Per Cent
1. Once per year . . . . .	45	48.4
2. Twice per year . . . . .	8	8.6
3. Three times per year . . . . .	3	3.2
4. Four times per year . . . . .	2	2.2
5. Every two years . . . . .	3	3.2
6. Every three years . . . . .	5	5.4
7. Continually . . . . .	2	2.2
8. No pattern . . . . .	2	2.2
9. Others . . . . .	4	4.3
10. No answer . . . . .	19	20.4

Timing of ratings.---Ratings are most commonly done in the spring of the year, with a variety of other patterns shown by the following tabulated information:

<u>Time of Year</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
1. Spring . . . . .	40	43.0
2. No set pattern . . . . .	13	14.0
3. Mid-term . . . . .	11	11.8
4. Fall and spring . . . . .	9	9.7
5. Mid-term and spring . . . . .	4	4.3
6. Fall, mid-term, and spring . . .	3	3.2
7. Fall and mid-term . . . . .	1	1.1
8. Fall . . . . .	1	1.1
9. No answer . . . . .	11	11.8

Informing teachers of ratings.---In most cases, teachers are informed of their ratings. Conferences are the most frequently used methods of conveying ratings, copies of the ratings are second, and general statements are third, as may be seen by an examination of Table X. Some principals use two methods.

Table XI, page 125, shows that teachers are most frequently given their ratings within one week. The second largest group of principals gives teachers ratings immediately. Several other different time intervals are mentioned by others.

TABLE X  
METHODS OF INFORMING TEACHERS OF THEIR RATINGS IN  
CLASS AAA AND CLASS AAAA HIGH SCHOOLS IN TEXAS

Method of Informing	Number Using Each Method	Per Cent Using Each Method
1. Conference . . . . .	67	72.0
2. Copy of rating . . . . .	10	10.8
3. General statement . . . . .	7	7.5
4. Other . . . . .	1	1.1
5. Not at all . . . . .	14	15.1
6. No answer . . . . .	8	8.6

TABLE XI

LENGTHS OF TIME INTERVENING BETWEEN RATINGS AND INFORMING  
TEACHERS OF RATINGS IN CLASS AAA AND CLASS AAAA  
HIGH SCHOOLS IN TEXAS

Time Interval	Number Listing	Per Cent Listing
1. Within one week . . . .	21	29.6
2. Immediately . . . . .	19	26.8
3. As soon as requested .	6	8.5
4. As soon as possible . .	5	7.0
5. Within one day . . . . .	3	4.2
6. Others . . . . .	12	16.9
7. No answer . . . . .	5	7.0

Teachers rated highly.--Teachers have been rated rather highly according to the principals of the class AAA and class AAAA high schools of Texas. Three principals stated that all of their teachers rated above average in the spring of 1964, and 66.7 per cent of them claimed faculties of 75 per cent above average or better, as has been shown in Table XII.

Confidentialness of evaluation records.--Most principals keep evaluation records inaccessible to other teachers. In fifty-eight schools, or 62.4 per cent, they are confidentially kept; in thirteen schools, or 14.0 per cent, they are not. The remaining twenty-two principals, or 23.7 per cent, did not say.

Purposes of ratings.--The most frequent use of ratings, as shown by Table XIII, page 128, is for the improvement of instruction. Ratings are used as a partial basis for dismissal, secondly. As a basis for promotion, as a basis for in-service programs, and as the sole basis for dismissal, the ratings are used third, fourth, and fifth, respectively. Ratings are used as a basis for salary determination only by one school.

The total uses of ratings exceed the total number of schools because six schools use ratings in four ways,

TABLE XII  
 PER CENT OF TEACHERS RATED ABOVE AVERAGE IN CLASS AAA AND  
 CLASS AAAA HIGH SCHOOLS IN TEXAS DURING THE  
 SCHOOL YEAR 1963-1964

Per Cent of Teachers above Average	Number of Schools with This Per Cent	Per Cent Schools with This Per Cent
1. One hundred . . . . .	3	3.2
2. Ninety . . . . .	25	26.9
3. Seventy-five . . . . .	34	36.6
4. Fifty . . . . .	9	9.7
5. Forty . . . . .	1	1.1
6. Thirty . . . . .	7	7.5
7. Twenty . . . . .	6	6.5
8. Ten . . . . .	1	1.1
9. Zero . . . . .	0	0.0
10. Undecided . . . . .	7	7.5

TABLE XIII

PURPOSES FOR WHICH RATINGS ARE USED IN CLASS AAA AND CLASS AAAA HIGH SCHOOLS IN TEXAS

Purpose	Number of Schools Stating Objective	Per Cent of Schools Stating Objective
1. Improvement of instruction . . . . .	75	80.6
2. Partial basis for dismissal . . . . .	46	49.5
3. Basis for promotion . . . . .	24	25.8
4. Basis of in-service program . . . . .	14	15.1
5. Sole basis for dismissal . . . . .	3	3.2
6. Basis for salary . . . . .	1	1.1
7. Others . . . . .	6	6.5
8. No answer . . . . .	11	11.8

twenty-five use them three ways, twenty-seven use them in two ways, and twenty-seven others use them in only one way.

### Facts about Hiring and Dismissing Teachers

Hiring of teachers by principals.--Although the job of hiring new teachers is not the job of the majority of high school principals, a considerable number say that they perform this function or assist in it, as may be seen by these tabulated results:

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Say that they hire new teachers .	52	40.6
Say that they assist in hiring .	10	7.8
Say that they hire none . . . . .	61	47.7
No answer . . . . .	5	3.9

Rate of dismissal.--There was no significant difference between the rate of dismissal in schools where teachers were formally rated and in schools where they were not. Principals who used formal rating dismissed an average of .68 teachers per school, and the average was .66 teachers per school where principals did not make formal ratings.

## CHAPTER VII

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Conclusions

##### Areas of Agreement

Areas of agreement between opinions of principals and authors of literature.--The opinions of the principals and authors of literature on the subject of rating were found to agree on the following points:

1. All teachers are rated, at least informally.
2. Teachers and administrators should be formally rated.
3. There is an identifiable, definable difference in the quality of teaching being done by different teachers.
4. It is not possible to develop a truly objective rating system.
5. It is not possible for a subjectively based rating to be fair to all.
6. A principal cannot rate teachers as well by relying on his personal judgment as he can by using some rating devices.
7. Formal ratings are more necessary in larger schools.

8. The most important purpose of rating is for improvement of instruction.
9. Teachers should participate in drafting rating instruments to be applied to them.
10. Teachers should be shown their ratings and have them discussed with them within a few days after the ratings are made.
11. Rating teachers encourages them to do better work.
12. The ratings of pupils and fellow teachers are not truly reliable.
13. External factors which influence the teacher and his students should be considered in ratings.
14. Administrators should have college preparation in the field of teacher rating.

These points indicate that most principals in class AAA and class AAAA high schools of Texas believe in sound principles of teacher rating.

Areas of agreement between practices in rating and accepted principles.--Practices in rating in the class AAA and class AAAA high schools were found to agree with accepted principles on the following points:

1. In the majority of schools all teachers are rated.
2. The principal is chiefly responsible for making ratings of teachers in his building.

3. The ratings of pupils and fellow teachers are not used.
4. The objectively slanted rating devices such as the forced-choice rating scale and the score card are commonly used.
5. Most rating instruments are locally originated.
6. A considerable number of ratings are based on more than one type of evidence.
7. The majority of principals keep records of classroom visitations.
8. Most principals rate teachers at least once per year.
9. Most teachers are informed of their ratings, usually through a conference and within a few days after the rating is made.
10. The most frequent use of rating is for improvement of instruction.

#### Areas of Disagreement

Practices in rating in the schools studied were found to disagree with accepted principles in the following areas:

1. Administrators are generally not rated.
2. Few teachers are raters, indicating a lack of cooperative ratings, even though ratings serve

the dual purpose of assisting in improvement of instruction and acting as a basis for administrative action.

3. Most rating devices were originated by administrators or administrative offices, whereas a very small per cent involved teachers in the cooperative development of devices to be applied to them.
4. The most common time for rating is in the spring, which is too late to accomplish adequate improvement of weak teachers prior to dismissal time.
5. Principals are not trained in rating teachers.

#### Recommendations

The rating programs in the schools studied are basically sound, but many could be improved. Only a slight majority, 55.9 per cent, of the principals responding feel that the rating instruments used by their schools are satisfactory.

#### Individual School Districts

Need for programs of rating administrators.--A program for rating administrators should be considered by the schools which have rating of teachers now.

Need for increase of self-evaluation.--The use of self-evaluation and cooperative evaluations between the principal

and teacher should be increased. In the schools using teacher rating both administratively and for improvement of instruction, a special effort should be made to reap the benefits which accrue from a cooperative rating program.

Need for redesigning rating instruments.--Principals of schools which use an administratively designed rating instrument should study the successfulness of its use. If the cooperation of the teaching staff in the rating program is not entirely satisfactory, then it would probably be well to design a new rating instrument and program for its use with the help of teachers and administrators.

Need for implementation of new rating programs.--In those large high schools where a formal rating program is not in use, the staff should study the advantages and disadvantages of rating and should try to determine whether it would be beneficial. If a rating program is implemented, it should be done through the cooperation of the administrators and the teaching staff.

Need for earlier ratings.--The reports show that in many schools a single rating takes place in the spring of the year. Strong consideration should be given in those schools to rating teachers earlier in the year in order that

time can be allowed for the implementation of programs of improvement for weak or possibly unsatisfactory teachers.

Need for training raters.--Very few schools that use rating have a training program for raters. It is suggested that the rating program could be strengthened by a provision for training in the use of the local rating instrument for all prospective raters.

#### College Training for Principals

Although the majority of principals believe that training in the field of teacher rating should be included in the college preparatory program for administrators, very few principals feel that they received that preparation. It is recommended that the staffs of colleges which train administrators should examine their curriculums and determine whether they are offering adequate preparation for this important function. If they are not, then consideration should be given to the possible modification of the curriculum so that it will provide training that may be needed.

#### Future Studies

Prediction of teaching efficiency.--The area of prediction of teaching efficiency prior to entry into service

was not explored because it was thought by the writer that the hiring of new teachers was not usually the job of the principal. This assumption was found to be somewhat erroneous as a considerable number of principals in the class AAA and class AAAA high schools in Texas indicated that they participate in hiring teachers. There is a need for investigation in this field in order that the status and the degree of effectiveness with which principals are functioning in this area may be ascertained.

Better understanding of meaning of scores.--An investigation into uses of the terms "average," "above average," and "below average" is needed in order that ratings may be made more meaningful to those other than the rater. The number of teachers who received high ratings indicates a need for clarification of these terms.

#### Need for Continuous Evaluation of Teacher Rating

The programs of teacher rating should be evaluated continuously in the light of new developments by all groups connected with them in any way. Teacher rating has made considerable improvements in the years during which research has taken place in its behalf; there is no reason to think that it will not continue to do so.

**APPENDIX**

FIGURE 6  
EXAMPLE OF A SELF-EVALUATION RATING INSTRUMENT

# WACO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

139

WACO, TEXAS

## A SELF-EVALUATION CHECK LIST FOR TEACHERS

Indicate answer by number symbols as follows: 1 (Never); 2 (Seldom); 3 (Sometimes); 4 (Often); 5 (Usually).

### 1. Personal Fitness for Teaching

Place Number  
Here

- |                                                                                 |       |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| a. Am I physically and emotionally equal to the demands of teaching?            | _____ |
| b. Am I loyal to my profession and to the school system of which I am a member? | _____ |
| c. Do I accept constructive criticism?                                          | _____ |
| d. Is my criticism of others constructive?                                      | _____ |
| e. Do I have self-control?                                                      | _____ |
| f. Is my voice pleasing?                                                        | _____ |
| g. Am I progressive and interested in self-improvement?                         | _____ |
| h. Am I careful of my appearance?                                               | _____ |
| i. Do I express myself with ease and confidence?                                | _____ |
| j. Am I co-operative with co-workers?                                           | _____ |
| k. Am I able to adapt myself to changes?                                        | _____ |
| l. Am I resourceful?                                                            | _____ |

### 2. Instructional Skill

- |                                                                                                    |       |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| a. Do I understand the nature and needs of the children I teach?                                   | _____ |
| b. Do I have sufficient knowledge of the learning process and of the subject matter I am to teach? | _____ |
| c. Do I understand and support the educational program accepted in the Waco schools?               | _____ |
| d. Do I give sufficient time to over-all and daily planning?                                       | _____ |
| e. Do I give attention to individual needs?                                                        | _____ |
| f. Do I discover pupil interests and capitalize on them?                                           | _____ |
| g. Do I encourage pupil participation?                                                             | _____ |
| h. Do I motivate children for work?                                                                | _____ |
| i. Am I interested in new and improved methods of teaching?                                        | _____ |
| j. Do I make use of services offered by consultants and other teachers?                            | _____ |

### 3. Competence in Working with Community (Parents)

- |                                                                                         |       |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| a. Am I able to interpret the Waco school program to parents and other citizens?        | _____ |
| b. Do I take part in community activities?                                              | _____ |
| c. Am I liked and respected by the citizens of the community?                           | _____ |
| d. Do I get along with parents?                                                         | _____ |
| e. Do I recognize contributions of citizens and community groups to the school program? | _____ |

### 4. Classroom Management

- |                                                                               |       |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| a. Do I give attention to physical conditions? (Heat, light, and ventilation) | _____ |
| b. Do I keep my classroom attractive?                                         | _____ |
| c. Do I strive to develop self-discipline on the part of my pupils?           | _____ |
| d. Do I keep records and reports accurately?                                  | _____ |
| e. Do I submit records and reports on time?                                   | _____ |

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

**FIGURE 7**  
**EXAMPLE OF A FOUR-POINT FORCED-CHOICE RATING INSTRUMENT**

**WICHITA FALLS PUBLIC SCHOOLS**  
**PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL EVALUATION REPORT**  
 (CONFIDENTIAL)

141

Name ..... School .....

Present Assignment .....

How long in present assignment? .....

EVALUATION	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory
Use check to show evaluation in each division. Use back of sheet to indicate "notable excellencies" and "notable deficiencies."				
<b>I. PERSONAL</b>				
Grooming				
Health				
Punctuality and reliability				
Enthusiasm and cheerfulness				
Tact and common sense				
<b>II. PROFESSIONAL</b>				
Knowledge of subject matter				
Cooperation and loyalty				
Attitude toward criticism				
Teacher-pupil relationship				
Teacher-parent relationship				
Professional interest and growth				
<b>III. TEACHING TECHNIQUES</b>				
Classroom management				
Organization of subject matter				
Resourcefulness in methods and devices				
Skill in stimulating interest				
Attention to individual needs				
General development of pupils				
<b>GENERAL EVALUATION IN PRESENT ASSIGNMENT</b>				

Recommendations:

Re-election?      Yes                      No

Continuance in present assignment?      Yes                      No                      If NO why not? .....

Date .....

(Signed) .....

(Over)

FIGURE 8  
EXAMPLE OF A FIVE-POINT FORCED-CHOICE RATING SCALE AND  
DESCRIPTIVE REPORT INSTRUMENT

# PRINCIPAL'S REPORT ON TEACHERS

(CONFIDENTIAL)

143

Teacher's Name \_\_\_\_\_ School \_\_\_\_\_

Present assignment of work \_\_\_\_\_

How long has this teacher taught in this building? \_\_\_\_\_

<b>RATING</b> Place check mark to show ratings on items in each of the four divisions. Indicate on back of sheet "notable excellencies" or "notable deficiencies."	Superior	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Unsatisfactory
<b>I. Personal Equipment—</b>					
1. General appearance .....					
2. Health .....					
3. Enthusiasm and cheerfulness .....					
4. Punctuality and reliability .....					
5. Tact and common sense .....					
<b>II. Social and Professional Equipment—</b>					
1. Knowledge of subject matter, and professional training ..					
2. Cooperation and loyalty .....					
3. Attitude toward criticism .....					
4. Relationship between teacher and pupil .....					
5. Professional interest and growth .....					
<b>III. School Management—</b>					
1. Governing skill .....					
2. Care of hygienic conditions .....					
3. Care of routine .....					
4. Neatness of room .....					
5. Care of school equipment .....					
<b>IV. Technique and Results of Teaching—</b>					
1. Definiteness and clearness of aim .....					
2. Selection and organization of subject matter .....					
3. Resourcefulness in methods and devices .....					
4. Skill in stimulating thought and interest .....					
5. Skill in making assignments .....					
6. Attention to individual needs .....					
7. Skill in drills and tests .....					
8. General development of pupils .....					
<b>GENERAL RATING—</b>					

Prospective value \_\_\_\_\_

Do you recommend this teacher for re-election? (Yes or No) \_\_\_\_\_

If not, why? \_\_\_\_\_

Should any change of grade or department of work be made in assignment for next year? \_\_\_\_\_

Please answer all questions on back of this form.

Date \_\_\_\_\_

(Signed) \_\_\_\_\_ Principal

1. Does this teacher work well with other teachers? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Does this teacher work well with parents? \_\_\_\_\_
3. Does this teacher support the policies and procedures of the Dallas Independent School District? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. Is this teacher willing to assume extra-curricular assignments? \_\_\_\_\_
5. Have you discussed this rating sheet with the teacher? \_\_\_\_\_

Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**FIGURE 9**  
**EXAMPLE OF A FIVE-POINT FORCED-CHOICE RATING SCALE AND**  
**GENERAL STATEMENT INSTRUMENT**



**INSTRUCTIONS:** The following statements describe the *superior teacher* who achieves outstanding success. For each statement place a check mark in the column which is your best estimate of the degree of success in attaining the *superior* description.

	Outstanding	Strong	Average	Minimally Acceptable	Weak
3. <b>ATTITUDE TOWARD PROFESSION</b> —Participates consistently in the building and improvement of the profession through membership in professional organizations.					
4. <b>ATTITUDE TOWARD ADMINISTRATION</b> —Recognizes the necessity of administrative policies and procedures, assists in their formulation, loyally supports them and complies with them; cooperates in accepting responsibility and activities.					
5. <b>LOCAL SCHOOL RESPONSIBILITIES</b> —Consistently promotes friendly relationships through active participation in faculty groups and meets school responsibilities including extra-curricular activities in a punctual forthright manner and with spirit of cooperation.					
6. <b>UNDERSTANDING OF TOTAL SCHOOL PROGRAM</b> —Consistently works cooperatively with all grades or subject areas and realizes that each is a necessary and integral part and has its own contribution to make to the overall school program.					
<b>COMMUNITY SERVICE</b>					
1. <b>CULTURAL ATTITUDES</b> —Manifests respect for all religious beliefs, mores and traditions of the community, and encourages the advancement of the cultural, moral and social standards of the community.					
2. <b>CIVIC AFFAIRS</b> —Consistently is well-informed on local, state, national, and world affairs, and exercises his prerogative to vote and participates in civic affairs.					

**GENERAL EVALUATION STATEMENT** (Summary statement concerning overall competency, including statements as to unusual strengths and/or weakness.)

**PRINCIPAL'S RECOMMENDATION**

- 1. To second year probation.....
- 2. To three year contract .....
- 3. To one year contract (approaching retirement) .....
- 4. Return to one year probation .....
- 5. Change from supply to contractual status .....
- 6. Resigning .....
- 7. Should *not* be reemployed .....

Signed .....

Date .....

ALDINE SECONDARY SCHOOL			
Record of Classroom Observation*			
TEACHER _____		SCHOOL _____	DATE _____
Grade or Class _____		Time _____	General Estimate _____
Room	Phy. Environ.	Atmosphere	Materials
Teacher	Appearance	Personality	Attitude
	Skill	Preparation- Plan	Knowledge
Teaching	Assignment	Presentation	Ind. Differences
Pupils	Performance	Discipline	Interest
REMARKS: _____ _____ _____			
_____ Principal or Assistant Principal			

\*Aldine Senior High School, Record of Classroom Observation, Aldine Senior High School, Aldine, Texas.

FIGURE 10

EXAMPLE OF A CLASSROOM OBSERVATION RECORD FOR USE  
BY AN ADMINISTRATOR

<p>ALDINE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL</p> <p><u>TEACHER VISITATION REPORT*</u></p>	
Name _____	Date _____
Class Visited _____	Teacher _____
COMMENTS:	

\*Aldine Senior High School, Teacher Visitation Report,  
Aldine Senior High School, Aldine, Texas.

FIGURE 11

EXAMPLE OF A TEACHER VISITATION REPORT FOR USE BY A  
DEPARTMENT HEAD OR FELLOW TEACHER

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Sources

#### Books

- Beecher, Dwight E., The Evaluation of Teaching, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, New York, 1949.
- Chandler, B. J., and P. V. Petty, Personnel Management in School Administration, World Book Company, New York, 1955.
- Reeder, Ward G., The Fundamentals of Public School Administration, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1958.
- Stoops, Emery, and M. L. Rafferty, Jr., Practices and Trends in School Administration, Ginn and Company, Dallas, Texas, 1961.

#### Bulletin

- Department of Classroom Teachers and Research Division of the National Education Association, Teacher Rating, National Education Association of the United States, Washington, D.C., 1946.

### Secondary Sources

#### Books

- Beecher, Dwight E., The Teaching Evaluation Record, Educators Publishing Co., New York, 1956.
- Campbell, Ronald F., John E. Corbally, Jr., and John A. Ramseyer, Introduction to Educational Administration, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Boston, 1958.

- Hughes, James Monroe, Human Relations in Educational Organization, Harper and Brothers, Publishers, New York, 1957.
- Jacobson, Paul B., William C. Reavis, and James D. Logsdon, Duties of School Principals, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1950.
- Knezevich, Stephen J., Administration of Public Education, Harper and Brothers, Publishers, New York, 1962.
- Kyter, George C., The Principal at Work, Ginn and Company, Dallas, Texas, 1941.
- Lawson, Douglas E., School Administration: Procedures and Policies, Odyssey Press, New York, 1953.
- Morphet, Edward L., Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Educational Administration: Concepts, Practices, and Issues, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1959.
- Reavis, William C., and Dan Cooper, Evaluation of Teacher Merit in City School Systems, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1945.
- Sears, J. B., Public School Administration, The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1947.
- Weber, Clarence A., Personnel Problems of School Administrators, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1954.

#### Periodicals

- Andrews, John H. M., and Alan F. Brown, "Can Principals Exclude Their Own Personality Characteristics When They Rate Their Teachers?" Educational Administration and Supervision, XLV (July, 1959), 234-242.
- Barr, A. S., "The Measurement and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency: A Summary of Investigations," Journal of Experimental Education, XVI (June, 1948), 203-283.

- Combs, Arthur W., "Objective Measurement Is Impossible," NEA Journal, LIII (January, 1964), 34-73.
- Crossley, John B., "Supervision and Rating Are Compatible," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, XLI (October, 1957), 73-77.
- Doherty, Victor A., "A Solution to One Problem Created by Tenure," The American School Board Journal, CXLIV (April, 1962), 20.
- Dugan, Ruth R., "Personality and the Effective Teacher," The Journal of Teacher Education, XII (September, 1961), 335-337.
- Gibson, Frederick J., "Education's Weakest Area," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, XLV (December, 1961), 110-112.
- Hellman, Walter H., "The Merit Theme with Variations," The American School Board Journal, CXLIII (December, 1961), 9.
- Himmelberger, Warren, "A New Approach to Merit," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, XLV (October, 1961), 12-15.
- Lord, Robert, and David Cole, "Principal Bias in Rating Teachers," The Journal of Educational Research, LV (September, 1961), 33-35.
- McNaughton, Anthony H., "How New Zealand Merit Rates Its Teachers," School Executive, LXXVII (September, 1957), 102-104.
- Megel, Carl J., "Summarization of Policy and Conclusions of the Chicago, March 17, Merit Rating Conference of the American Federation of Teachers," The American Teacher Magazine, XLVI (April, 1962), 3, 22-23.
- Melby, Ernest O., "Role of Evaluation in Improving Teaching," Educational Leadership, XV (January, 1958), 218-220.
- Morgan, Raymond, "Accentuation in Evaluating Teaching Personnel," National Business Education Quarterly, XXVI (May, 1948), 26-30.

- Patrick, T. L., "The Importance of Evaluating the Work of the Individual Teacher," Educational Administration and Supervision, XLII (January, 1956), 4-9.
- Popham, James W., and Lloyd Scott Stundlee, "Out-of-School Activities May Not Measure Teacher Competence," Nation's Schools, LXVI (November, 1960), 97-99.
- Ralston, Mack A., "Classroom Teachers and Merit Rating," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, XLI (October, 1957), 78-79.
- Rehage, Kenneth J., "On Merit Increases," The Elementary School Journal, LXII (November, 1961), 61-62.
- Reiels, James O., "An Approach to Merit Rating," The American School Board Journal, CXLIV (March, 1962), 14.
- Remmers, H. H., and others, "Second Report of the Committee on Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness," Journal of Educational Research, XLVI (May, 1953), 641-658.
- Rugg, H. O., "Self-Improvement of Teachers through Self-Ratings: A New Scale for Rating Teachers' Efficiency," The Elementary School Journal, XX (May, 1920), 670-684.
- Ryans, David G., "The Investigation of Teacher Characteristics," The Educational Record, XXXIV (October, 1953), 371-396.
- Steffensen, James P., "Teacher Evaluation and Salary Policy," School Life, XLIV (October, 1961), 22-24.
- Stirling, Thomas, and Lerue Winget, "What Is the Case for and against Merit Rating for Teachers?" Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, XLIV (April, 1960), 92-95.
- Stoops, Emery, and James R. Marks, "What about Teacher Evaluation?" School Executive, LXXVII (September, 1957), 97.
- Tenure Committee, Harvey Kirkland, Chairman, The State Council of Education of California, "Evaluation--Key to Tenure," CTA Journal, LVIII (January, 1962), 14-15.

- Tolle, Edwin R., and Walter I. Murray, "Forced-Choice: An Improvement in Teacher Rating," Journal of Educational Research, LI (May, 1958), 679-685.
- Vander Werf, Lester S., "Evaluation of Teaching," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, XL (October, 1956), 78-86.
- Willey, Darrell S., and Seldon E. Burks, "Some Factors Pertaining to Merit Salary Planning," The Teachers College Journal, XXXIII (December, 1961), 3.
- Zimites, Herbert, "Teacher Selection and Personality Assessment," The National Elementary Principal, LXI (November, 1961), 22.

#### Bulletins

- Aldine Senior High School, Record of Classroom Observation, Aldine Senior High School, Aldine, Texas.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Teacher Visitation Report, Aldine Senior High School, Aldine, Texas.
- Department of Public Instruction for the State of Delaware, Teacher Rating Card, Department of Public Instruction for the State of Delaware, Dover, Delaware.
- Educational Research Service, Personnel Evaluation and Promotion, Urban School Districts, Circular No. 8, American Association of School Administrators, Washington, D.C., 1962.
- National Education Association, Research Division, Guidelines for the Evaluation of Classroom Teachers, National Education Association of the United States, Washington, D.C., 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_, National Education Association Statements and Publications on Teacher Evaluation, Research Memo No. 17, National Education Association of the United States, Washington, D.C., 1962.
- New York State Teachers Association, Progress Report on Continuing Survey of Research on Teacher Evaluation, New York State Teachers Association, Albany, New York, 1959.