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ABSTRACT

LINKING TEACHER EVALUATION, PROFESSIONAL GROWTH, AND MOTIVATION: A MULTIPLE-SITE CASE STUDY

by

Nancy Calloway Wagner

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the nature of the activities, processes, and structures used to link a teacher evaluation program to professional growth and motivation. A total of 52 teachers in the Johnson City School System, who were scheduled for evaluation during the 1994-95 school year, were selected by both random and purposeful sampling techniques to participate. Data were collected through both quantitative and qualitative methods. Principals of the nine schools involved also participated in the naturalistic inquiry component of the study. Data were analyzed both deductively and inductively.

The analysis revealed attitudes, behaviors, and perceptions of those involved in the implementation of a growth-oriented approach to teacher evaluation. What were the reasons for the success or failure of the program? Through data analysis the investigator identified 12 critical elements within four major categories that influence the linking of teacher evaluation, professional growth, and motivation. The four major categories are: characteristics of the culture, characteristics of the administrator, characteristics of the teacher, and characteristics of the process. The 12 critical elements were identified as follows: a trusting environment; collaborative relationships; high expectations of growth; administrators who are facilitators or coaches and resource providers; teachers who are mature, responsible, and self-directed; and a continuous process that is individualized, formative, and structured.

Based on the findings, the following recommendations were suggested: (1) assess the culture of the school before implementing the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model, (2) provide training for teachers and administrators, (3) allow teachers to choose professional growth options, (4) identify teachers' level of readiness for self-directive learning, (5) emphasize importance of the principal's role, (6) ensure presence of the 12 critical elements identified, and (7) implement the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model as the professional growth option of the proposed Tennessee State Model for Local Evaluation.
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CHAPTER 1
Introduction

Findings from literature indicate that the field of supervision in public schools is in "a state of transition from a traditional view of supervision as a hierarchical construct, to a more democratic, or horizontal, notion of supervision" (Poole, 1994, p. 284). Such a shift has enacted what Poole (1994) identifies as two basic approaches to supervision. The "neo-progressive" supervisor focuses on reflective, collegial, and professional aspects, with a main goal of developing deliberative classrooms that encourage teachers and students to construct meaning from their interactions and investigations. On the other hand, supervisors with a "neo-traditionalist" focus support teacher behaviors that are thought to enhance student learning. In this approach, the coaching of teachers to encourage them to display these behaviors receives priority over identifying and solving actual problems of practice.

Due to the "Hunterization" of American schools in the 1980s through the use of Madeline Hunter's instructional model, clinical supervision focused more on a technological, hierarchical view of teaching and learning. The shift to a more collegial, reflective model of supervision is now apparent. The literature suggests that supervision must shift from the neo-traditional approach to the neo-
progressive approach. With the neo-progressive approach, supervisors must assume that teachers have the ability and desire to unravel their own instructional dilemmas. The supervisor's role is to support challenging conditions that permit teachers "to engage in reflective transformation of their classroom experience" (Poole, 1994, p. 287).

Implementing a supportive supervision model allows teachers to be viewed as the expert who interprets and applies research-based knowledge to solve problems related to instructional practice (Poole, 1994).

The two major purposes of teacher evaluation involve improving instruction and making personnel decisions (Airasian, 1993; Stiggins, 1986). Formative evaluation provides feedback to the teacher and encourages improvement; while summative evaluation is used for the selection of teachers and for holding teachers accountable for meeting basic competencies. According to Nevo (1994), teachers have a more positive attitude toward formative evaluation and are more negative toward summative evaluation. The purpose of teacher evaluation should not be to prove, but to improve.

With this approach, evaluation plays a more constructive role in education (Nevo, 1994). Since the majority of teachers are tenured, the primary focus of evaluation should be to improve instruction (Airasian, 1993; Ellis, 1985).

According to Boyd (1989), effective evaluation systems provide: (a) teachers with useful feedback on classroom
needs; (b) insights from which teachers develop new strategies; and (c) opportunities for coaching from principals and peers to suggest changes in the classroom. He suggests that specific procedures and standards must guide the evaluation process for it to be effective. The standards should be objective, be clearly communicated and reviewed, focus on important teaching skills, and be linked to the teacher's professional growth.

In linking evaluation to professional growth, principals should collaborate with teachers in setting specific, achievable goals. They should provide teachers with constructive feedback to improve weaknesses and amplify strengths. Peer and student evaluations can provide beneficial feedback to teachers as they seek to grow professionally.

Linking the evaluation process to professional growth requires that teachers engage in self-evaluation (Boyd, 1989). Reflective practice has become an area of great interest since 1983 with publication of The Reflective Practitioner by Donald Schon. Recognition of the importance of reflective practice can be traced to John Dewey in 1903 and is beginning to appear again in much of the current literature. However, "its implications for teacher evaluation have not yet been appropriately explored in any detail" (Reagan, Case, Case, & Freiberg, 1993, p. 263).
How can teachers be motivated to seek and achieve instructional goals? Recent studies have shown that teachers are motivated more by intrinsic than extrinsic rewards. Results of a survey conducted by Pastor and Erlandson in 1982 showed that teachers have greater job satisfaction when they participate in decision making, use valued skills, have freedom and independence, are challenged, express creativity, and have opportunities for learning. Sergiovanni (in Ellis, 1985) found that teachers are motivated when they feel they have been successful in reaching and affecting students, when they receive recognition, and when they feel responsible.

Herzberg's research (1982) indicates that individuals are motivated primarily through intrinsic rewards. Achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and opportunity for advancement, respectively, are distinct motivators of both attitudes and high performance. Haefele (1993) identified the following top five motivators of work performance: doing the job, liking the job, achieving success in doing the job, being recognized for doing the job, and moving upward as an indication of professional growth. These motivators have great relevance as stimulators of high performance for teachers.

Goal setting has an achievement orientation. Although not a panacea, goal setting is a very "effective motivational tool that can be used by any practicing
manager" (Locke & Latham, 1984, p. 3). Teachers are motivated by the achievement or significant progress toward their individual goals. According to Haefele (1993), most teachers are motivated by the work itself. He also believes that responsibility is a powerful motivator of performance. As a result of his research, Haefele (1993) suggests that emphasis be placed on the formative purposes of evaluation, motivation, and development. He considers goal setting one of the most important steps in the teacher evaluation process.

Statement of the Problem

Experienced teachers often state that evaluations are not productive. One contributing factor to their perception is the lack of a clear link between teacher evaluation and teacher development. For the evaluation process to be a positive experience for teachers and administrators, it must be meaningful, and not just an empty, disconnected exercise (Boyd, 1989).

Very little has been done in developing collaborative, growth-oriented approaches to evaluation. According to Reagan and others (1993), the "growing popularity of reflective practice as a goal for teachers will require a reexamination and reconceptualization of the ways in which teachers are evaluated" (p.276). They believe that a more qualitatively oriented approach to evaluation should be utilized to evaluate reflective teaching. They indicated
that this type of model does not exist; they propose, however, that it is "time for its genesis" (Reagan, et al, 1993, p. 276).

**Purpose of the Study**

The primary purpose of this study was to conduct an investigation of the implementation of teacher evaluation focusing on the internal dynamics and actual processes. A secondary purpose of the study to assess teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of the State Model for Local Evaluation and the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model.

This study was conducted during the 1994-1995 school year. Analysis of the data included looking at activities and expected outcomes as well as informal patterns and unanticipated consequences. Results of the analysis were used in the refinement of the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model. With evidence of its effectiveness, the refined model was submitted for consideration as an option for tenured teachers in the Johnson City School System.

**Research Questions**

This multiple-site case study examined teachers' perceptions of the value and effectiveness of evaluation as it relates to their motivation and professional growth. Five sets of attributes have been identified through research "as keys to effective growth-producing teacher
evaluation: (1) the teacher, (2) the evaluator, (3) data collection procedures, (4) the feedback, and (5) the evaluation context" (Long, 1990, p. 1).

The following null hypotheses were tested with the use of the Teacher Evaluation Profile Survey Instrument:

1. $H_0$: There will be no significant difference between the control and experimental groups in their perceptions of the nature of the evaluation environment based on their experiences under the State Model for Local Evaluation.

2. $H_0$: There will be no significant difference between the control and experimental groups in their perceptions of the overall quality of the State Model for Local Evaluation.

3. $H_0$: There will be no significant difference between the control and experimental groups in their perceptions of the impact of the State Model for Local Evaluation on teaching performance.

4. $H_0$: There will be no significant difference in perceptions of the nature of the evaluation environment of teachers who have participated in the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model and of teachers who have been evaluated using a traditional, competency-based evaluation model.

5. $H_0$: There will be no significant difference in perceptions of the overall quality of evaluation, between teachers who have participated in the Professional
Teacher Evaluation Model and teachers who have been evaluated using a traditional, competency-based evaluation model.

6. H₀: There will be no significant difference in perceptions of the impact of evaluation on teaching performance, between teachers who have participated in the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model and teachers who have been evaluated using a traditional, competency-based evaluation model.

7. H₀: There will be no significant difference in teachers' responses to the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) instrument based on a competency-based model of evaluation and responses based on participation in the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model.

8. H₀: There will be no significant difference in the control group's responses to the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) pre-survey instrument and the post-survey instrument.

The researcher gathered data from the survey and developed the following questions which were addressed in the interview process:

1. Does the evaluation process have a positive effect on teacher motivation and professional development?
2. Do teachers who use this goal setting process become reflective practitioners?
3. What attributes of an evaluation process do teachers consider to be the most important in promoting professional growth?

4. What role does the principal play in the effectiveness of the evaluation process?

5. Do principals experience professional growth and motivation from the evaluation process?

Significance of the Problem

The teacher evaluation process in Johnson City Schools has followed a traditional, competency-based model for a number of years. This highly structured process was designed to determine the extent to which teachers meet a specific level of competency. All teachers, apprentice, probationary, and all three levels of Career Ladder, have been evaluated using the same checklist and procedures. This model, with pre-conference, observation, and post-conference, attempts to combine formative and summative evaluation. However, there was no evidence that this checklist-driven model led to instructional improvement or to teacher growth. Instead, it was used as a summative form of evaluation by rating teachers on how well they met the minimum competencies defined in the Tennessee Instructional Model (TIM).

Evaluation in the 1990s must have growth as its main purpose, rather than accountability. For teachers to grow
and develop as professionals, they must become reflective practitioners (Marczely, 1992).

A more formative form of evaluation must be developed that will promote professional growth, provide external data on teaching performance, be safe and non-threatening, and be directly tied to staff development (Boyd, 1989; Poole, 1994). Thomas McGreal (1994) calls for an evaluation model that "(1) provides a much softer image of its purpose; (2) offers opportunities to differentiate the process; (3) is more individually focused; (4) supports and encourages looking at teaching in richer ways; and (5) links evaluation and professional development closely" (p. 215).

The Professional Teacher Evaluation Model was developed for use in this study. This model for evaluation was designed to encourage reflective practice and to allow teachers to become self-directing, self-evaluating, and self-correcting. With this type of evaluation model, accountability can shift from meeting minimum competencies to being accountable for professional growth (Poole, 1994).

The ultimate goal of the evaluation process is to promote reflective practice that enhances teacher motivation and professional growth. Through this new growth-oriented approach to evaluation, teachers engaged in reflective transformation of their classroom experiences. This study provided data to assist in the restructuring of teacher evaluation in the Johnson City School System. Answers to
the research questions provided a framework for enhancing the design of a formative evaluation process specifically for the professional teacher.

**Limitations**

The scope of this study is limited to the Johnson City School District or to a school district with similar characteristics. The target population is elementary and middle school teachers who were scheduled for evaluation during the 1994-1995 school year. Due to some extenuating circumstances, high school teachers in the system were not considered a part of the population. This multiple-site case study employed the characteristics of naturalistic inquiry; therefore, generalization was not an important consideration.

The short period of time for this study, one-year, precluded the collection of long-term data. It is possible that participants who experienced low quality goal development and moderate effort at implementation could develop skills, if given the time, that would enhance their goal setting abilities and implementation process. Having a longer period of time for this study would also have allowed an opportunity to examine the impact on student learning and performance.
**Definitions**

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions will be used:

1. **TEP** - The Teacher Evaluation Profile is an instrument designed to measure teacher perceptions of their most recent evaluation experience. The results detect if teachers perceive significant relationships between attributes of teacher evaluation and its quality and impact on teacher growth (Stiggins & Nickel, 1988).

2. **Standard model of evaluation** - The standard, or traditional, model of evaluation is basically used for accountability purposes. It is a formal and structured process that is designed to measure minimum competencies (Haefele, 1993).

3. **Formative evaluation** - Formative evaluation promotes professional development of teachers by providing them with opportunities for growth and feedback on progress (Millman, 1981; Stiggins, 1986).

4. **Summative evaluation** - Summative evaluation provides information for use in decisions regarding personnel; hiring, firing, promotion, tenure, and merit pay (Millman, 1981; Stiggins, 1986).

5. **Competent Teacher** - A teacher is considered to be competent when the ability to effectively perform the minimum competencies included in the Tennessee Career
Ladder State Model for Local Evaluation has been demonstrated.

6. **Professional Teacher Evaluation Model** - This model for evaluation is based on a goal-setting process that encourages reflective practice and professional growth and development.

7. **Professional Development** - Professional development is designed for individuals and leads to increased personal understanding and awareness. Professional development is guided by individual goals and focuses on the unique needs of individuals (Duke, 1990).

8. **Tennessee Career Ladder State Model For Evaluation** - This State approved model of evaluation assesses the performance of competencies/skills deemed important to effective teaching. The instruments include checklists and rating scales, as well as a developmental plan.

9. **Probationary teacher** - In Tennessee, teachers who are beginning their first year of teaching are considered probationary teachers. The State requires that these teachers be evaluated in the probationary year using the state model for evaluation.

10. **Apprentice teacher** - In Tennessee, apprentice teachers are teachers who are in their second through their fourth years of teaching. Apprentice teachers must be evaluated using the state model each year.
11. **Professional teacher** - In Tennessee, professional teachers are considered Career Level I teachers and must be evaluated using the state model twice during a ten-year period.

12. **Career Ladder levels** - The Tennessee Career Ladder Program has three levels above the probationary and apprentice stages: Career Level I, Career Level II, and Career Level III. This program is a merit pay system where teachers who reach Career Level I, II, or III status receive supplements and the opportunity to work extended contracts.

**Overview of the Study**

Chapter One includes the following: (a) an introduction, (b) the problem statement, (c) the purpose and significance of the study, (d) the hypothesis and research questions, (e) limitations, (f) definition of terms, and (g) an overview of the study.

Chapter Two presents a review of the literature pertinent to the study and reflects the opinion of authorities. This chapter provides the theoretical framework and research base for the development of formative model for teacher evaluation.

In Chapter Three, a description is presented of the following: (a) the target population, (b) the subjects involved, (c) the sampling method, (d) the research design and procedures followed, and (e) the measure employed to
analyze the data. A rationale for the instruments and strategies selected to measure the variables is presented. The validity and reliability of the instrument are also discussed.

Chapter Four presents a description of the findings and the techniques employed to analyze both the quantitative and qualitative data. Critical elements influencing linking teacher evaluation, professional growth, and motivation are identified and discussed.

Chapter Five includes a summary of the research problem, methods, and findings and a presentation of conclusions and recommendations. Theoretical concepts, previous research, and results of this study are examined to provide a framework for an evaluation model that will promote reflective practice that fosters teacher growth and development.
CHAPTER 2
Review of Related Literature

Introduction

The purpose of Chapter Two is to present a review of related literature concerning the effects of different forms of evaluation on teacher performance, professional growth, and motivation. The first part of the literature review focuses on the major purposes of teacher evaluation. Several factors such as state and district mandates, collective bargaining units, and barriers to effective evaluation are addressed.

The next section provides a description of various models of evaluation. Both formative and summative models are reviewed. Evaluation models that have both summative and formative components are also discussed.

The third section of the review of literature addresses previous research on evaluation. The impact of evaluation on teacher/principal relationships, teacher motivation, and professional growth, is examined through a wide body of research.

The fourth section of this chapter presents a discussion of implications for school systems in the development of growth-oriented approaches to teacher evaluation. The importance of an effective work culture is emphasized.
A summary of the literature review is followed by research questions that guided the initial stages of this study. These questions emerged as a result of the literature review. However, due to the qualitative nature of the study, the researcher was prepared to change or eliminate the original questions and include additional questions, as the design of the study emerged (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1989).

Purposes of Teacher Evaluation

The two major purposes of teacher evaluation are formative and summative. Formative evaluation provides feedback to the teacher and encourages improvement; while summative evaluation is used for the selection of teachers and accountability (Airasian, 1993; Manatt, 1988; McGreal, 1988; Millman, 1981; Stiggins, 1986).

Teacher evaluation is an integral component in the professional life-cycle of teachers. In most cases the main purposes of teacher evaluation are to control teachers, to motivate them, to hold them accountable, or to get rid of them when they perform poorly. As a result, evaluation has an image of being against teachers rather than for teachers (Nevo, 1994).

The field of supervision in public schools is in "a state of transition from a traditional view of supervision as a hierarchical construct, to a more democratic, or
According to Poole (1994), there are two basic approaches to supervision. The "neo-progressive" supervisor focuses on reflective, collegial, and professional aspects, with the main goal of developing deliberative classrooms that encourage teachers and students to construct meaning from their interactions and investigations. Supervisors who are "neo-traditionalist," on the other hand, focus on teacher behaviors that are thought to enhance student learning. In this approach, the coaching of teachers to encourage them to display these behaviors receives priority over identifying and solving actual problems of practice.

Performance appraisals, although designed to "motivate and stimulate the development of the individual's strengths and correct any weaknesses so that the person is of maximum value to the organization, sometimes reduce performance to a level lower than where it was prior to the appraisal" (Locke & Latham, 1984, p. 77). The classic study conducted at the General Electric Company concluded that criticism caused performance declines. The findings of this study emphasized the importance of goal setting in improving performance. According to Locke and Latham (1984), "the most effective remedy for poor performance is to focus on the future rather than on the past" (p. 77).

In their work on the Teacher Evaluation Theory Project, Stufflebeam and Nevo (1994) identified eight ways in which
teachers can benefit from teacher evaluation. The summative evaluation information can be used to demonstrate teacher competence, provide necessary data for certification, and provide data for employment procedures. This process can also provide data that can be used for accountability. The formative process encourages teachers to be self-evaluators seeking to improve their teaching and to inspire better learning. The use of techniques for self-evaluation has increased in recent years and teachers have had a legitimate role in providing input into the process of being evaluated by others. When teachers strive to meet very high standards, it is possible for them to seek national recognition (Stufflebeam & Nevo, 1994).

The primary purpose of evaluation in the 1990s will be growth instead of accountability. This purpose will be met by a softer evaluation that is descriptive rather than evaluative. It will consist of discussions instead of conferences, narratives instead of rating scales, and reflections instead of comments on strengths and weaknesses. "For those who subscribe to Total Quality Management, there is no evaluation at all" (Marczely, 1992, p. 214).

Factors Regulating Teacher Evaluation

In 1983, twenty-six states had laws requiring teacher evaluation. Of those, 75% leave the control of evaluation procedures to local school districts and in most cases these
procedures are negotiated as a part of collective bargaining agreements (Stiggins & Bridgeford, 1985).

State laws may also impede formative practices by requiring certain procedures such as use of uniform, mandated evaluation reports. If evaluations must first meet the state requirements, school administrators may decide that adding the formative component is not necessary or possible because of time constraints. The arbitrary evaluation criteria that have been developed for teacher evaluation result in negative feelings regarding the process (Rosenberger, 1991). According to Milner (1991), an objective instrument cannot measure the subjective dimension of a classroom. It is the subjective dimension that gives teaching its creative force.

Contracted agreements tend to promote "uniformity and specificity in evaluation procedures" (Stiggins & Bridgeford, 1985, p. 90). In many cases, the collective bargaining process has made evaluation more impersonal and rule governed and has failed to promote linking teacher evaluation and individual development. Instead of encouraging teachers to solidify more enriching and skillful approaches to teaching, the evaluation process forces teachers to adopt restrictive and trivialized techniques for the evaluation procedure (Milner, 1991).

According to Milner (1991), "teachers generally feel that mandates from national, state, and local authorities
undermine rather than promote high-quality education" (p. 464). However, The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) is in the process of establishing standards and methods for assessment and certification for the accomplished teacher. "National Board Certification is being developed by teachers, with teachers, for teachers" (NBPTS, 1993, p. 1) and will be a symbol of professional teaching excellence. In their work, the National Board has emphasized that "encouraging professionalism in teaching will improve student learning" (p. 21). Emerging ideals are for schools to develop "strong professional cultures whose norms support collaboration, innovative teaching, a high degree of collegiality and participation in a broad array of professional activities" (p. 21). The work of the National Board has been a collaborative effort with professional teachers, administrators, educational researchers, and evaluation specialists that is still in the developmental stages and functioning on an experimental basis (Stufflebeam & Nevo, 1994).

**Description of Various Models of Teacher Evaluation**

Due to the "Hunterization" of American schools in the 1980s with Madeline Hunter's instructional model, clinical supervision has focused more on the technological, hierarchical view of teaching and learning. The 1990s calls for a more collegial, reflective model of supervision.
Poole (1994) suggests that supervision must shift from the neo-traditional approach to the neo-progressive approach. With the neo-progressive approach, supervisors must assume that teachers have the ability and desire to unravel their own instructional dilemmas. They must support challenging conditions that permit teachers "to engage in reflective transformation of their classroom experience" (p.287). Implementing a supportive supervision model will allow teachers to be viewed as the expert who interprets and applies research-based knowledge to solve problems related to instructional practice (Poole, 1994).

**Standard (Traditional) Model of Evaluation**

Haefele (1993) identified the following characteristics in the traditional model of evaluation: (a) it is a one-size-fits-all hierarchical model; (b) teachers are observed two or three times per year, every three years; (c) the observation is usually 20 to 30 minutes in duration and is done by the principal; (d) the observation is followed by a post conference where strengths and weaknesses are listed and suggestions for improvement are made; (e) it is a formal, structured, and standardized process. Teachers are aware of the form and content of the evaluation. This traditional model of evaluation has the necessary criteria for legal purposes, but neither verifies effectiveness of the process nor alters the character of the process. According to Root
and Overly (1990), most professionals agree that evaluation should result in improved instruction. However, the traditional model creates such anxiety that the process tends to be negative, feared, and rejected by those being evaluated.

Under this model, teachers are perceived to be deficient and principals and supervisors are viewed as experts. They can detect deficiencies and develop plans to correct these deficiencies. Teachers assume a passive and obedient role and are dependent on principals to "judge their faults and dictate strategies to improve their performance" (Haefele, 1993, p. 337). The process is a "tell-and-sell" situation and has been used in teacher evaluations for decades.

Using a behavior checklist for teacher evaluation has been criticized conceptually for adopting an overly reductionist view of teaching (Airasian, 1993). Medley and Coker (1987) insist that we must "stop pretending that expert opinions about teacher effectiveness are valid" (p. 139).

The majority of teacher evaluation systems focus on accountability and have "little or no impact on teacher or school improvement" (Stiggins, 1986, p. 52). According to Haefele (1992), no evidence supports the use of this traditional model to help teachers improve skills that in turn produce higher achieving students. Research indicates
that no relationship exists between a principal's evaluation of a teacher's performance and student achievement (Haefele, 1992; Huddle, 1985; Marczely, 1992; Medley & Coker, 1987; Root & Overly, 1990). Several factors contribute to this ineffectiveness. Principals are unable to devote the time necessary to implement the traditional model effectively and are also reluctant to give low ratings and to confront incompetent teachers (Haefele, 1992).

University educators feel that traditional models of evaluation are flatly mechanistic and equate good teaching with simple behaviors that are rewarded. According to Vito Perrone of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, teaching is an art and should not be an exercise built on strict plans and algorithms (Milner, 1991). With the demand for professionalism and accountability growing, districts should consider doing away with the out-dated models of evaluation that do not promote professionalism and are not good measures of performance. "Good organizations don't measure competence; they teach you to be more competent" (Manatt, 1988, p. 82).

Professional (Non-traditional) Models of Evaluation

"In many school districts, teacher evaluation is a bureaucratic requirement that is conducted perfunctorily and does little to improve teacher performance" (Root & Overly, 1990). In a National Institute of Education survey of
10,000 teachers, 20% of the teachers responded that principals were of "no help" to them in improving the teaching and learning process. Nearly one-half felt that principals had been only "moderately helpful" (Huddle, 1985).

"Important aspects of good teaching should be arrived at through a process of reflection, debate, and compromises among stakeholders in the schools or district" (Airasian, 1993, p. 60). In seeking to create a professional rather than a bureaucratic approach to teacher evaluation and to teaching, the active involvement of teachers is very important. When teachers become an integral part of the evaluation process, by identifying needs, analyzing goals, choosing their instructional strategies, and planning and monitoring their work, they can benefit from evaluation and evaluation can benefit from teachers (Nevo, 1994).

In 1979 the Connecticut State Department of Education developed evaluation methods that established a strong relationship between teacher evaluation and teacher development. The model encourages:

- cooperative planning between professionals and evaluators of the objectives of each individual evaluation, the evaluation procedures, and the process of evaluating the system by staff;
• clear specification and communication of the evaluation purposes as well as the specific responsibilities and tasks that will serve as the frame of reference for individual evaluations;

• opportunity for teachers to evaluate themselves in positive and constructive ways; and

• emphasis on diagnostic rather than evaluative assessment with specific attention given to analyzing difficulties, planning improvements, and providing clear, personalized, constructive feedback (Stiggins & Bridgeford, 1985).

In 1987, the Pleasant Valley Central School District had a highly structured, check-list driven process that was designed to ensure minimal competency of teachers. Realizing that this model did not lead to instructional improvement or to teacher growth, the superintendent requested that a new model for evaluation be developed that would promote professional growth, provide external data for use by teachers on teaching performance, be safe and non-threatening, and be directly tied to staff development.

With the pilot of this new model, during the 1991-92 school year, the following two assumptions were made: (a) tenured teachers are competent, and (b) supervision for these teachers should "focus on the continuing development of the teachers' professional knowledge and skills" (Poole, 1994, p. 288).
This model is a form of clinical supervision designed for the purpose of professional growth and development. The model creates a climate where growth is expected and provides a real opportunity for teacher involvement and for the building of trust between the teacher and administrator (Poole, 1994).

Another form of clinical supervision, cognitive coaching, uses a planning conference, observation, and reflective conference to help teachers "improve instructional effectiveness by becoming more reflective about teaching" (Garmston, 1993, p. 57). Cognitive coaching is a non-judgmental process designed to enhance a teacher's "perceptions, decisions, and intellectual functions. Changing these inner thought processes is prerequisite to improving overt behavior that, in turn, enhances student learning" (Costa & Garmston, 1994, p. 2). With the ultimate goal of "teacher autonomy: the ability to self-monitor, self-analyze, and self-evaluate" (Garmston, 1993, p. 58), cognitive coaching fosters the ability of teachers to make changes in their own thinking and teaching.

"If evaluation is to improve schools, it must motivate individual teachers to become better teachers" (Stiggins, 1986, p. 54). When teachers are viewed as problem solvers who are active constructors and processors of knowledge and administrators are no longer viewed as supervisors, inspectors, or experts who check off behaviors from a
printed list, teachers are encouraged to stretch themselves (Airsian, 1993).

In their book, Cultural Leadership: The Culture of Excellence in Education, Cunningham and Gresso (1993) emphasize the importance of creating a risk-free environment that allows teachers to try new ideas that will improve our schools. They feel that a grass roots effort is necessary to improve our educational system. For this to happen, American schools must create "an ongoing culture that enables educators and schools to deal with whatever renewal efforts they want to pursue" (p. 275). It is believed that, if we foster an attitude of effectiveness and support it in the culture, all aspects of the organization will fall in line (Cunningham & Gresso, 1993).

With current school reform efforts, there is an emphasis on collaborative cultures that encourage and support reflective practice. Cognitive coaching supports professional inquiry, experimentation, and continued professional growth (Garmston, 1993). The results of research on cognitive coaching (Costa & Garmston, 1994) reveal that this coaching process fosters collegiality, deepens reflective skills, and develops teacher autonomy.

The purpose of a supportive supervision model is to promote teacher autonomy and encourage them to be self-evaluating and self-correcting. Supportive supervision focuses on professional growth rather than on
accountability. With supportive supervision teachers are in charge of their professional growth (Poole, 1994).

Research on Evaluation

The redefining of supervision has led to more teacher decision-making, empowerment, professionalism, collaboration, and peer support in schools. With these changes, increasing support exists for a non-traditional evaluation system which may include peer observation and coaching (Bickel & Artz, 1984; Brandt, 1982; Brandt, 1989; Chase & Wolfe, 1989; Chrisco, 1989; Costa, Garmston, & Lambert, 1988; Darling-Hammond, 1988; Evans, 1989; Garmston, 1993; Goldsberry, 1984; Mandeville & Rivers, 1989; Raney & Robbins, 1989).

Teacher empowerment literature indicates, "hierarchical distinctions should be removed and that teachers should be awarded the professional autonomy and genuine collegial involvement in decision making that they rightly deserve" (Haefele, 1992, p. 340). If teachers are to be empowered, they must have the power to make decisions regarding practices, goals, performance, and appraisal. To make appropriate decisions that will result in improved teaching and learning, teachers must become reflective practitioners (Haefele, 1993). According to Marczely (1992), "reflection of the teacher is necessary for professional growth and improvement" (p. 284).
Other Studies Concerning Models of Teacher Evaluation

Dade County School District. Dade County School District in Florida tested a collegial model of evaluation in 1992 and projected that full implementation would require a five to ten year test period. Those involved suggested they had much to gain and little to lose by placing the operation and the decision-making functions in the hands of the teachers with the collegial model as the basic framework and guide for the evaluation and development of teachers (Haefele, 1992).

1989-90 Ohio Study. Using a 272 district sample in Ohio in 1989-90, a study was conducted to determine what approaches school districts were using to evaluate teacher performance. Results of this study revealed the following seven models of evaluation: (a) The Teacher Trait Model; (b) The Rating Scale Model; (c) The Performance Objective Model; (d) The Instructional Objective Model; (e) The Teacher Concern Model; and (f) The Eclectic Model (combines two or more of these approaches.) The results showed that 84% of the districts used the Traditional Trait Model that lists specific teacher behaviors. Most of these used this model in conjunction with the scale model. It is a "quick, easy, but ineffective way to access teacher performance, rarely offering the teacher any real assistance" (Marczely, 1992, p. 283).
Three Parallel Systems. Duke (1990) revised existing systems of teacher supervision and evaluation by adopting "three parallel systems: an accountability system based on performance standards and classroom observation, an assistance system designed to correct deficiencies, and a professional development system" (p. 71).

The professional growth system was designed for tenured teachers who had mastered the basic competencies. Those involved in this program would develop a professional growth plan, identify resources needed, and design a process for monitoring progress. Three years would be spent working on the professional development plan. In the fourth year, these teachers would "recycle through the accountability system to assure that they still met basic performance standards" (Duke, 1990, p. 71).

In the project conducted with over two dozen school districts, Duke (1990) found that many teachers had difficulty in writing challenging goals. He determined that in order to develop the skill of setting goals, teachers needed to increase their awareness of themselves and new developments in education. Breaking routines, changing perspectives, examining assumptions, and reading challenging materials are activities that will help teachers increase awareness of themselves. Some important ingredients for professional development are time to develop goals and the
support of caring and concerned colleagues who stimulate reflection.

Results of this study showed that teachers came to realize "that professional development can serve as a rich source of insights, an antidote to burnout, and a pleasurable collegial experience" (p. 74). Duke (1990) recommends an extended pre-goal-setting stage to heighten awareness and increase the likelihood that meaningful goals will be identified. He suggests that teachers and administrators will be eager to examine their practices, beliefs, and needs for growth if they are given "regularly scheduled opportunities to share with colleagues, a comfortable setting, some initial guidance, norms of respect and support, and a variety of stimuli" (Duke, 1990, p. 75).

South Kitsap School District. In 1990 the South Kitsap School District teachers were asked to respond to the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) Questionnaire. They were asked to describe their last evaluation experience. Five attributes that were identified through research as keys to effective growth-producing teacher evaluation were addressed in the survey. These key elements include attributes of the teacher, evaluator, data collection procedures, feedback, and evaluation context. When these attributes are present in the evaluation process, the potential for teachers' professional growth and development is increased. The results of the TEP focus on changes in teachers' perceptions
of the evaluation environment by comparing responses on the 1989 profiling to the responses on the 1987 TEP survey. On the initial survey, 53% of the teachers perceived that teacher evaluation is for accountability purposes and that a teacher's professional development becomes incidental to the process. It was recommended that multiple sources of data become an integral part of the evaluation process. In addition, collegial training in the development of these data sources should be provided to assure that the effects are positive and growth producing (Long, 1990).

Iowa's 1992 Study. Another study done by Lawler (1992) also utilized the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) to examine teachers' perceptions of the quality and impact of teacher evaluation in Iowa. Results of this study indicated that evaluator training had significant effects on the overall quality of evaluation planning. However, results also reflect that the evaluator training had no significant effect on teaching practices, attitudes about teaching, and understanding about teaching (Lawler, 1992). A similar study using the Teacher Evaluation Profile found that teachers judge the quality of their evaluation on attributes of the evaluator and the feedback they receive (Hobson, 1990).

Pacific Northwest School Districts. Case studies of four Pacific Northwest school districts, components of a
larger study done by Stiggins and Bridgeford (1985), added to the understanding of the evaluation environment. District administrators, building principals, and teachers were interviewed. Results showed that all four districts' evaluation procedures were very similar. They all had three main stages; pre-conference, observations, and post-conference. Principals and/or vice principals conducted evaluations formally once or twice a year. Peers and students were seldom involved and self-evaluations were very limited. Both teachers and administrators indicated a need for improvement. Recommendations from teachers' perspectives are as follows:

- Provide an opportunity for peer and self-evaluation through goal-setting and videotaping.
- Give teachers more knowledge about what constitutes effective teaching.
- Provide quality staff development to improve skills.
- Give more frequent, specific feedback -- constructive criticism, not vague generalizations.

Administrators identified the following barriers that limit the use of formative evaluation: teachers' lack of trust in the process; lack of time for evaluation; adversarial context of evaluation; and principals' skills as evaluators. Administrators recommended that staff development be provided in goal setting and that a strong
link between evaluation and staff development be forged
(Stiggins & Bridgeford, 1985).

Central Illinois School District. In a study done in the Central Illinois School District, teachers reported more professional growth as a result of their most recent evaluation than the national average. Results indicate that when certain variables are present in a district, teacher growth can result. Significant variables include trust, clearly defined and shared purpose for evaluation, and strong leadership from the central office (Nielson, 1993).

Impact on Teacher Motivation and Professional Growth

According to Stiggins (1986), the majority of teacher evaluation systems focus on accountability and have "little or no impact on teacher or school improvement" (p. 52). Under the accountability system, after a teacher demonstrates minimum competence and is granted tenure, they are no longer affected by the evaluation system. Teachers are not required by law or contract to move beyond minimum competence. In contrast, professional development models of evaluation are "designed to promote excellence by helping the already competent teacher attain new levels of professional excellence" (Stiggins, 1986, p. 52).

According to Duke (1993), professional growth involves more than learning. Learning is the acquisition of knowledge. Growth implies the transformation of knowledge
into the development of the individual. "Growth is qualitative change, movement to a new level of understanding, the realization of a sense of efficacy not previously enjoyed" (p. 703).

To achieve excellence, one must perform at the boundaries of one's abilities to test and push back personal limits. As teachers gain experience, they feel less need to grow. According to Duke (1993), "new knowledge is increasingly filtered through well-formed cognitive structures, with the result that dissonant information is often excluded or discredited. Only knowledge that confirms prior beliefs and assumptions tends to be absorbed" (p. 703).

The Sarasota, Collier, Monroe, and Broward County Florida School Systems met to share and discuss their efforts in understanding the relationship between evaluation of teacher performance, teachers' professional development, and school improvements. In their discussions, they agreed that growth and development leading to continuous forward motion requires tremendous energy and change. The evaluation process should enhance this forward momentum by releasing energy, encouraging potential, and promoting possibilities (Barth, 1993).

Organizational structures of schools and districts influence the behavior of teachers. Evaluation procedures reflect the culture of the school system and influence the
job status of teachers and their relationships with school administrators. "The idea of evaluating all competent teachers every year according to a common set of performance standards that, at best, represent minimum or basic expectations is little short of institutionalized insult" (Duke, 1993, p. 703). Teachers and administrators both know that these evaluations are a terrible waste of time and energy. There is no incentive for growth when teachers are evaluated according to the same criteria as every one of their colleagues. Conducting evaluations of competent teachers for purposes of accountability conveys distrust (Duke, 1993).

Barth (1993) maintains that several stages of teacher development exist. Beginning teachers must be oriented into the school culture; therefore, structure is sometimes reassuring. Evaluation of beginning teachers should focus on management, instructional competencies, and baseline repertory. They need to know what is expected of them. The second stage of teacher development should be more open and flexible. One system approached this flexibility by allowing teachers to determine their own goals and develop plans for putting them into practice. "Teachers characterized this open-ended approach as inspirational, motivating, and energizing" (p. 217). They were given the opportunity to undertake a project of their interest and were provided with the time and resources to see it
completed (Barth, 1993). "When employees have an opportunity to be self-directed in their learning, they are likely to be highly motivated and committed to their development" (Cunningham & Gresso, 1993, p. 188).

Cunningham synthesized and combined the many overall stages of development into three major stages of human development. The third and highest stage, "vital self-reliance," is characterized by self-direction, self-acceptance, self-support, reliance, esteem, understanding, and confidence. In this stage, individuals are able to reach their potential and work for continuous improvement in themselves and the organization (Cunningham & Gresso, 1993, p. 212).

Employee motivation is a major problem for managers which has been identified by Frederick Herzberg and others for many years. Motivation means "getting people committed to the pursuit of lofty goals not the avoidance of bad things" (Odiorne, 1987, p. 212). Herzberg's motivation theory identifies dissatisfiers (hygiene factors) and satisfiers (motivator factors). Hygiene factors involve working conditions such as job security, interpersonal relationships, and salary. If these are not adequate, these extrinsic factors can cause dissatisfaction. Motivator or growth factors are intrinsic to the job. These include achievement, recognition for achievement, the work itself,
responsibility, and growth or advancement. According to Herzberg (1992):

Employee abilities to perform in real situations can be motivated according to cognitive and motivational levels suggested by the motivator factors:

1. **Knowing more** — do the employee's achievements show that he or she knows more about the job than he or she did before?

2. **Understanding more** — does the employee make connections between different feedback, or recognition for achievement, so that he or she understands what needs to be done without being told?

3. **Creativity** — does the employee combine knowledge and understanding of the work itself to produce new solutions to job problems?

4. **Effectiveness in ambiguity** — does the employee take responsibility for his or her work and make good decisions in ambiguous situations?

5. **Individuation** — has the employee developed unique expertise that would qualify him or her for formal or informal advancement to higher order work?

6. **Real growth** — does the employee behave ethically toward others or does he or she rely on illusory growth for satisfaction making himself or herself look taller by making others look smaller (p. 319).
Two other closely related motivational theories are Maslow's hierarchy of needs and the ERG theory. Each of these theories propose that "people are motivated to satisfy needs" (Champagne & McAfee, 1989, p. 136). In Maslow's theory, self-actualization represents the need for people to become all they are capable of being. Maslow and other theorists maintain that very few people ever reach total self-actualization. Greater competency and mastery in whatever one is doing is always possible. Clayton Aldefer's ERG theory proposes three categories in the hierarchy of needs: existence, relatedness, and growth. The growth level represents the need for personal growth and being creative on the job (Champagne & McAfee, 1989).

A condition that allows one's learning curve to excel is ownership. Deciding what one wants to know gives ownership. Also, working with other adults allows teachers to make their practice visible. They learn by reflecting on their practice with themselves and others (Barth, 1993).

"The late Rensis Likert, a psychologist at the University of Michigan, argued that group goal setting fosters a higher degree of cooperation and communication than individual goal setting, and thus is preferable" (Locke & Latham, 1984, p. 37). The Developmental Education Model, presented by Glassberg and Oja (1981), emphasizes the importance of providing an opportunity for teachers to work
in small groups to define their own personal and professional goals.

Research done by Locke and Latham (1984) found that "performance feedback led to improved performance only when these incentives led individuals to set goals for improving their performance" (p. 10). After eighteen years of research and study, Locke and Latham (1984) concluded that goal setting can lead to high productivity, improve job satisfaction, and increase confidence and pride in one's work. They maintain that "people will become motivated in proportion to the level of challenge with which they are faced" (p. 21). An important step in getting people committed is the establishment of creative goals that give focus and direction and add challenge and motivation to human endeavor. The improvement of employee attitudes is an important side benefit of goal setting (Champagne & McAfee, 1989).

Strengthening a teacher's ability for self-diagnosis is a very important consideration in the development of evaluation systems. When teachers can begin to identify their own strengths and weaknesses and an environment is created that encourages professional growth, increased teacher effectiveness is possible (Hill, 1991; Johnson, 1992). Collegial pairing contributes to a supportive environment where mutual respect and understanding flourish and where teachers "rejuvenate, grow, and renew" (Hill,
1991, p. 19). "By having a performance-based evaluation system in place that is reflective of teacher input and effective teaching techniques, teachers can become full partners in pursuit of school-wide excellence" (Johnson, 1992, p. 145).

Creating a culture where adult learning is "expected, respected, promoted, and modeled by senior teachers, principals, and superintendents" (Barth, 1993, p. 219) will encourage teachers to learn by reflecting on practice, leading, and risking (with safety straps). Barth (1993) maintains that modeling has the extraordinary power to make a connection between adults learning and schools improving. The culture must communicate that everyone must be a learner.

**Implications for School Systems**

Currently, teacher empowerment and school-based management are proposed changes in many school districts' organization and management. With such changes, the role of principals and teachers will change in many ways. We will see distinctions between leaders and followers begin to blur. Cooperation, professionalism, and collegiality will become the norm. As a result of these changes, many school activities, relationships, and teacher evaluation will take a new form. Teachers will be viewed as professionals "who individually and in groups can provide their own self-
When employees become truly empowered, they become intrinsically motivated. They work from the heart because their work is perceived as being important. Empowerment occurs when people become aware of who they are, what their abilities are, and how they can benefit the organization. People do not become empowered by behaving as someone else would have them to behave (Cunningham & Gresso, 1993).

To have a credible and effective teacher evaluation program, school districts must determine the purpose of evaluation, who should be involved in developing the program, and what implementation factors should be considered. When the purpose of evaluation is for instructional improvement and "when teachers are viewed as knowledgeable, decision-making practitioners, the involvement of teachers should be quite extensive and active" (Airasian, 1993, p. 64).

Since principals play a key role in how these issues are determined, success of the teacher evaluation program is greatly influenced by them. Principals should perform the "role of an educator concerned about improved staff teaching skills and student learning outcomes" (p. 65), not one of a manager with a clipboard and rating scale. Principals should become true instructional leaders with a personal
commitment to and involvement in improved instruction (Airasian, 1993).

Duke and Stiggins (1986) recommend districts seeking growth-oriented approaches to teacher evaluation to consider a three-part strategy of "(a) evaluating existing evaluation procedures, (b) improving the evaluation environment, and (c) upgrading evaluation skills" (p. 41).

An environment that exhibits mutual support and respect for personal growth allows school managers and teachers to function at their best. With this type of environment, formative teacher evaluation has the potential to contribute to improved instruction and learning in our schools. Given that fewer teachers are entering the profession, improving the quality of instruction requires the development of the skills of teachers already in the classroom (Stiggins & Bridgeford, 1985).

As members of the organization participate in personal and professional development activities, they should be encouraged by the work culture to apply their improvements to make improvements in the organization. It is the function of the cultural leader to help employees see how their development can benefit the organization. Cunningham and Gresso (1993) emphasize that personal and professional growth will positively impact the organization. "Organizational strengths are built upon individual strengths and individual strengths grow from personal and
professional development" (p. 188). An effective work culture must allow individuals to choose developmental activities that are of interest to them and that address specific needs they may have. Development activities may take many forms. Some of the activities could include: readings, group sharing sessions, attending conferences, networking, mentoring, tutoring, planning and developing new programs, etc. The work culture should promote and demand continuous personal and professional growth of the members of the organization (Cunningham & Gresso, 1993).

Continuous and effective interaction between administrators and teachers is necessary for meaningful evaluation to occur. With this type of evaluation process, the means for improved learning for teachers and students, based on their individual needs and interests, is provided (Root & Overly, 1990).

Formative evaluation is very sensitive to teachers' needs and goals. The teacher evaluation environment can be improved by focusing on professional development and creating a trusting, supportive environment for teachers to be observed and receive suggestions. Formative evaluation is a vital step in strengthening instructional effectiveness nationwide (Stiggins & Bridgeford, 1985).

Root and Overly (1990) identified the following key elements for successful evaluation procedures:
1. Involve key stakeholders in the decision-making process.
2. Establish goals mutually.
3. Establish a time frame.
4. Emphasize formative evaluation.
5. Alter classroom observation practices. (Formal observations should be minimal.)
6. Use rating scales sparingly.
7. Seek training for evaluators.
8. Identify intervention staff development opportunities.

According to Duke (1993), school systems that have tried to remove organizational and personal barriers to professional growth are beginning to reap benefits. Under an accountability-driven evaluation process, experienced teachers received little benefit. However, with professional development as the goal of evaluation, these teachers feel more trusted and challenged. Administrators have more time to support teachers in their professional growth and they find that their relations with teachers are less adversarial. As teachers acquire new skills and knowledge and reconnect with what it means to learn and grow, schools and students reap the benefits (Duke, 1993).

Summary

This chapter reviewed the related literature concerning the effects of different forms of evaluation on teacher
performance, professional growth, and motivation. The two main purposes of teacher evaluation are accountability (summative) and professional growth (formative). However, in most cases, summative evaluation receives the most emphasis.

A large body of research indicates that there is no relationship between a principal's evaluation of a teacher's performance and student achievement (Haefele, 1992; Huddle, 1985; Marczely, 1992; Medley & Coker, 1987; Root & Overly, 1990). According to Root and Overly (1990), most professionals agree that evaluation should result in improved instruction. However, the traditional model creates such anxiety that the process tends to be negative, feared, and rejected by those being evaluated. In seeking to create a professional evaluation model, the active involvement of teachers is very important. They should be involved in identifying needs, setting goals, choosing instructional strategies, and planning and monitoring their own work (Nevo, 1994).

Examining the key elements of effective, growth-producing teacher evaluation models has been the focus of many research studies. Several studies have been conducted using the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) instrument. Results of these studies were discussed in this chapter, along with recommendations for effective evaluation procedures.
"Evaluation systems work best when they are viewed as a subset of a bigger movement - a district-wide commitment to the enhancement of classroom instruction" (McGreal, 1988, p. 4). The teacher evaluation process has an impact on teacher motivation and professional growth. Tremendous energy and change are necessary for growth and development. "The job of a school district is to provide staff development that fosters teaching talk and to employ an evaluation system that is both complementary and supplementary to staff development" (McGreal, 1988, p. 4). The evaluation process should enhance growth by releasing energy, encouraging potential, and promoting possibilities (Barth, 1993).

No incentive exists for growth when teachers are evaluated according to the same criteria as every one of their colleagues. Conducting evaluations of competent teachers for purposes of accountability conveys distrust and has a debilitating influence on the development of supportive, growth-oriented relationships between teachers and administrators (Duke, 1993; McGreal, 1988). Allowing teachers to determine their own goals and develop plans for putting them into practice provides an open-ended approach that is characterized by teachers as being inspirational, motivating, and energizing (Barth, 1993).

Formative evaluation is very sensitive to teachers' needs and goals. The teacher evaluation environment can be improved by focusing on professional development and
creating a trusting environment for teachers to be observed and receive suggestions. Formative evaluation is a vital step in strengthening instructional effectiveness nationwide (Stiggins & Bridgeford, 1985).

The researcher designed this investigation using a multiple-site case study that involved both quantitative and qualitative data. This program effects and implementation process case study approach was used to help determine the impact of teacher evaluation programs and to provide inferences about reasons for the success or failure of the programs. The following section lists the research questions that guided the initial stages of this study.

**Research Questions**

Several questions emerged as a result of the literature review and guided the initial stages of the investigation.

1. Does evaluation hinder or enhance professional development?
2. In what ways can evaluation not only avoid interfering with teachers' growth, but support and enhance professional development?
3. To what extent do the schools' values foster reflection on practice?
4. How can evaluation be an opportunity for reflection which leads to developmental progress toward self-definition, autonomy, and interdependence?
5. Should there be a balance between evaluation driven by bureaucratic requirements and that fueled by professional incentives?

6. In what ways does the school culture contribute to teachers' and principals' capacity for growth?

7. In what ways can individuals contribute to a school culture that supports professional development?

8. Under what conditions will teachers and administrators reveal, share, and celebrate what works for them?

9. What services are provided to teachers involved in The Professional Teacher Evaluation Model?

10. What is the teachers' level of involvement in the processes of The Professional Teacher Evaluation Model?

11. What is the teachers' level of comfort with an evaluation process that focuses on growth?
Chapter 3

Methods

Introduction

The purpose of Chapter Three is to present a discussion of the methods and procedures that were used to conduct an investigation of the processes used in linking teacher evaluation to professional growth and motivation. The investigation was conducted in the Johnson City School System in Johnson City, Tennessee. Schools selected to participate in this study included the eight elementary schools and one middle school in the system.

A multiple-site case study format, with both quantitative and qualitative data, was selected as the most appropriate method of study. "Because qualitative and quantitative methods involve differing strengths and weaknesses, they constitute alternative, but not mutually exclusive, strategies for research" (Patton, 1990, p. 16). Both forms of data can be collected in the same study.

Qualitative research involves a rich description of people, places, and conversations. This type of research is concerned with participants' perceptions and requires that data be collected in natural settings through contact with people (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982).

Qualitative research is frequently called naturalistic inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Zeichner, 1980). According
to Zeichner (1980), the components of naturalistic inquiry include participant observation, case study, and ethnography. Lincoln and Guba (1985) indicated that the "design of naturalistic inquiry...cannot be given in advance; it must emerge, develop, unfold" (p. 225).

The use of the qualitative multiple-site case study format allowed the investigator to, "describe the unit of analysis, the program of evaluation, in depth and detail, in context, and holistically" (Patton, 1990, p. 54). According to Patton (1990), "qualitative inquiry is highly appropriate in studying process because depicting process requires detailed description; the experience of process typically varies for different people; process is fluid and dynamic; and participants' perceptions are a key process consideration" (p. 95). During process evaluations, the investigator looks at formal activities and anticipated outcomes and investigates informal patterns and unanticipated interactions. This type of investigation can lead to the isolation of critical elements affecting program successes and failures (Patton, 1990).

Patton (1990) suggested that many situations occur in which analyzing program implementation data would be of greater value than analyzing program outcomes. He suggested the following questions be answered:

What do clients in the program experience?

What services are provided to clients?
What do staff do?
What is it like to be in the program?
How is the program organized? (p. 102)
The researcher should give attention to "inputs, activities, processes, and structures" (Patton, 1990, p. 103). With this type of investigation, decision makers can learn what is taking place in a program. They can determine how a program has developed and how and why it deviates from initial expectations (Patton, 1990).

In qualitative case study research, a problem is identified from practice and then very broad questions are formulated. Questions about process and understanding what happened guide the research (Merriman, 1988). "Case studies are particularly valuable when evaluation aims to capture individual differences or unique variations from one program setting to another, or from one program experience to another" (Patton, 1990, p. 54).

**Research Design**

The investigation of the teacher evaluation process was a combination of deductive and inductive analysis of responses on the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) questionnaire and the field study of three individual groups, respectively. The purpose of gathering survey data and conducting a multiple-site case study was to provide a comprehensive approach in giving a "thick description" of
teacher evaluation designed to promote and enhance motivation and professional growth.

The deductive analysis of the TEP provided the researcher with specific information as to teachers' perceptions of the existing evaluation process. This information resulted in generation of specific questions that were used in the interview component of each case study. In addition, comparison of the results from the pre-survey and post-survey provided support for the qualitative data.

The inductive data analysis helped to generate grounded theory which contributed to the building of a professional teacher evaluation model. This process is a major component in Lincoln and Guba's (1985) flow chart presented in their book, *Naturalistic Inquiry*. According to Miles and Huberman (1984), using both quantitative and qualitative data contributes to building theory, improving predictions, and to making recommendations about practice.

**Case Study Research**

The investigator used multiple-site case study research to investigate the nature of the activities, processes, and structures used to link a teacher evaluation program to professional growth and motivation. Both quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed. Qualitative data consisted of "detailed descriptions of situations, events, people, interactions, and observed behavior" (Merriman, 1988, p.
This is the raw data that provided depth and detail to the study. Quantitative data received from the survey were used to provide support for the findings from the qualitative methods.

**Population and Sample Size**

Tenured elementary and middle school teachers who were scheduled for evaluation during the 1994-95 school year participated in this study. The multiple-site case study consisted of four groups of teachers; North Side Elementary School (n=9), Liberty Bell Middle School (n=10), and experimental (n=17) and control groups (n=16) from the other seven elementary schools (see Table 1).

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Evaluation model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Bell</td>
<td>n=10</td>
<td>Professional Teacher Evaluation Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>n=9</td>
<td>Professional Teacher Evaluation Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>n=17</td>
<td>Professional Teacher Evaluation Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>n=16</td>
<td>State Model for Local Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The control group was only involved in the quantitative component of the study. Teachers in this group were
evaluated using the Tennessee State Model for Local Evaluation, which Johnson City Schools has used for a number of years. This model is a very traditional evaluation process with the purpose of verifying a teacher's level of competency in using the Tennessee Instructional Model (TIM). A rating scale is used to indicate a teacher's level of competence in six domains. Areas of strength and weakness are identified and a development plan is established. Emphasis is placed on classroom observations and the scores given for each domain. Even though this model follows the steps of clinical supervision, it is considered a summative form of evaluation.

The other groups were evaluated using the newly developed Professional Teacher Evaluation Model (see Appendix A). This new model of evaluation was designed to provide an opportunity for teachers to work collaboratively with principals in setting goals for improvement. This formative evaluation process allows teachers to select goals, activities, and action plans that promote their professional growth and development. The steps in this process include an orientation meeting, goal setting conference, development of action plans, implementation, possible observations and informal conferences, mid-year review, possible observations and informal conferences, and end-of-year review. At the end-of-year review, teachers submit a narrative report of the progress they have made.
toward goals and have a reflective discussion with the principal.

Through an existing procedure used by Johnson City Schools to rotate teachers through a ten year evaluation cycle, a total of 52 teachers were identified for the original sample. From this original sample, purposeful sampling was used to identify participants at North Side Elementary and Liberty Bell Middle School. The investigator used a stratified random sampling technique to form an experimental group and control group from the remaining seven elementary schools. Data were collected from all four groups; however, the control group only participated in the experimental component of the study (see Figure 1).

The administrator at North Side Elementary School made a commitment to evaluate all tenured teachers using this collaborative, growth-oriented model for evaluation. Liberty Bell Middle School's administrator provided tenured teachers, who were scheduled for evaluation, the opportunity to select either the state model (competency-based) or the new model (growth-oriented). The other seven elementary schools were involved in an experimental study where teachers in a control group (n=16) were evaluated using the State Model for Local Evaluation; while those in an experimental group (n=17) were evaluated using the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model.
Sampling and Data Collection Strategy

Figure 1. Sampling and data collection strategy: Rotating random sampling was used to identify the original sample. Stratified random sampling and purposeful sampling techniques were used to identify specific groups. Data collection for the control was strictly quantitative. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected from the other groups.

Table 2 displays the seven elementary schools involved in the experimental component of the study and the sample size of both the experimental and control groups.
Stratified random sampling was used to assign teachers to these two groups.

Table 2

Sample Size of Control and Experimental Groups at Individual Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cherokee</td>
<td>n=1</td>
<td>n=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmont</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keystone</td>
<td>n=1</td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Side</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratton</td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>n=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towne Acres</td>
<td>n=1</td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the exception of one individual, all who were randomly assigned to the experimental group agreed to participate. All those at Liberty Bell Middle School, who were given the opportunity to select the model for their evaluation, chose the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model. This goal setting model offered teachers the opportunity to pursue areas of interest through a variety of activities.

Data Collection

To provide for triangulation, the researcher decided to use multiple sources of data. Each participant responded to a pre- and post-survey. The data collected from this
questionnaire, the Teacher Evaluation Profile (see Appendix B), were analyzed to determine teachers' perceptions of the nature of the evaluation environment, the overall quality, and the impact on teaching performance. To provide additional data, the investigator conducted interviews and observations, and reviewed reflective journals and documents presented at the end-of-year reviews.

The investigator personally administered the survey to the participants. After the completion of the pre-survey, the investigator conducted an orientation to the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model for those selected to participate in the experimental group. The steps outlined in the model were explained and teachers were given an opportunity to offer suggestions for improving the model. The researcher provided participants with materials concerning goal setting strategies, action research, and professional portfolios. They were asked to review the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model and other materials before agreeing to participate in this study. With the exception of one individual, all teachers randomly assigned to the experimental group agreed to participate. At the end of the school year, participants again responded to the TEP survey instrument, reflecting on the evaluation process they were involved in during the year. Figure 2 presents a flow chart describing the methods and sequence of data collection procedures used in the multiple-site case study.
Data Collection Flow Chart

Teacher Evaluation Profile
Pre-Survey

Observations → Goals and Action Plans → Observations

Interviews

Reflective Journals ↔ Narrative Reports

Teacher Evaluation Profile
Post-Survey

Figure 2. Data collection flow chart: Teacher Evaluation Profile pre-survey observations, goals and action plans, observations, interviews, reflective journals, narrative reports, Teacher Evaluation Profile post-survey.

**Interview Procedures.** The cases involved in the qualitative component of the study were selected from the groups using the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model; the experimental group, the Liberty Bell group, and the North Side group. Initial plans for identifying a minimum sample
were to use random sampling within each site to select participants for interviews and observations. However, to meet the multiple interests and needs of the study and to provide flexibility, the researcher was prepared to use purposeful sampling techniques for selecting additional participants for interviews.

The number of individuals selected through the random sampling and purposeful sampling techniques was based on the need to provide information-rich data to the study and not for the purpose of reaching a predetermined sample size. Initially 20 individuals were selected as interview participants. However, as the interviewing process progressed, four additional teachers were identified as sources of rich information and were added to the interview roster.

Principals at both North Side Elementary and Liberty Bell Middle School participated in open-ended interviews conducted by the investigator. The investigator used purposeful sampling techniques to select teachers from these two schools for the interview component of the study.

In the group involving the other seven elementary schools, the investigator selected four principals and conducted a random sampling of teachers to identify an initial roster for the semi-structured, open-ended interviews. To examine extreme and deviant cases and to
provide for maximum variation, additional teachers were identified for the interview process (see Figure 3).

**Interview Sampling Technique**

![Diagram showing sampling techniques]

**Figure 3.** Flow chart for sampling techniques: random sampling, purposeful sampling, and information-rich cases.

The investigator contacted those selected to explain the purpose of this component of the study and the approximate time required. Specific dates and times for interviews were scheduled individually and as information was analyzed from previous interviews.

At the beginning of each interview, the researcher explained the process used in selecting interviewees and assured their confidentiality. The interviews were designed
to be semi-structured and open-ended. The investigator asked additional questions necessary for clarity of responses. At the end of the interview, the investigator summarized major points made by the respondents and offered them the opportunity to provide additional information.

All interviews were audio taped. After listening to the tapes and recording notes concerning the effectiveness of the process and specific modifications made in the structure of the interview, the researcher had the tapes transcribed. The typist, who entered this data into a computer word processor, was instructed to make accurate copies of the interviews.

Following each interview, the researcher recorded personal reflections and "ideas, behaviors, and nonverbal cues" (Guba & Lincoln, 1981, p.182). This information was used to develop a preliminary analysis of the data.

Observation Procedures. Observations of goal-setting conferences, mid-year reviews, end-of-year reviews, and selected activities were also conducted by the investigator. Settings for observations of specific conferences, reviews, and activities were selected in the following ways: (a) when requested by principal or teacher, (b) when convenient to schedule, and (c) when specific activities were brought to the attention of the investigator. This component of the process provided the investigator with an opportunity to observe processes, participants' behaviors, and activities.
Data from these observations were used in describing the process in the implementation of teacher evaluation.

**Reflective Journals and Narrative Reports.** Teachers and principals participating in the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model were asked to keep a reflective journal during the process. The investigator designed journals that provided some open-ended questions to assist participants in organizing their thoughts concerning each step in the process. Some of these include the following: [The goal-setting conference helped me to...; The best part of this phase of the process was when...; The conference could have been improved by...; The end-of-year review gave me an opportunity to...; I was most encouraged by...; I was most frustrated when...; Additional reflections...].

Participants were not required, but were encouraged, to keep the reflective journals. Those who agreed to record their reflections submitted journals to the investigator at the end of the school year.

Additional data were collected by reviewing the narrative reports that teachers submitted to principals during the end-of-year review. The investigator examined these documents to determine the type and quality of goals that were set and the rate of successful completion of these goals. In addition, evidence was sought concerning the level of teachers' motivation in improving the teaching and learning process in their classroom.
Deductive Data Analysis

The quantitative data collected from responses to the pre-survey instrument were analyzed. This analysis produced descriptive statistics that revealed teachers' perceptions of the quality of the standard model for teacher evaluation and its impact on their teaching performance. In addition, attributes of the teacher, evaluator, feedback, procedures, and the context were also analyzed. The post-survey data provided this same information based on teachers' perceptions of the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model. To test the null hypotheses stated in Chapter I, comparisons of the pre-survey responses of the control group and experimental group were made using the t-test for independent samples and analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to compare adjusted means on the post-survey, while controlling for pre-survey means. For each t-test, the pooled variance estimate was used in cases where the probability of the $F$ value was large and the separate variance estimate was used in cases where the probability of the $F$ value was small. In addition, the t-test for dependent samples was also used to compare the pre-survey and post-survey responses of all four groups.

Inductive Data Analysis

Transcribed interviews, notes from observations, and reflective notes from the investigation were organized and
placed in categories as the process evolved. All documents were dated and titled and entered into *Enthnograph v4.0*, a data management computer program "designed to enhance and facilitate the process of qualitative data analysis" (Seidel, Friese, & Leonard, 1995, p.5). Revision of the organization and categories was ongoing as new information was revealed. According to Miles and Huberman (1984), field notes should be written up in a systematic form immediately following each contact. The investigator followed this suggestion and included reflective remarks in brackets.

**Analysis of Interviews.** Analyzing qualitative data consists of three parts: (1) noticing, (2) collecting, and (3) thinking about things. According to the authors of *The Ethnograph v4.0: A User's Guide*, the noticing, collecting, and thinking process has the following characteristics:

- Iterative and Progressive: The process is iterative and progressive because it is a cycle that keeps repeating. For example, when you are thinking about things, you also start noticing new things in the data. You then collect and think about these new things. In principle the process is an infinite spiral.

- Recursive: The process is recursive because one part can call back to a previous part. For example,
while you are busy collecting things, you might simultaneously start noticing new things to collect.

- Holographic: The process is holographic in that each step in the process contains the entire process. For example, when you first notice things, you are already mentally collecting and thinking about those things (Seidel, Friese, & Leonard, 1995, p. E2).

As each interview was analyzed, the researcher considered the credibility of what was reported by the respondent. The possibility of respondent bias and personal context were also considered. Interview data were coded and divided into categories. The code words used were considered "`condensed representations of facts described in the data' (Kelle and Seidel, 1995)" (Seidel, Friese, & Leonard, 1995, p. E17). After the text of transcripts was reformatted and imported into the Ethnograph program, the investigator re-examined each interview and re-coded the data. When the results of the this coding were compared to the original coding, they were found to be very consistent. If code words can truly be trusted as surrogates for the text, the researcher can emulate some traditional quantitative techniques such as frequency distributions and hypothesis testing (Seidel, Friese, & Leonard, 1995).

A constant comparative method was used in which incidents were coded for a category and compared with previous incidents that were coded in the same category.
This process stimulated thought that led to both descriptive and explanatory categories (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The next step in the analysis was integrating categories and their properties. This process, facilitated by the Ethnograph software package, helped the investigator to more clearly define each situation.

To provide for trustworthiness, the investigator shared a summary of the analysis with respective sites. The purpose of this step was to determine if the investigator had "successfully produced a reconstruction of the respondents' constructions" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 351). This member check allowed respondents to examine and respond to the reconstruction.

**Analysis of Observations.** Observing different phases of the evaluation process with various participants allowed the researcher to note procedures and identify patterns. The investigator used the analysis of the observations to organize the data to describe important processes and illuminate how participants changed (Patton, 1990).

**Within-Site Analysis - Case Study.** According to Patton (1990), it is appropriate for the researcher to begin with an analysis of individual cases in a multiple case study. Following the gathering of data through interviews and observations, the investigator developed a summary report
for each individual case. Reflecting on the results, the investigator noted areas to improve in subsequent cases.

Each case study provided a brief description of each site and a detailed description of interactions and activities. They were written at the evaluative level which required the researcher to weight complex alternatives. Confidentiality and anonymity were adequately maintained.

After case study reports were developed, they were presented to participants for a comprehensive member check and indexed to develop the audit trail.

**Cross-Site Analysis.** Within-site analysis and cross-site analysis strategies are definitely not mutually exclusive (Patton, 1990). According to Miles and Huberman (1984), "seeing processes and outcomes that occur across many cases or sites, and understanding how such processes are bent by specific local contextual variations" (p. 151) can increase the generalizability of a study.

The researcher used the unordered meta-matrix. With this technique, basic information from all three cases was organized and placed on a chart that allowed the investigator to identify patterns. This procedure was reviewed by the auditor.

In the analysis of the patterns that were identified, the researcher looked for similar patterns as well as dissimilar patterns. The process progressed from the
identification of patterns to the examination of interrelationships and constructs and finally to the development of theories (Miles & Huberman, 1984).

Establishing Trustworthiness

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), the terms internal and external validity should be replaced with credibility and transferability, respectively. Their naturalistic paradigm also suggests that we substitute the term dependability for reliability. The researcher made an effort to establish credibility, transferability, and dependability with selected techniques and activities.

Credibility. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985) an investigator could increase credibility by conducting a study over a prolonged period of time, conducting persistent observation, or providing triangulation. Peer debriefing, negative case analysis, referential adequacy, and member checks were suggested as additional techniques in providing credibility.

The investigator employed the following techniques for establishing credibility: triangulation, referential adequacy, and member checks. The technique of triangulation involves the use of a variety of data sources to validate information. Data collected from a survey instrument, interviews, observations, and documents were used to provide for triangulation. Audio taping all the interviews provided
referential adequacy and member checks provided respondents an opportunity to examine and respond to the case reports.

**Transferability.** External validity, transferability, is a measure that indicates whether or not the results of a study can be generalized to other similar populations. The term "naturalistic generalization" has a very different meaning than scientific generalization. Lincoln and Guba (1985) cite Robert Stake as follows:

Stake's posture seems to be that there are two kinds of generalizations. One is rationalistic, propositional, lawlike—that is the meaning we usually attach to the term in scientific discourse. The other kind is more intuitive, empirical, based on personal direct and vicarious experience—that is the meaning intended by the term "naturalistic generalization." Case studies may not contribute much if the former kind of generalization is desired, but cases are a powerful means for building the later. Stake (1978,p.5) points out, "I believe that it is reasonable to conclude that one of the most effective means of adding to understanding--for all readers--will be approximating through the words and illustrations of our reports the natural experience attained in ordinary personal involvement." To put it another way, if you want people to understand better than they otherwise might,
provide them information in the form in which they usually experience it (p.120).

The investigator provided a thick description to enable the reader "interested in making a transfer to reach a conclusion about whether transfer can be contemplated as a possibility" (p.316). However, due to the difficulty in verifying a "proper" thick description, the investigator could not specify the external validity of the study.

**Dependability.** In their book, *Naturalistic Inquiry*, Lincoln and Guba (1985) present four techniques for demonstrating reliability. First, an argument is made that "there can be no validity without reliability (and thus no credibility without dependability), a demonstration of the former is sufficient to establish the latter" (p.316). However, this argument is very weak and for a strong demonstration, dependability must be dealt with directly. The second technique presented was the use of "overlap methods." This technique is a form of triangulation which is also used to demonstrate validity. Therefore, "the overlap methods' are simply one way of carrying out Argument 1 and not a separate approach" (p.317). The third technique suggested using "stepwise replication" which requires an inquiry team of two or more persons. The inquiry audit is the fourth technique suggested for demonstration of dependability.
The inquiry audit was used by the investigator to establish the dependability of this study. The auditor examined the data collection process and inspected the data and the accuracy of the analyses. Finding acceptable procedures and analyses, the auditor established the dependability and confirmability or objectivity of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

The Inquiry Audit. Lincoln and Guba (1985) presented Halpern's description of an audit trail which divides the audit into the following six categories: raw data, data reduction, data reconstruction, process notes, personal notes, and information concerning observation formats and surveys.

The investigator supplied the auditor with audio tapes of interviews, personal notes and reflections of the investigator, transcripts of all interviews, summaries of case reports for each site, teachers' reflective journals, end-of-year narrative reports, and survey data. Halpern's procedures for an audit trail are divided into five stages: "preentry, determination of audibility; formal agreement; determination of trustworthiness (dependability and confirmability and a secondary check on credibility); and closure. These procedures provided the guidelines which were used in the auditing process for this study.

Dr. Carolyn Brown, Chair of the Department of Behavioral Sciences at King College in Bristol, Tennessee,
conducted the audit for this study (see Appendix D for the letter of agreement). Through the auditing process outlined in the audit report, she determined the credibility, dependability, and confirmability of the investigation (see Appendix E).

**Summary**

This study was conducted in nine schools in the Johnson City School System and was designed using the multiple case study format with both quantitative and qualitative data. Participants were initially selected using a purposeful sampling technique which involved the tenured teachers scheduled for evaluation during the 1994-95 school year. In addition, teachers in seven of the elementary schools were randomly assigned to a control group or experimental group.

A total of 24 individuals, 6 principals and 18 teachers, were selected for the interview component of the study. Data from the pre-survey were used to develop an initial interview guide. Both deductive and inductive analyses of data were conducted. Trustworthiness or credibility was demonstrated by triangulation, referential adequacy, and member checks.
Chapter 4
RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of Chapter Four is to present the results of data collection and a discussion of the analysis. Part I presents the data obtained from the Teacher Evaluation Profile Survey Instrument.

Part II, a presentation of the qualitative data, includes a description of the various sites involved in the implementation of the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model. Three groups of teachers and principals participated in interviews and responded to open-ended questions concerning teacher evaluation, professional growth, and motivation. Data were collected through transcripts of interviews, field observations, informal conversations, reflective journals, and narrative reports. Since teachers in the control group were evaluated using the Tennessee State Model for Local Evaluation, which Johnson City Schools has used for a number of years, they did not participate in the qualitative component of the study.

In Part III, critical elements influencing the linking of teacher evaluation, professional growth, and motivation are identified. A discussion of the analysis of findings as it relates to the purpose of the investigation is also presented.
Description of The Teacher Evaluation Profile Instrument

The investigator received permission from Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in Portland, Oregon to use The Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) Questionnaire in this study (see Appendix F). This instrument allowed the investigator to determine the nature of the teacher evaluation environment in the Johnson City School System.

Respondents began by rating the overall quality and impact of their most recent evaluation experience on a scale from 0 to 9. A high rating of 9 for the overall quality reflected very high quality, with a low rating of 0 reflecting very poor quality. Similarly, a high rating of 9 for the overall impact of the evaluation process on professional practices reflected a strong impact on "teaching practices, attitudes about teaching and/or understanding of the teaching process" (Stiggins & Nickel, 1989, p. 154). No impact and no changes in practices, attitudes, and/or understanding were reflected with a low rating of 0. The interval scale also allowed teachers to choose degrees of quality and impact other than the extremes of very high or very low.

The instrument assesses five key attributes that have been identified as essential for effective evaluation systems (Stiggins & Nickel, 1989). The first set of questions (1-9) address attributes of the teacher. The
teachers' perceptions of the person who served as evaluator of their most recent evaluation are reported in questions 10-21. The next set of questions (22-30) focuses on the attributes of the procedures used in the evaluation process. Next, in questions 31-39, teachers indicated the extent to which specific sources of information were used to provide feedback on their performance. In the last set of questions (40-44), the respondents focused on the context in which the evaluation took place.

A five-point descriptive scale is provided on the form for each question. For example, respondents described a procedure used to address the dimensions of their teaching standards to be evaluated on a scale ranging from "all the same for all teachers" to "tailored somewhat for your unique needs," while they rated the examination of student achievement in their evaluation from "not considered" to "used extensively."

Stiggins and Nickel (1989) conducted a pilot test of the instrument. Results of the analysis of correlations among the components of the instrument indicated validity and reliability. "To explore the relationships among items on the TEP, [they] conducted a factor analysis of the 44-item correlation matrix using varimax rotation to yield orthogonal factors" (p. 157). The data received from this analysis indicate that the Teacher Evaluation Profile
Instrument addresses the construct it was designed to reflect.

The coefficient alpha estimates of the internal consistency reliability of the five subscales and estimates of the intercorrelations among scales showed consistently high reliabilities and moderate intercorrelations. "The exception was the teacher scale, which is slightly less reliable and is clearly statistically independent of the other scales" (p. 157). The internal consistency reliability of the total instrument was .93. According to Stiggins and Nickel (1989), the Teacher Evaluation Profile Instrument "is valid in the sense that it provides data on attributes of a teacher evaluation environment that have been shown to be related to teacher growth and development. It is reliable in the sense that it produces internally consistent data on those attributes" (p. 162). The use of this instrument can assist school districts in creating an evaluation environment that will be conducive to producing teacher growth and development through the evaluation process.

Description of The Sample

Demographic items included on the survey instrument provided information on gender, highest degree, career ladder level, ranges of total years of teaching experience, ranges of total years with the Johnson City Schools, and
location of current teaching assignment. Frequency distribution for gender, years experience, career ladder status, and highest degree are presented for each group.

As shown in Table 3, gender distribution is very similar for all four groups involved in the study. The general population of teachers in Johnson City's elementary schools has very few males; therefore, one would expect to see a small number of males in each group. North Side Elementary has no males on their teaching staff.

Table 3

**Frequency Distribution for Gender Within Each Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Bell</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows that the control and experimental groups are very similar in total years of experience. Some teachers failed to respond to the demographic portion of the survey. The missing data is represented in the column marked "M." Three teachers in the control group and one teacher in the experimental group had missing data.

Of those participating in the study, Liberty Bell had the largest percentage of teachers with 5-10 years of
experience and North Side had the greatest percentage in the 21-25 years range. The percentage of teachers in the 16-20 years range was fairly equal for all four groups.

Table 4

Frequency Distribution for Years of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Years experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Bell</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. M = missing data.

As shown in Table 5, the control group and experimental group are very similar in the percentage of participants with Career Level I. The experimental group was the only group that had participants with career level III status.

Table 5

Frequency Distribution for Career Ladder Status of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Career Ladder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>App</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
As shown in Table 6, the control group and experimental group are very similar in the percentage of participants with masters degrees. Liberty Bell had the highest concentration, 90% of those participating in the study, of teachers who have earned advanced degrees.

Table 6

**Frequency Distribution for Highest Degree Earned by Teachers in Each Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Bell</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Abbreviations are as follows: BS = bachelor of science; MS = master of science; MA = master of arts; MEd = master of education; M = missing data.
Descriptive Statistics - Pre-Survey Results

The investigator administered the pre-survey to all participants prior to the beginning of the 1994-95 school year evaluation process. The purpose of this survey was to provide baseline and descriptive data to be combined with the qualitative data for a more detailed and precise description of each case involved in the study. This section will present a descriptive analysis of the data collected through the pre-survey.

Attributes of the Teacher

The first section of the survey addresses the attributes of the teacher. Table 7 displays the mean scores for questions 1-9 for each group. In items 1-7, respondents describe attributes of themselves as teachers. In item 8, however, they indicate the number of years they have been in their current position. In addition, item 9 reflects the teacher's perception of experience with teacher evaluation prior to the most recent experience. This item received the lowest mean score in each group. These scores indicate a general feeling that evaluations have been a waste of time. Teachers in all four groups perceive themselves as having strong attributes in the areas of professional expectations of self, orientation to risk taking, orientation to change, orientation to experimentation in the classroom, knowledge of technical
aspects, and knowledge of subject matter. With the Liberty Bell group and the control group, the lowest mean score was in their openness to criticism. For the North Side group and the experimental group, the lowest mean score was in their orientation to change.

Table 7
Pre-Survey Mean Scores for Each Group by Elements of Effective Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes of the teacher</th>
<th>Mean scores</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Professional expectations of self</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Orientation to risk</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Orientation to change</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Orientation to experimentation</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Openness to criticism</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Knowledge of technical aspects of teaching</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Knowledge of subject matter</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean for items 1-7</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Yrs of experience in position</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Experience with evaluation prior to most recent evaluation</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. Abbreviations used are identified as follows: LB = Liberty Bell Middle School and NS = North Side Elementary School. An overall mean was calculated for items 1-7. Due to the nature of the questions, items 8 and 9 were not included in this mean.

Perceptions of the Evaluator

In the next section of the survey, respondents were asked to describe their perceptions of the person who evaluated their performance. All sites use a team approach in the evaluation process with principals, supervisors, and assistant principals conducting observations. The summative evaluation is conducted by the principal in all of the elementary schools. However, at the middle school, the principal and assistant principals have the responsibility of conducting summative evaluations. When responding to questions 10-21 on the survey, teachers were instructed to consider their principal or grade level assistant principal as their evaluator. Table 8 displays the mean scores for items 10-21. The overall mean scores for all items in this section were very similar for Liberty Bell and North Side. In the control and experimental groups, teachers had similar perceptions of the person evaluating them.

For Liberty Bell, the highest mean scores were in the working relationship with their evaluator, the level of trust, and the temperament of the evaluator. Therefore, the
evaluators at Liberty Bell could be described as being helpful, trustworthy, and patient. The highest mean scores reported by the North Side teachers were in the working relationship with their evaluator and the evaluator's interpersonal manner. The strongest attributes of the North Side evaluator were identified as his helpfulness and patience.

The same evaluators are described by the control group and experimental group. The two highest mean scores for the control group were in the working relationship with evaluators and in the level of trust. The experimental group's highest mean scores were in three areas: the working relationship with evaluators, the interpersonal manner of the evaluators, and the evaluators' knowledge of the technical aspects of teaching. Teachers' perceptions of these evaluators indicate that they are knowledgeable, trustworthy helpers who are non-threatening and patient. All groups reported having a good working relationship with evaluators. Items that received the lowest mean scores were: (a) with both the control and experimental groups -- the evaluator's familiarity with the classroom, (b) with the North Side group -- the evaluator's capacity to model, and (c) with the Liberty Bell group -- the usefulness of the suggestions for improvements made by the evaluator.
Table 8

Pre-Survey Mean Scores for Each Group by Elements of Effective Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions of the person who evaluated your performance</th>
<th>Mean scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Credibility</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Working relationship</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Level of trust</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Interpersonal manner</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Temperament</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Flexibility</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Capacity to model</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Familiarity with your classroom</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Familiarity with classrooms in general</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Usefulness of suggestions</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OVERALL MEAN for 10-21   | 3.96   | 4.03 | 3.83    | 3.72        |

Note. LB = Liberty Bell Middle School; NS = North Side Elementary School.
Attributes of the Procedures

The next section of the questionnaire focuses on the attributes of the procedures used in the evaluation system. The overall mean scores for items 22-30, displayed in Table 9, show teachers' perceptions of the procedures used in the State Model for Local Evaluation to be fairly consistent across the four groups. All groups reported that observation of classroom performance was used extensively as a source of performance information for the evaluation. The lowest mean scores consistently occurred with item number 30; the approximate frequency of informal (unannounced drop-in) observations. This item revealed that informal observations were somewhat infrequent with the State Model. In item 25, the mean scores reflect a general consensus that the teaching standards being evaluated were the same for all teachers. They were not tailored for the individual needs of the teachers.

The most extensive use of student achievement, as a source of information in the evaluation of the teacher's performance, was reported by North Side teachers (mean score = 3.56). The Liberty Bell group had the lowest mean score of 2.10 for this item. For the item regarding teachers' endorsement of the standards used in evaluation, the North Side group had the highest mean score (4.11) and the experimental group had the lowest mean score (3.12) for this item.
Table 9

Pre-Survey Mean Scores for Each Group by Elements of Effective Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes of the procedures</th>
<th>Mean scores</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>LB</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22. Were the standards communicated to you?</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23. Were standards clear to you?</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25. Were standards tailored for you?</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent were the following sources of information used as a part of your evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26. Observation of your classroom performance</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27. Examination of records (lesson plans)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28. Examination of student achievement</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What was the extent of observation in your classroom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29. Number of formal observations</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30. Frequency of informal observations</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Mean for items 22-30</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. Abbreviations used in this table are identified as follows: LB = Liberty Bell Middle School and NS = North Side Elementary School.

Attributes of the Feedback

Table 10 displays the mean scores for the next section of the questionnaire. Items 31-40 address the attributes of the feedback given to the teacher by the evaluator. The overall mean scores for these items, range from 3.18 to 3.85, with the experimental group having the lowest overall mean and the North Side group having the highest overall mean.

Table 10
Pre-Survey Mean Scores for Each Group by Elements of Effective Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes of the feedback</th>
<th>Mean scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Amount of information</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Frequency of formal feedback</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Frequency of informal feedback</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Depth of information provided</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Quality of the ideas and suggestions</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36. Specificity of information</td>
<td>LB  NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00  3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.81  2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Nature of information</td>
<td>3.40  4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00  3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Timing of feedback</td>
<td>3.80  3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.81  3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Feedback focused on district standards</td>
<td>4.10  3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.63  4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean for items 31-39</td>
<td>3.22  3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.45  3.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Abbreviations used in this table are identified as follows: LB = Liberty Bell Middle School and NS = North Side Elementary School.

### Attributes of the Evaluation Context

Table 11 displays the mean scores for items related to the attributes of the evaluation context. The mean scores for all groups on item 40 indicated that a great deal of time was spent on the evaluation process. In contrast, item 41 shows that all groups reported that very little time was allotted for professional development during the school day.

In item 44 respondents rated the intended role of evaluation on a scale from 1 (teachers accountability) to 5 (teacher growth). All groups perceived the intended role of the evaluation process as being more for accountability than for teacher growth. North Side's group had the highest mean score of 3.333 and the experimental group had the lowest mean score of 2.12.
Table 11

Pre-Survey Mean Scores for Each Group by Elements of Effective Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes of the evaluation context</th>
<th>Mean scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Amt. of time spent on evaluation</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Time allotted for professional dev.</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Training programs and models</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Clarity of evaluation policy statements</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Intended Role of evaluation</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean for items 40-44</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Abbreviations used in this table are identified as follows: LB = Liberty Bell Middle School and NS = North Side Elementary School.

In Table 12, mean scores for the overall quality of the evaluation, and its impact on teaching performance are displayed. Results showed the control group with the highest mean score and the experimental group with the lowest overall mean score for perceptions of the overall quality of the evaluation process. Of those responding to the survey, North Side teachers had the highest mean scores in describing the impact of the evaluation process on
teaching performance and Liberty Bell had the lowest mean score.

Table 12

Pre-Survey Mean Scores for Each Group Reflecting Perceptions of Overall Quality and Impact on Teaching Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>LB</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Quality</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Teaching</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Abbreviations used in this table are identified as follows: LB = Liberty Bell Middle School and NS = North Side Elementary School.

Pre-Survey t-test Results for the Control and Experimental Groups

Due to the nature of this study, the investigator used the results of the t-test to enhance the description of the control and experimental groups and not for the purpose of generalization to other populations. From the data collected on the pre-survey for the control and experimental groups, a t-test for independent samples was conducted to test the following null hypotheses:

1. $H_0$: There will be no significant difference between the control and experimental groups in their perceptions of the nature of the evaluation environment based on their experiences under the State Model for Local Evaluation.
2. \( H_0 \): There will be no significant difference between the control and experimental groups in their perceptions of the overall quality of the State Model for Local Evaluation.

3. \( H_0 \): There will be no significant difference between the control and experimental groups in their perceptions of the impact of the State Model for Local Evaluation on teaching performance.

Differences in the mean scores for each item on the pre-survey were analyzed using the t-test for independent samples. With an alpha level of .05, the first null hypothesis was retained for 42 of the 44 items on the questionnaire. Both the second and third null hypotheses were also retained when testing for significant differences in perceptions concerning overall quality and impact on teaching performance.

Tables 13 and 14 display the t-test results for the two items showing a significant difference, in the perceptions of the two groups. Item 24, under the attributes of the evaluation section, addresses a teacher's endorsement of the teaching standards being evaluated. The scale ranges from 1 (not endorsed) to 5 (endorsed). With mean difference of .76, 31 degrees of freedom, t-value of 2.31, and a two-tail probability of 0.028, a significant difference at a level of \( p < .05 \) was detected. The control group more strongly
endorsed the standards for the State Model for Local Evaluation than did the experimental group.

Table 13

Results of Pre-Survey t-test for Independent Samples: Attributes of the Evaluation Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24. Were standards endorsed by you:</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

The second item showing a significant difference is found in the section that focuses on the attributes of the feedback provided. Item 36 addresses the specificity of the information provided. The scale ranges from 1 (general) to 5 (specific). With a mean difference of 1.10, 31 degrees of freedom, a t-value of 2.95, and a two-tail probability of .006, a significant difference at the level of p < .05 was identified. Based on perceptions of the State Model for Local Evaluation, the control group reported receiving more specific information from the evaluator's feedback than did the experimental group. Table 14 displays the t-test results for item 36.

Responses to rating the overall quality of the evaluation from both groups were analyzed using the t-test. With an alpha level of .05, the perceptions of the two groups were not significantly different, t = 1.62, p = .114.
The t-test results also indicate no significant difference in the perceptions of the impact of evaluation on teaching performance, \( t = 1.66, p = .109 \) (see Table 15).

Table 14

Results of Pre-Survey t-test for Independent Samples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes of the Feedback</th>
<th>Specificity of the Information provided:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05

Table 15

Results of Pre-Survey t-test for Independent Samples:

Overall Quality on Impact on Teaching Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Quality</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact on teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Quality</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results of the t-test on the data collected from the pre-survey provide a baseline of similarity among all those involved in this multiple-site case study. Overall, the nature of the evaluation environment, as perceived by
respondents, in the Johnson City School System was fairly consistent across the district at the beginning of this investigation.

Post-Survey ANCOVA Results

From the data collected on the post-survey for the control and experimental groups, an analysis of variance (ANCOVA) was conducted to test the following null hypotheses as stated in Chapter I, while controlling for initial differences reflected on the pre-survey.

4. $H_0$: There will be no significant difference in the adjusted means of perceptions of the nature of the evaluation environment of teachers who have participated in the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model and of teachers who have been evaluated using a traditional, competency-based evaluation model.

5. $H_0$: There will be no significant difference in the adjusted means of perceptions of the overall quality of evaluation, between teachers who have participated in the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model and teachers who have been evaluated using a traditional, competency-based evaluation model.

6. $H_0$: There will be no significant difference in the adjusted means of perceptions of the impact of evaluation on teaching performance, between teachers who have participated in the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model
and teachers who have been evaluated using a traditional, competency-based evaluation model.

The analysis of covariance was used to compare differences in the post-survey, while controlling for differences in pre-survey mean scores. With an alpha level of .05, the fourth null hypothesis was retained for 39 out of 44 items. The fifth null hypothesis, addressing the overall quality of the evaluation process, was also retained.

With an alpha level of .05, four items in the section addressing attributes of the procedures reflected significant differences. Table 16 displays the results of the ANCOVA for these four items.

For item 25, the scale allowed respondents to indicate the extent to which the evaluation system was tailored to meet unique needs of the teachers. The experimental group perceived the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model to be somewhat tailored to individual needs; whereas, the control group indicated that the State Model for Local Evaluation standards were the same for all teachers. The difference in perceptions was statistically significant, $F = 21.18$, $p = .000$.

Item 26 required respondents to indicate the extent to which observations of classroom performance were used as a source of information for the evaluation. The scale ranged from 1 (not considered) to 5 (used extensively). The mean
scores for this item ranged from 2.71 to 4.57. Classroom observations were used extensively for the control group and somewhat considered for the experimental group. With an alpha level of .05, the difference in perceptions was statistically significant, \( F = 26.4, p = .000 \).

Items 29 and 30 also deal with classroom observations. A significant difference in the extent of classroom observations, both formal and informal, was revealed from the ANCOVA. The control group reported a greater number of formal classroom observations per year and a greater frequency of informal observations than did the experimental group. For the item concerning the number of formal observation, \( F = 9.16, p = .006 \). Differences in perceptions were also significant for the frequency of informal observations, \( F = 7.4, p = .012 \).

Table 17 shows the results for item 44, which addresses the intended role of the evaluation process. The scale for responses ranged from 1 (teacher accountability) to 5 (teacher growth). The control group perceived the evaluation process as being more applicable for teacher accountability. On the other hand, the experimental group described the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model as being designed more for teacher growth. The difference in perceptions was statistically significant, \( F = 8.9, p = .006 \).

The overall quality of the evaluation and its impact on teaching performance were addressed at the beginning of the
Table 16

Analysis of Covariance Showing Comparisons of Control and Experimental Groups' Post-Survey, While Controlling for Pre-Survey Scores: Attributes of the Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25. Were standards the same or tailored:</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.38</td>
<td>21.18</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26. Observation of your classroom performance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>29. Number of formal observations per year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30. Approximate freq. informal observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
Table 17

Analysis of Covariance Showing Comparisons of Control and Experimental Groups' Post-Survey, While Controlling for Pre-Survey Scores: Attributes of the Evaluation Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation:</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

survey instrument. As shown in Table 18, the perceptions of the two groups concerning the overall quality of their most recent evaluation was not statistically significant, F = 2.92, p = .100. With an alpha level of .05, the difference in adjusted means of perception of the impact of the evaluation process on teaching performance was statistically significant, F = 9.66, p = .005; therefore, the sixth null hypothesis was rejected.

Comparisons of Pre-Survey and Post-Survey Responses

Do teachers' perceptions of the nature of the evaluation environment change based on their participation in the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model? The research question is stated in the format of a null hypothesis as follows:

7. H₀: There will be no significant difference in teachers' responses to the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) instrument based on a competency-based model of
evaluation and responses based on participation in the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model.

8. \( H_0 \): There will be no significant difference in the control group's responses to the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) pre-survey instrument and the post-survey instrument.

Table 18

Analysis of Covariance Showing Comparisons of Control and Experimental Groups' Post-Survey. While Controlling for Pre-Survey Scores: Overall Quality and Impact on Teaching Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Quality:</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact on Teaching Performance:

Control: 6.36 2.10 1 24.14 9.66 .005*

Experimental: 8.07 1.00

* \( p < .05 \)

To test null hypothesis number seven, the t-test for dependent samples was used to compare responses on the TEP instrument given before and after participation in the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model. This analysis, displayed in Tables 19-21, gives a comparison of the pre-
survey and post-survey results for each group; Liberty Bell, North Side, and the experimental group.

A t-test for dependent samples was also conducted using data from the pre- and post-survey for the control group. The form of evaluation used with this group did not change. The responses of the control group on both surveys, reflect their perceptions of the State Model for Local Evaluation. With an alpha level of .05, the differences in perceptions on the pre- and post-survey were not statistically significant for any item for the control group.

Liberty Bell's t-test results, as shown in Table 19, reflect significant differences, with an alpha level of .05, in 4 out of 44 items. Two of these items were related to perceptions of the evaluator. The responses on the post-survey indicated that the evaluator was perceived as being more credible and providing more useful information with the use of the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model. Two other improvements in meeting teachers' individual needs and providing time during the school day for professional development were also reflected.

For North Side Elementary, the only two areas showing a statistically significant difference in perceptions as a result of participation in the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model were related to the attributes of the evaluation procedures. The post-survey results reveal less
use of the examination of classroom records (lesson plans) as a source of information for the evaluation. Also, there were fewer formal observations of classroom performance (see Table 20).

Table 19
Results of t-test for Dependent Samples Showing Comparisons of Pre-Survey and Post-Survey Responses for the Liberty Bell Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pre M</th>
<th>Post M</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator Credibility</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.015*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator Usefulness of info.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>-2.37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.042*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures Standards tailored</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>-2.75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.022*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context Time for prof. dev.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>-2.59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.029*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

For the experimental group, the null hypothesis was retained for 32 of the 44 items. Those reflecting a difference in means at an alpha level of .05 are displayed in Table 21. The majority of the items were related to either the attributes of the procedures of the evaluation or the evaluation context. Attributes of the teacher and attributes of the feedback each had one item that showed
differences with $p < .05$. For all except two items, the differences reflected an increased mean score, indicating improved perceptions of the attributes. The only two items reflecting a decrease in mean scores involved use of classroom observations as a source of information and the number of formal classroom observations during the year.

Table 20

**Results of t-test for Dependent Samples Showing Comparisons of Pre-Survey and Post-Survey Responses for the North Side Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Pre M</th>
<th>Post M</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>Use of class records</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td># of Formal observ.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Did teachers' perceptions of the overall quality of the evaluation system and its impact on teaching performance change after participating in the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model? Did teachers who were in the control group have a different perception, at the end of the 1994-95 school year, of the overall quality of the evaluation process and its impact on their teaching performance? These two research questions are related to the seventh and eighth
null hypotheses and were tested for significance by use of the t-test for dependent samples.

Table 21

Results of t-test for Dependent Samples Showing Comparisons of Pre- and Post-Survey Responses for the Experimental Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Pre M</th>
<th>Post M</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Orientation to change</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>-4.24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>-2.78</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>-3.77</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>Standards communicated</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>-2.42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>Standards endorsed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>-5.60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>Tailored standards</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>-5.09</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>Observation classroom</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td># of formal observations</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.023*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Specificity information</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>-2.89</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Time for prof. dev.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>-4.24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Clarity of policy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>-4.24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Intended role</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>-5.18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
All four groups involved in the study reported improved perceptions of the overall quality evaluation and its impact on teaching performance, as shown in Table 22. However, the difference in perceptions for the North Side group concerning the impact of the evaluation process on their teaching performance was not statistically significant. The North Side group's results for the item concerning overall quality were $t = -2.69$ and $p = .028$. Mean scores for the item concerning the impact on teaching performance were $t = -2.04$, $p = .076$. Using an alpha level of .05, the control groups perceptions of overall quality and impact on teaching performance did not change significantly, $t = -1.75$, $p = .100$ and $t = -1.65$, $p = .119$, respectively.

As shown in Table 22, both the Liberty Bell group and the experimental group showed significant differences in perceptions of both overall quality and impact on teaching performance. For the question on overall quality the mean scores for Liberty Bell and the experimental group were very similar and represent a perception of high quality concerning the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model. The experimental group's mean score for ranking the impact of the evaluation process on teaching performance was the highest of all four groups. With a mean score of 5.44, the control group gave the lowest rating to the impact of the State Model on teaching performance.
Table 22

Results of t-test for Dependent Samples Showing Comparisons of Pre-Survey and Post-Survey Responses for All Four Groups:

Overall Quality and Impact on Teaching Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Pre M</th>
<th>Post M</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Bell</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>-3.25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.010*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>-2.48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.035*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>-2.69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>-2.04</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>-5.33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>-6.16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

Summary of Survey Results

Responses to the pre-survey were based on teachers' experiences with a competency-based model of evaluation. With an alpha level of .05, 42 of the 44 items on the questionnaire showed no significant differences in perceptions of the control and experimental groups. There was also no significant difference in their perceptions of the overall quality of evaluation and its impact on teaching performance.

In comparing responses from the control and experimental groups, results indicated that the control
group more strongly endorsed the standards of the evaluation and had received more specific feedback from the administrator than did the experimental group. Results of the t-test also revealed no significant difference between the two groups in their perceptions of the overall quality of the evaluation and its impact on teaching performance.

Responses on the post-survey were based on the teacher's most recent evaluation. The control group was evaluated using the competency-based model, while the experimental group was evaluated using the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model. Using the analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) and an alpha level of .05, five items revealed a significant difference in perceptions of the two groups.

Items reflecting significant differences fell into the areas of procedures, the intended role of evaluation, and the impact of the evaluation on teaching performance. The experimental group indicated the process and standards used for evaluation were tailored to meet individual needs of teachers, emphasized professional growth, and had a positive impact on their teaching performance. On the other hand, the control group reported more extensive use of formal and informal observations as a source of data for the evaluation.

The Professional Teacher Evaluation Model was designed to be individualized, to involve fewer formal classroom observations, and to emphasize professional growth. The
significant differences reflect a difference in the design of the evaluation models being used.

When comparing pre- and post-survey results of the other three groups, the investigator found the experimental group to have a greater number of items reflecting significant differences in teachers' perceptions of the evaluation process. For the Liberty Bell group, results revealed significant improvement in perceptions of the evaluation process were revealed in the credibility of the evaluator, the usefulness of the information, the individualization of the standards, and the amount of time being allotted for professional development during the school day.

Results of the analysis of data gathered from the North Side Elementary group did not show any significant differences in improvement of their perceptions of the evaluation process. The only two areas reflecting a significant difference were the use of class records as a data source and the number of formal observations. In both cases, these data sources were used less with the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model than they had been used under the competency-based model. Again, the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model was designed to emphasize the use of alternative sources of data.

As a result of their experiences with the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model, the experimental group viewed
themselves as being more oriented toward change and the evaluator as being more credible and flexible. The standards for the evaluation were communicated better, were more readily endorsed and were tailored to individual needs of the teachers. Formal classroom observations were not used as much as a source of data and the number of formal observations was reduced. Teachers indicated they had more specific feedback with the new model. The intended role of the evaluation was perceived to be more for professional development and more time was provided for professional development activities. Teachers in this group felt the evaluation policy had been made more clear with the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model.

After participating in this growth-oriented model, both the Liberty Bell group and experimental group showed significant improvements in their perception of the overall quality of the evaluation and its impact on their teaching performance. Even though the North Side group ranked the new model higher in both categories, the difference in the mean scores on the pre- and post-survey was not significant.

**Part II: Interview, Observation, and Document Results**

Part II includes a description of the various sites involved in the investigation. Case study reports for Liberty Bell Middle School, North Side Elementary School, and the experimental group are presented in this section of
Chapter Four. These three groups of teachers and principals participated in interviews and responded to open-ended questions concerning teacher evaluation, professional growth, and motivation. Data were collected through transcripts of interviews, field observations, informal conversations, reflective journals, and narrative reports. The control group did not participate in the qualitative component of the study.

Through qualitative analysis, critical elements influencing the linking of teacher evaluation, professional growth, and motivation were identified. These elements fall in four major categories: (a) characteristics of the school culture, (b) characteristics of the administrator, (c) characteristics of the teacher, and (d) characteristics of the process. The level of success of the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model varied somewhat among the groups investigated. The degree of success was directly related to the characteristics of the culture, the administrator, the teacher, and the process.

**Within-Site Analysis - Case Study Reports**

This section presents case study reports for each group involved in the investigation. The groups were composed of principals and teachers from Johnson City Schools' eight elementary schools and one middle school. To ensure confidentiality, the names of those who participated in the
study will not be used in the presentation of the data. In each case report teachers will be referred to as Teacher A, Teacher B, etc.

**Liberty Bell Middle School**

Liberty Bell Middle School, serving approximately 1450 students in grades 6-8, is located on the northeast end of Johnson City in a complex that includes Freedom Hall Convention Center and Science Hill High School. The professional staff consists of a principal, three assistant principals, three guidance counselors, two librarians, 86 classroom teachers (including special education and resource), and instructors for exploratory courses and special programs (teen living, art, music, band, physical education, technology, orchestra, computer technology, and foreign language). Each grade level is divided into interdisciplinary teams and is served by an assistant principal and guidance counselor. Various configurations of teams are designed to meet the needs of the student population.

The principal of Liberty Bell Middle School is a dedicated professional interested in her teachers' growth and development and the impact that will have on student learning. Due to this interest, she requested permission from the Director of Schools to provide an alternative form of evaluation for tenured teachers. When asked to participate in this multiple-site case study, piloting a
goal-setting model of evaluation designed to promote growth and motivation, the principal whole-heartily agreed. Since she already had some ideas of how a goal-setting, growth-oriented model of evaluation should be implemented, the investigator included this site as one group for investigation. The principal and teachers at Liberty Bell decided to name their growth plans -- Professional Improvement Plans (PIP).

The evaluation cycle for Liberty Bell teachers has been designed in such a way that all teachers teaching a particular subject are scheduled for evaluation the same year. The language arts teachers were scheduled to be evaluated during the 1994-95 school year. However, because of her commitment to providing opportunities for growth, the principal wanted to present the concept of Professional Improvement Plans (PIP) to all teachers. Grade level meetings were held where she presented her ideas for professional improvement. All teachers were asked to consider developing Professional Improvement Plans (PIP) either as an individual or as a team.

Teachers scheduled for evaluation were given an opportunity to choose how they wanted to be evaluated from the following options: (a) the competency-based model that has been used since 1988, the State Model for Local Evaluation, or (b) the goal-setting model being piloted, The Professional Teacher Evaluation Model. All tenured language
arts teachers chose the goal-setting model. The majority of teachers responded very favorably to the idea of Professional Improvement Plans. In the discussion, an 8th grade language arts teacher commented that this process would be on-going. By setting 3 to 5 year goals, as well as shorter term goals of 1 to 2 years, evaluation becomes a continuous process with teachers continuously learning and growing.

The principal developed an outline of components necessary for the PIP plans which included: (a) criterion, (b) objectives, (c) procedures, and (d) appraisal method and target dates. Part I of the plan, the criterion, should identify exactly what the teacher or teachers would like to do. Part II, the section for objectives, should list specific things that will need to be accomplished to reach the criterion in Part I. In Part III, action plans and activities planned to achieve each goal are addressed. Part IV of the plan, appraisal method and target dates, will present a plan for documenting and evaluating progress toward the criterion and objectives and a timeline for implementation. When this outline was presented to teachers, the principal requested their input and suggestions.

Participation in this process was completely voluntary. Those being evaluated could choose this approach as opposed to the State Model for Evaluation. Other teachers could
choose to participate as an individual, with others as a team, or not all. The principal was impressed by the number of teachers electing to be involved in some sort of Professional Improvement Plan. After teachers developed their Professional Improvement Plans according to the outline, they had a conference with the principal to discuss their plans. A copy of the plan, signed by the teacher and principal, was placed in the teacher’s personnel file.

A total of ten teachers participated in the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model. From this group, three were selected for the interview process through a purposeful sampling technique. One additional teacher, who was considered a possible source of new information was added to the interview roster as the process evolved. This case study report includes comments and reactions from four teachers and the principal. Data collected through observations, field notes, reflective journals, and narrative reports are also included.

Principal Interview. The principal of Liberty Bell Middle School is a graceful, articulate administrator with a high level of professionalism. On March 15, 1995, the investigator conducted an interview with her in her inviting and comfortable office. The door was closed to provide privacy for the interview.

The investigator began by asking the principal to describe the evaluation process she was using for tenured
teachers. Some of the major characteristics mentioned by her were: flexible, collaborative, and continuous. Her enthusiasm about this process was clear when she said:

I'm very excited about it. First of all, it gives the teachers an opportunity to work on what they really are interested in. Secondly, it gives us the opportunity as a school to form expert groups; therefore, we become our own staff developers in a sense. What I see happening next year after we're into this is that we would have faculty meetings after school, whereby teams or individuals would share the projects that they are working on. Each of them is collecting material in journal form... Therefore, that will be available to the entire school.

The principal also described this process as being informal, formative, and individualized. Teachers decided on an area of interest and prepared a rough draft outlining the criterion, objectives, procedures, evaluation and timeline. At this point, a discussion with the principal about their plans helped to identify available resources. She offered "suggestions for videos they could watch or books they could read, or ERIC searches they needed to do, and other people they needed to talk with." Informal observations were planned to provide formative checks.

When asked to describe the components of the process that had gone well, the principal responded:
First of all, I'm thrilled with the number that have agreed to [participate] initially. Secondly, as we now work with untenured teachers in the development plan that they have to do...as part of their summative, we are making suggestions that they enter into a PIP Plan, too.

The investigator asked the principal to compare this new model of evaluation for the experienced teacher with the State Model for Local Evaluation. She explained:

First of all, I think it better addresses their professional needs at this particular point. It is not mechanical, like the seven step process or the TIM process for teacher evaluation. As a matter of fact, teachers could really meet all of those components without doing a really good job in the classroom. I think once we tenure a teacher, we are saying they are professional; therefore, in my opinion and theirs, I think they need to do something different than what we would use for non-tenured teachers. I think the TIM model has some pluses, but I think they are really excited about the fact that they can work on something that they are interested in and that they can apply within their classroom situation. [The process] gets into action research. That is really what they are doing in keeping journals and logs; therefore, I think
we can build on that whole idea as part of professional development.

As comparisons were made between the competency-based model and the growth-oriented model, the issue of time was mentioned. The principal indicated that she felt the time spent with this new model of evaluation was a better use of time. She said: "I don't find it a burden of time, because it's a high when you go into meet with these people and they are so excited about what they are doing. It is almost a natural move for many to integrate a curriculum...I think it is a better use of time."

Benefits of this evaluation program were also discussed. The principal first indicated benefits to the teacher, "I think the biggest thing is that it has made them thinkers. They are analyzing what they want to do and how it needs to be done and why it needs to be done." One part of this program that the principal required was that teachers become more familiar with brain-based research in learning and teaching by participating in a study group. Teachers became so excited about Jane Healy's book, Endangered Minds, that they read the entire book rather than the one assigned section.

The principal did not feel that students had benefited directly from this evaluation program. However, she indicated that teachers are modeling the process of learning and are becoming better learners themselves. Students
should be brought into the dialogue of what it means to learn.

Another advantage of this type of evaluation process is its connection with other requirements for professional growth and inservice. The principal said: "...we've offered this whole process, as their professional growth and their inservice. [They are] obligated basically only then to what the district would indicate that we would have to be involved in, but this plan covers both of those." This type of evaluation allows us to link evaluation to professional growth and inservice. "Teachers who have chosen this path... [have chosen] a continuous improvement plan. It is not something that they just do once every three years or five years or whatever. It is on a year to year basis."

Looking ahead to how this evaluation system should be implemented on a larger scale, the principal indicated that teachers should have options. "...I think if it is an option and people get excited about it, then those 'nervous nellies' who have been on those fence posts waiting to see how things will happen are drawn into it...I think that could really jeopardize it if we force feed people on it." She also added that she feels teachers should be given an opportunity to revise their plans if they find they have set unrealistic goals. "So it is always a dynamic piece of work; it is not static."
Another topic of discussion concerned the issue of how to address a tenured teacher who may be having some difficulties in their teaching performance. The principal responded to this issue by saying:

Hopefully, the principal would have done his/her work by that time and the teacher would know that there were areas that the administrator felt needed to have some concentration. Therefore, I would work with my faculty, I would be very up-front about that and say this is fine, but these are the things I'm going to build in because of what we have already talked about in the past. There [would be] a paper trail on that.

When asked what kind of interaction she was going to have at the end of the year with the teachers involved in this process, the principal responded:

It will be a check point... They will have begun their reading and their studying. Some of them are working on particular subjects, so it will be a sharing situation. Basically, then taking their plan, most of them are working on a three year span [and asking the following]: (a) What is your concentration for next year? (b) What do I as the administrator have to provide? (c) What do you need? Basically set up a plan for what we intend to do next year... They must keep a journal, start their reading in their own study groups, etc. They are developing a portfolio ...
The issue of assigning scores for levels of achievement toward goals was discussed. The principal indicated that she did not intend to assign scores. She explained:

My feedback would be these are commendations and recommendations. That is all I intend to do... So far I am very pleased about what they have done. Before I met with them, they had done a lot of work, in that they [met] as a group and talked about what they wanted to do. They had written rough drafts. I read them and made suggestions and turned them back and they rewrote. So far I'm very pleased. I think they are very realistic... So far I'm quite pleased with what they are doing. Again, I think that comes from their interest.

If the principal had to assign scores to a specific criteria for these teachers she feels that they would all be five's. She is very pleased with the quality of their work.

Teacher A Interview. The first teacher interviewed, Teacher A, from Liberty Bell was a seventh grade language arts teacher. In her 21st year of teaching, this teacher holds a masters degree plus 45 hours and is a Career Ladder I teacher.

She was very excited about this new process for evaluation from the very beginning. She knew immediately what she wanted to work on and was able to identify some very challenging goals. The investigator selected this
teacher as an interviewee after the principal indicated how pleased she was with what she was doing and the impact she was having on students.

After school on May 19, 1995, the investigator met with Teacher A in her classroom to discuss her reactions to the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model. Her classroom was very neat and organized. The blackboard contained information from the day's lesson and an overhead projector was placed near the front of the room. The teacher seemed anxious for the interview to begin. She had a folder containing several sets of papers clipped together. This organized packet of information provided documentation of her Professional Improvement Plan and the activities in which she had been involved through this process.

At the beginning of the interview, Teacher A expressed her opinion of this form of evaluation and its impact on her motivation by saying:

...this has been so nice to be able to choose something that I wanted to do personally to help me in my teaching and that I felt would help students and yet, still get credit for it and it was more exciting to do that...I mean it has been exciting to do some of the readings that we've had, to watch some of the tapes, to find new things to do. It was more exciting to do lesson plans. It was more work, but it was interesting. It was sort of like a challenge.
As the teacher continued to talk she began to share some of the activities she had implemented in her classroom. The development of many of these activities was a direct result of her readings of professional literature. She cited examples of improved student learning and evidence of carryover of the skills learned to other areas:

I told the kids, "I want you to learn to catch mistakes. Some of the other teachers told me that the kids are proof reading their work. One teacher said that she had something on the overhead one day and this boy said, "...did you know that you need a comma..."? She said, "How did you know that"? And he said, "I learned that in English. I've learned a lot in English this year." That just made my day, because he was conscious of these things and carrying it over into something else...I have seen so much improvement in their writing since the beginning of the year. That's been exciting to actually be able to see some improvement and to be able to carry it over into other subjects, that was nice.

The investigator listened attentively as Teacher A continued to share her excitement about all the things she had done and her students' progress. She emphasized that this type of evaluation is an on-going process when she said, "that's one thing that I really want to work on next year..."
A strong link between evaluation, professional growth, and motivation is apparent from Teacher A's comments. The investigator got a sense of her motivation and the connection being made between evaluation and professional growth when she said:

Nancy, this has been...it's almost been like a first year of teaching. I have some of that excitement back. [The principal] told me when I met with her in January, to be sure to keep down the time that I spent. She sent me the books and you did the ERIC search and I know when I first got that I said three is no way I can ever get these assignments. I'm just going to concentrate on one article a night. I finished months ago. It was interesting, it was fun, I could say, "hey I've done that" or "I didn't do this exactly the way they said, I need to change this." I felt like it was things that I could use that applied to exactly what I was doing. When I kept my time down. I couldn't get over this is my first year of my professional growth cycle. I have 30 some hours. This is great!

When asked if she felt like she had grown from this process, she said, "Yeah! I feel like ... I can honestly say, I feel like I have done a better job. I am more comfortable in what I have done this year than any year since I've been up here." Teacher A's motivation was very evident as she continued to give more and more examples of
student progress. Students wrote biographies and essays that were entered into contests. Several pieces of student work were published in the *Kingsport Times News*. The teacher received lots of positive feedback from parents on the work that students were doing and the recognition they were receiving. She said that as she got into her goals:

The more I thought about and the more I read, I guess the more I really got into it...I said, "I want to do this and if I do this, I ought to do this..." It was sort of like a snowball effect, I guess.

Being a very organized person, Teacher A was able to set her own deadlines and schedule for this process. It was evident that she felt very comfortable in setting her own schedule for completion of activities and projects. She shared:

That's just the way I operate. I'm not one to put things off to the last minute. I like to think about it. I wrote it up one weekend, but I didn't type it. I came back the next weekend and looked at it again and made some changes and added some things. That's just how I do things. I don't function well under pressure. That helped me because I didn't feel so overwhelmed with it. I would look at it and check things off. I kept a record. I kept each one of these in a paper clip and when I would make out a test, I would put a copy in here. So I could look back and say I've been
working on this. [The principal] told me to keep a bibliography of what I had read ...maybe somebody else would want to read the books I had read. I don't think.... any of the books that I have ordered have been excellent as far as being down to earth and giving me ideas on how to do some of these things. After I met with her... I met with her the first of May. She seemed to be very pleased how I was doing and gave me some suggestions about next year. She said there was a video on curriculum integration that would be good and that I would probably want to watch. And then she suggested that same book Schools of Thought.

Teacher A feels that this model of evaluation has been much more beneficial to her than the State Model for Local Evaluation. She stated:

I think this one has helped me become a much better teacher. I feel more comfortable... This one has been great because it is more of an ongoing thing. I feel like it was more beneficial to me to improve my teaching. Instead of doing three okay lessons, I've tried to say okay...let's make this a little more.... I have really enjoyed this a lot more. I really think you apply yourself a lot more if you think it is going to benefit you. That helps the kids.

The investigator was very impressed by this teacher's excitement. Her voice inflections, laughter, and enthusiasm
reflect a very motivated teacher who has appreciated the opportunity to link evaluation with professional growth. This year has been a rejuvenating experience for her. She has been renewed and is excited about teaching again.

Teacher B interview. The next teacher interviewed, Teacher B, was a sixth grade language arts teacher with 27 years of teaching experience. He has a masters degree and is a Career Ladder I teacher.

The investigator selected Teacher B for the interview component of the study because of comments he made during the orientation. He expressed his belief that the current form of evaluation is a waste of time for most teachers and administrators. He indicated that experienced teachers should have a different approach to evaluation from that of the beginning teacher and seemed very excited about the possibilities of this new form of evaluation and the PIP Plan. The investigator saw Teacher B as a source of rich information.

On May 24, 1995, the investigator conducted an interview with Teacher B in the 6th grade conference room located in Constitution Hall of the Liberty Bell Complex. At the beginning of the interview, Teacher B was asked to give a description of the type of evaluation process he had been involved in and to express how he felt about his experience. He responded:
I would just like to preface it by saying that I am just really thrilled after 27 years of a profession to have an evaluation procedure which I feel enables me to really grow. And I am going through sort of a double barrel of folks as part of the language program. We are converting to the whole language approach pretty much totally, and so I have been doing some things with the other language arts teachers in that regard. And then [another teacher] and I have our own separate plan in which we are going to integrate language arts and social studies to... That's why we are actually changing rooms so we can be beside each other. We are going to have the doors open pretty often; I hope. At this point, I want them open more than she does. If it works out fine, my goal would be to have the doors open almost constantly except for maybe one day a week when we need to do our own separate thing. I am excited about both of the plans that I am involved with.

Teacher B stated that the team of 6th grade language arts teachers met together to decide "on some general, raw goals and objectives, and procedures, and have spent a lot of time this year doing a lot of reading." He indicated that each person in the group is researching and developing whole language activities that they will share with the others. Evidence of reflective practice was seen when Teacher B stated:
I have already come up with three or four whole language activities based on stories that I think will fit in really well. I have implemented two of them already this year and found some bugs, which I can get out by next year. And I think a lot of the other teachers have done the same. We are not going to share them until we debug them so to speak. I am saving one that is kind of exciting and interesting and gets the kids up and about. The last week of school is a good time to do that. So I will have actually tried three of the four new whole language activities this year and then once we debug them we are going to share them with each other and try them, because we don't have any accurate information among all of us.

Teacher B feels he has benefited tremendously from being involved in his Professional Improvement Plans. He feels he has grown professionally and has been rejuvenated. Also, Teacher B really appreciates the collegiality that has developed among the teachers. He stated:

It's been a benefit in a lot of ways. Number one we are actually getting to do something meaningful, instead of coming up with a lesson plan and a unit plan as we have done all of these years. A lot of times that particular lesson plan, and that particular unit plan was not even what we were teaching when we were observed; formerly evaluated. It's just so much better, because now we are
coming up with things that we can really use. We are not doing this for just an evaluation. We are actually doing something that is really going to benefit us...that's going to allow us to grow professionally and improve professionally. A side effect which I had not counted on is it has enabled us to, kind of forced us to get together. We are not isolated. We are not doing our own little thing in our own little classroom as much. I mean the language arts teachers are at an advantage for us to be able to share with each other. Karen and I have spent more time talking about what each other does. I'm excited about it. It's been a rejuvenation for me because I have just two or three years left until I can retire, not that I am going to. A lot of my decision will be based largely upon how well this works and how excited I am. But I really appreciate the opportunity to do this because the other one...I mean I am not being critical, but it was very little ever came out of those evaluations that enabled me to improve or grow. I have always been fortunate to get good evaluations, but all of us need good constructive criticism. All of us need to be pushed or given opportunities to improve and to grow and that was lacking before. I think this...I think if a person has ownership, if a person has responsibility, that the end product is usually better. And I think the teachers who
chose this now have an ownership of their improvement and their evaluation and I think it's a great thing.

When the issue of time was discussed, Teacher B indicated that this process requires a lot more time than the State Model of Local Evaluation; however, he emphasized that he did not mind the extra time because he and other teachers "see that it benefits them and it's more efficient."

Another area of discussion concerned how this type of evaluation affected the relationships between teachers and principals. Teacher B said:

It's different. It's better. Because we hear that they too have a handle on what we are doing, and they are working with us. It's not just a come in one time, fill out a check sheet type of thing. It's a constant. Not only the initial conference, but we have had with several conferences with the principal along the way, and little progress reports, and she has been very helpful. She understands that we've got a lot of other things to do, and there hasn't been a lot of pressure to have such and such done by a certain time. It's an ongoing kind of process, which is really I guess what it should be. But we feel as if they're more involved with what we are doing and therefore have a better understanding of what we are doing. I think it's been very beneficial from that stand point too, because I think they know what we are doing, and we can benefit
from seeing them and asking them questions about what we can do.

In our discussion of the framework of the evaluation process, Teacher B indicated that he liked the flexibility and the freedom to set his own deadlines and timeline for completion. He felt that the broad framework, the Professional Improvement Plan and its four components, was sufficient for his needs. He also felt comfortable about not having scores assigned by the administrator. When asked how it made him feel not to be rated, Teacher B said, "It doesn't bother me, because that's a very superficial kind of deal. I think any teacher worth his salt is his or her own harshest critic anyway."

Teacher B also compared the value of this new model for evaluation with the value of the State Model for Local Evaluation. He said:

I don't want to be critical, but in 27 years of teaching at the public school and private school level, I never received an evaluation that I felt really...that had any kind of constructive criticism that enabled me to grow at all. I got a lot of, as you say, positive strokes. So I guess it was helpful to know that I was doing something that makes it that way. But the longer I was in the profession, the more the evaluation just became a chore. Just something to go through and to get over
with actually. And that's why that I really like this new model.

When asked to identify components of this new form of evaluation that need improvement, Teacher B indicated that providing time for teachers to collaborate, plan, share, etc. during the school day would reap the most benefits. He stated:

I know this year we've spent a lot of...and I mean I have really appreciated it anyway...the days in the library on integration, and one earlier on and I have really enjoyed those days. It's stimulating. Not only professionally stimulating, but you get to see...this is a big campus and it's nice to see some of these other folks that we never get a chance to see...

According to Teacher B, having the time to be together to read and discuss readings would relieve a lot of frustration. However, he stated, "But we'll get it done ... because of the ownership and the enthusiasm." This statement reflects the importance of teachers selecting areas of interest and having the freedom to explore those in ways they have chosen. This ownership provides the motivation for teachers to accomplish their goals.

One exciting result of this pilot at Liberty Bell has been the connection that has been made between the evaluation system, professional growth, and motivation. Teacher B shared
how he is tying his evaluation with his professional growth plans for the summer. He explained:

We are getting together for at least two days this summer. The school system is paying for the two of us to go to a TAMS [Tennessee Association of Middle Schools] conference because a lot of the focus is on integration, and so we are going mid-June and we are going to spend about a day and a half there. Then the two of us are going to meet, either... We are going to play it by ear. It will be a total of anywhere from six to twelve hours. We are going to start out from eight or eight-thirty, and as long as we are fresh and making progress we are going to keep going. If we want to do it just in the mornings, or if we really get going and get six or eight hours in a day we'll do it. If we want to stop at eleven o'clock and start again another day...

Teacher B expressed his appreciation for this new approach to evaluation which has provided him with a new challenge. He has been rejuvenated by his experience and is looking forward to the upcoming years. He will still be teaching the sixth grade; "But, it's gonna be a new program in a lot of different ways. That's something to look forward to."

**Teacher C Interview.** Teacher C is a 6th grade language arts teacher who has 15 years of teaching experience, has a
master's degree, and is a Career Ladder I teacher. The investigator observed Teacher C as she implemented a new skill in her classroom. Therefore, she was included on the interview roster for Liberty Bell to provide more in-depth information about her experience and her reactions to the process.

When asked to describe this new model of evaluation from her perspective, Teacher C provided both positive and negative feedback. She said:

Well, to me it looks like a model that encourages you to develop what you want to do, what you think you need to work on, where your strengths need to be, and it's very flexible as to how you want to do it, when you want to do it, whether you are doing it alone, or with a group, or whatever. The thing that I didn't like about it is that I think it is too open-ended, and I work better with a deadline or a goal to reach, and I just felt like there wasn't one and I was really struggling to think now where am I supposed to be. As far as value, I think it's great because of all of the input I have gotten, like the Eric search, and the other research. I have two notebooks full of things on whole language now. The frustrating thing about it is...as far as working with other people with it, we all took it differently, since it wasn't a set down, you do this now, and then this...
So I felt like I was either pulling them or struggling to get where I wanted to go, and that was frustrating. Teacher C also added that she liked the freedom to be creative and not having to do all the things required by the TIMS model. Another frustration mentioned by Teacher C concerned the denial of a request to attend a conference on whole language. She believed that this conference would have been a wonderful opportunity to learn more about whole language and to network with others who are implementing whole language at the middle school level. She emphasized the importance of having the resources and support to assist teachers in reaching their goals.

In working with a group of teachers on a PIP Plan, Teacher C expressed a need for specific deadlines. Without this, other priorities seemed to keep the group from using the time they had available to work, share, and plan. As a result, she felt some frustration.

When asked to compare the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model with the State Model for Local Evaluation, Teacher C responded:

Well, I see the TIMS [as] excellent for new teachers. It really made me, when I began to use it, a more organized teacher. I knew specifically what my objectives were for the day, and I made sure I got them done. But after you do that for so many years, that's just kind of inborn to you then and you don't need it.
Whereas, the new plan, as I said before gives you a lot more time to be creative and more energetic. I think you take more opportunities for teaching. With the TIMS, you are so afraid to do any bird walking and you let moments when you could have taught the kids something slip by, because that wasn't on your agenda. Whereas with the newer one, I felt freer to do that. So I liked that better. I also liked getting all of the outside information in. That really helps me. There's a lot of stuff going on that we don't always know about. I think the TIMS model is more of what we are doing here or in this state. So I liked that better about the new one. I feel like I got more feedback with the other one. Of course again, it was more specific feedback. I liked before when she evaluated me, because she is always very positive, and she is always good to point out what you could do to improve, or to make a suggestion, which I like that too.

Teacher C expressed her desire to have constructive criticism from someone else. She feels it is important to hear areas of strengths and weaknesses identified by someone else. She said, "Sometimes you just get used to doing something and you don't even think about it anymore, and that always keeps you on your toes." She doesn't mind evaluating herself, but would prefer someone to examine her teaching. However, she prefers a discussion of the findings rather than assignment of scores.
She stated, "I think you can still see room for improvement and see where you are doing something excellent through the discussion. I don't think the scores are that big of a thing."

Teacher C has been encouraged to try new things with this form of evaluation and feels that she has grown professionally as a result. She also feels that her students have benefited. As a result to her new approach to teaching "these children are more eager to write and more eager to read..."

The relationship with the administrator was another topic for discussion. Teacher C indicated that she felt support and encouragement by the administration to open up and try new things. She indicated that with this model the administrator is supporting and encouraging, rather than evaluating.

**Teacher D interview.** The fourth teacher interviewed at Liberty Bell was selected as a result of an informal conversation with the investigator on May 1, 1995. Teacher D seemed to be a little unsure about her progress toward goals she had established in her Professional Improvement Plan. The researcher decided to add this teacher to Liberty Bell's interview roster in order to investigate her perception of this new form of evaluation. She seemed to be a possible source of new information.
On May 26, 1995, the investigator conducted an interview with Teacher D in her classroom. She was neatly dressed and displayed a beautiful smile as she greeted the investigator. Her classroom was attractively decorated even though the school year was quickly coming to a close. Teacher D is a 6th grade language arts teacher in her ninth year of teaching. She has a master's degree and is a Career Ladder I teacher. At the beginning of the interview she was asked to describe the process of evaluation in which she participated during the school year. She responded:

Basically, [the principal] gave us an outline on how to write our plan, and we sat down as an English department and we followed her outline and answered questions about what were we going to concentrate on. And we developed a plan for a three year period. We worked on what we could this year and basically this year was just a knowledge base. And we would meet maybe every six weeks with the principal and she would come to an English meeting and we would sit down and discuss where we were on the map. Each time each of us had learned something new, and we would take notes and share an idea as far as something we did in a classroom, even if it was something we had tried for ten minutes, and we took notes and that was basically what was done. I have been keeping a professional journal on the things that I have been reading.
When asked to compare the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model with the State Model for Local Evaluation, Teacher D stated:

This one is much more valuable to me, because the flexibility of it, and I am learning. With the Tennessee model, I'm not learning. I mean that's just steps that I know, that I have memorized in college that I have to make sure that I have everything in order. And you know you are just prepared for that. I mean that's a daily thing for me anyway. It's just a formal writing of it. And this way...I have spent as much time researching whole language, maybe more than I ever wanted to. So that's kind of forced me into it, but in a positive way. And I have loved sitting in the team meeting and just getting ideas from them, because the lessons are fairly new. But being able to sit down and talk professionally with people that you normally don't get to spend time with has been much more valuable for me. And it's just...it's more comfortable, because you are not worried about getting a five, or a four, or a three, and everybody can really be comfortable to bring all three of you in at one time for ten minutes or five minutes, and to me it's just more valuable. I am just learning a lot, and have so much more that I want to learn.
She indicated that this new model is much more time consuming, but in a positive way. She said, "I think, after a couple of years, it's just going to be something natural that we do and share."

The impact of the evaluation process on principal-teacher relationships was discussed. Teacher D feels that their relationship has been enhanced due to regular, informal meetings and discussions. She stated:

I think so because we get to see her more regularly now, instead of just coming in and talking to us individually about what we are doing on that particular day that she came in to evaluate us. And she is ordering materials for us that we have discovered through our reading; books that we want to read further to get more information. And she is helping us to find a conference and she is looking for other schools for us to visit that are close by. And I think that we have just had more contact with her as a group, which is what we needed. We needed to be more close as a department. We are so busy with our team, that we hardly see each other as a department, and every time I really look forward to going, because I learn so many new activities with the other teachers and what they are doing. And I tell them what I am doing and we all write down and give examples of what is going on in the classroom and it's been very helpful. I know with [the principal] being there, you
know she has really tried, and you have been a big help with the ERIC search that you got all of those journals for us.

The relationship between teachers and principals is much more relaxed. Teachers feel they have the freedom to experiment with new teaching strategies. Teacher D explained that the feedback she has received has been "verbal communication and talking about keeping a journal and just checking where I am." She didn't have to worry about getting a low score if something did not go right.

Teacher D was nervous at the beginning of the school year because she was not sure what to expect from this new process. She did not feel good about her progress and was worried about what kind of evaluation she was going to receive. After realizing, however, that the plan allowed for goals to be extended and that the first year could be totally for awareness and building a knowledge base, she felt better about her accomplishments. She expressed this feeling when she said:

The progress that I feel like I have made so far has just been gaining new knowledge. I am not really as much practicing it in the classroom at this point, and it's more of getting an understanding of whole language. I am starting now to develop plans for next year. So I've just seen an improvement as far as my knowledge.
Many positive aspects of the professional growth evaluation model were highlighted by Teacher D. However, when asked for areas of the model that need improvement, she stated:

I would like to have ... for those teachers who are doing this to have a day, like a workshop that we actually... not just after school, because that's kind of how it's been. We all have different clubs and organizations that we belong to and it's real difficult...you know, basically we have been meeting in our two o'clock planning, and by two thirty, everybody has got an M Team or a parent conference or somewhere you have to be or something. I wish that we could have a day that each department or how ever you are set up to do it, so that we could sit down and have a whole day to actually start writing all of our lesson plans and sharing information. Just go somewhere in our rooms and do that. And I am sure that [the principal] has always supported us to do that, but I think if we could just pick a day that was okay, that the principal would say okay this is your day. That would be very helpful.

Teacher D's overall impression of the model was very positive. She said, "It's really been good, because like I said, I have learned so much that I didn't know before. To be able to implement some of the things, because at this point, I've been
here six years and I am ready to learn something and I am ready for a big challenge."

The responses of the teachers at Liberty Bell were very consistent with the information provided by the principal. It is evident that there has been tremendous support and encouragement by the administrator in the implementation of the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model. As a result of the administrator's interest and support, teacher growth and enthusiasm occurred. Table 23 displays a summary of the behaviors, attitudes, and perceptions of Liberty Bell participants during the evaluation process.

North Side Elementary School

North Side Elementary School, serving approximately 260 students in grades K-5, is located near the downtown district of Johnson City. The professional staff includes a principal, a librarian, twelve classroom teachers, a guidance counselor, and part-time art, music, and physical education instructors. As indicated in the demographic section of the survey results, the majority of this faculty has twenty-one or more years of teaching experience. All tenured teachers participating in this study have Career Ladder Level I status and 67% have earned a masters degree.

The current administrator of North Side Elementary has been in this position since the fall of 1990. He is a professional educator interested in providing alternatives
Table 23

Participant Behavior, Attitudes, and Perceptions During Pilot of The Professional Teacher Evaluation Model—Liberty Bell Middle School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Feelings/Concerns</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Principal   | Enthusiasm - "I'm very excited about it." | Orientation Meetings - Shared outline of components for PIP Plans | • Structure  
• Resources  
• Feedback | "I think the biggest thing is that it has made them thinkers." | Give teachers options -- provide ownership |

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Feelings/Concerns</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Teacher A   | Enthusiasm - "...this has been about like my first year of teaching. I have some of the excitement back." | "It has been exciting to do some of the readings that we've had, to watch the videos, to find new things to do." | • Feedback  
• Encouragement  
• "She seemed to be very pleased with what I was doing and gave suggestions for next year." | • Motivation  
• Improved instruction  
• Improved learning | (table continues) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Feelings/Concerns</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Teacher B  | "I am just really thrilled, after 27 years of a profession, to have an evaluation which enables me to really grow." | • Research  
• Training  
• Development of whole language units | • Resources  
• Support  
• Feedback  
• Encouragement | • Motivation  
• Collegiality | Time for working with partner or team |

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Feelings/Concerns</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher C</td>
<td>Frustration -- The thing I didn't like about it is that I think it is too open-ended... I was really struggling to think now where am I supposed to be.</td>
<td>• Research</td>
<td>• Encouragement</td>
<td>• New knowledge and skills</td>
<td>• More structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Network with other teachers</td>
<td>• Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Include some formal observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Implement new instructional activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Feelings/Concerns</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Teacher D  | Positive reaction- "This one is much more valuable to me, because of the flexibility of it, and I am learning." | • Research  
• Share with colleagues  
• Keep professional journal | • Dialogue  
• Support  
• Encouragement  
• Resources | • Collegiality  
• New knowledge and skills | Time for training and working with other teachers to develop and share ideas |
to the traditional, competency-based form of evaluation that has been used in Johnson City Schools for a number of years. In an effort to provide a growth opportunity for all tenured teachers, the principal decided to ignore the standard evaluation cycle and evaluate all North Side tenured teachers using a goal setting model for evaluation.

The investigator met with this principal to explain plans for piloting The Professional Teacher Evaluation Model and to request that North Side be involved in the multiple-site case study. An agreement was made and the principal offered to share some research materials concerning teacher evaluation that he had collected and reviewed.

On October 27, 1994, the investigator met with the tenured teachers and the principal to explain the purpose of the multiple-site case study and to administer the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) instrument. At this time teachers were given materials on goal setting strategies, action research, and the development of teacher portfolios. They were asked to keep a reflective journal to record their thoughts, insights, and frustrations during the evaluation process.

Principal Interview. The investigator conducted an open-ended interview with North Side's principal in his office on February 23, 1995. This small office was relatively quiet, considering it was early afternoon in an elementary school. Bookcases filled with education
literature lined the walls and many folders were loosely placed on the principal's desk. The door was closed to offer privacy for the interview.

At the beginning of the interview, the principal explained the process that he and his teachers had followed in setting up this new form of evaluation. He described his situation by saying:

All teachers who have tenure are going through the new process; non-tenured are going through the old, with one exception. I have one non-tenured teacher that with 15 years experience that's going through both processes. So, what I'm trying to do is a formative type evaluation that involves goal setting and my follow-up on those goals.

He explained that he had two fifth grade teachers who had not had their goal setting conference with him. In an effort not to be too directive, he did not set specific deadlines. He stated, "I don't want to go to that, to be that direct. I want it to be a collaborative thing."

As stated earlier, the principal indicated a need for his following up with teachers on their progress toward their goals. He scheduled a "30 to 45 minute period to chat with them about the progress they were making and what [he] could do to support them." This was also a time for teachers to reflect and assess their progress. If necessary, goals that may have been unrealistic could be
changed at this point. The principal assisted teachers in thinking deeply about their practice by asking the following questions:

- How did you refine it, and why?
- What did you find out and where do we go from here?
- Should we throw the whole thing out or parts of it?
- Where do we go from here?

He feels that this type of process allows him to be a partner in helping teachers "to look at what they do, think about what they do, and refine what they do." With the traditional competency-based model we have been using, there is too much concern about using a certain teaching style and about making sure all points on the checklist have been demonstrated. A lot of fear is associated with this type of evaluation.

This principal feels that we need to create collaborative work environments where we can "focus on kids learning, rather than on whether teachers teach according to a prescribed lesson plan format." This collaborative work environment also creates a sense of freedom to explore new teaching strategies where the principal is looked upon as a "helpmate rather than a supervisor." With this kind of environment, the principal feels that he knows more about what is going on in the classrooms. He stated:

- Because now I get to see what's really going on. It's not a matter of going to say this is what I expect to
see, show it to me. Because a good teacher can put on a show. They can show you what you want to see, whether it's an announced visit or not. You know that's there. Now, I'm much more comfortable sitting down and learning what's going on in the school and seeing it, not from a me versus you perspective, but from a we perspective.

When the issue of accountability was discussed, the principal indicated that the State Model for Local Evaluation should be used in two instances: (a) with teachers who have specific problems and (b) with beginning level teachers. He feels that experienced teachers, however, should take responsibility for their own improvement in areas of interest with his serving as a "collaborative partner to discuss things with." The design of the process for these experienced teachers should have a lot of flexibility and "there needs to be trust, not only within a school, but between schools." This principal suggested that teachers have the option of choosing someone they trust, from a pool of administrators, supervisors, and peers, to serve as their evaluator. He explained:

Peer evaluation is going to enter into it. But at some point in time, teachers are going to have to trust each other to show them where they are bleeding and help them to put Band-aides on.
The role of the administrator in this new evaluation approach was discussed. This principal believes that the administrator's role should be to let this process grow and develop. However, he commented, "You still have to channel your energies toward making it happen and be sure the something turns out worthwhile." He feels that the administrator's role should be to guide the goal setting process to insure that teachers set challenging goals for themselves that are useful and specific and that will somehow impact student learning positively. He summarized his thoughts as follows: "It's going to be an ongoing process; there will be no end. It's just going to be a journey."

Near the end of the interview, the principal suggested three teachers' names for consideration in the teacher interview component of the process. One teacher, whose husband is a high school principal, had recently been moved to a new grade level. The principal felt that she would have an interesting perspective on the whole process. The second teacher mentioned is now serving as the guidance counselor and was formerly an elementary principal. Considering her prior experiences with teacher evaluation, the principal indicated that she would be able to provide insights from a broad perspective. The investigator decided to interview both of these teachers.
A teacher new to the system, with 15 years teaching experience, was also recommended for the interview process. However, since she was new to the Johnson City School System, the State Model for Local Evaluation had to be used for her evaluation. The principal decided to use both models with this teacher; therefore, the investigator did not feel she would be an appropriate candidate for interviewing.

After the completion of the second interview, the investigator felt a need for additional information. A teacher who was identified as an information-rich respondent was added to the North Side's interview roster. A total of three teachers and the principal were interviewed.

**Teacher A Interview.** The first two teachers, Teacher A and Teacher B, were interviewed on May 9, 1995. At the beginning of the process, Teacher A felt somewhat uneasy about setting goals for the year. She said, "I had no idea, initially, where I wanted to be at the end of the year." However, after having time to think about specific needs in relation to her new assignment, she was able to develop goals for herself and her class. She realized the process needed to be flexible and continuous when she was assigned to a new grade level in the middle of the school year.

The value of this type of evaluation model was discussed in the interview. Teacher A described her perceptions of the value of the evaluation by saying:
It is probably more genuine, than knowing that you have to 'perform' for x number of minutes. This to me is more real. It has more meaning to the teacher. It's just more genuine.

She also indicated that having a specific goal to learn more about multi-age grouping, provided the incentive she needed for seeking opportunities to visit other multi-age programs. Teacher A was able to make a connection between evaluation and professional growth.

This type of evaluation has improved Teacher A's attitude about the whole process. She says:

In this, I have not felt like was doing something that I just wanted to get over with. I was still doing what I was here to do without thinking so hard about getting something over with, which made me feel better. It's exciting to think in terms of where you are going to be at the end of the year. That's a good feeling.

From the conversation, the need for more structure in the process was revealed. Teacher A had difficulty in setting her own deadlines and sticking to them. She said, "I probably should have had a deadline. That's probably one of the weak points. Because I didn't have a deadline, I just kept pushing it back." She wanted more direction from the principal in setting benchmarks throughout the year.

Another area of concern from Teacher A addressed the need for time for conferencing with the principal. She said,
"There's really not a good time during the day." Since conferencing periods provide the support and encouragement needed for taking on new challenges, the lack of quality time with the principal could cause the process to diminish. Teacher A realizes the danger in being too relaxed about the process. A conscious effort must be made to have professional dialogue with the principal. This teacher believes that more structure is needed for this type of evaluation to be successful. She said:

There need to be guidelines, and you know, like I say...There needs to be a time thing, not you know to the day and the minute, but you know someone like myself evidently needs, a time frame. There should have been more than the beginning and the end. You need to get back and actually see how far you have come and what you are doing.

Teacher A emphasized the need for follow-up and support of the administrator. Not enough interaction between the teacher and principal, will result in failure to focus on the accomplishment of goals and failure to produce teacher growth and motivation.

Teacher B Interview. Teacher B is a very experienced educator who was formerly an elementary principal. Due to her background and experiences, she felt very comfortable in setting goals and establishing her own deadlines for
completion. She also emphasized the value of reflection and being able to think deeply about what you are doing and to make adjustments when necessary. The Professional Teacher Evaluation Model provides an opportunity to individualized the evaluation process by allowing teachers to pursue areas of individual interest.

Teacher B also indicated that the process itself should be individualized. She recognized that some teachers, who may not be as self-directed as they need to be, need more structure and specific deadlines. In the implementation of this goal-setting model of evaluation at North Side, some teachers were very late in setting goals. Teacher B suggested that specific dates for goal setting conference, mid-year reviews, and end-of-year reviews be set for those teachers needing more structure.

When asked how the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model affected the relationship between the principal and the teacher, Teacher B responded:

I think it's much easier than before, because I think it's a win-win situation, rather than I, or anyone else looking for something, and you feel that you always have to justify what you are doing. This way, the justification is simply that you are communicating with each other, rather than coming up with any proof kinds of things. You get to know them on a much more personal
basis. You see them much more closely in the things they do.

The issue of rating teacher performance was discussed. Teacher B said that she did not feel rating scales should be used. She has an internal rating scale and believes that everyone does. Becoming self-evaluators is an aspect of the process that allows teachers to examine their abilities and establish plans for growth. She supported the use of the State Model for Local Evaluation with teachers who are not self-directed learners.

**Teacher C Interview.** The third teacher (Teacher C) interviewed at North Side was added after the competition of the first two interviews. This teacher seemed a little frustrated at the orientation meeting in October; therefore, the investigator felt that her reactions to the evaluation process should be examined. She was interviewed on May 18, 1995 in her classroom.

At the beginning of the interview, Teacher C was asked to describe her feelings concerning the value the evaluation process she had been through. She replied:

I liked it. Mainly because we met individually with [the principal] at the beginning of the year and went over our goals, talked about how we were going to implement them and what we expected, you know, to happen throughout the year. It was a more give and take, more
on an equal professional level. You didn't feel like that you had a checklist or something. You could open up and talk about what you wanted to do. If you wanted to do something different or if you wanted to broaden something. So I really liked that part about it. It's good that you can reflect back when you are making lesson plans and seeing that you're implementing what you set your goals to at the beginning of the year. Also, to see if it didn't work and know that there is not going to be a penalty, you're not going to be marked down if it didn't work. It was something you agreed to try to do. I like that about it.

This collaborative approach and open communication with the principal about ways to improve instruction provided the encouragement and support for trying new things. Being released from the checklist format, created a risk-free environment for experimenting with new teaching strategies. Teacher C indicated that she felt much better about her relationship with the principal this year. She expressed her feelings when she said, "You feel like you are looked upon as more of a professional on an equal level and you feel like you can express yourself more openly, I think, or I felt that way." With this open, more relaxed communication with the principal, Teacher C received support and encouragement to accomplish her goals. She explained:
Throughout the year he has...most of the time, I would approach him about something. He would allow us to, you know talk to him about... the biggest thing I think is that he sees that if we need something... materials or something, he's been getting if for us, because he sees that it goes with the goals that we said that we wanted to do. Therefore, he has tried to get us the things that we've asked for to implement what we wanted. That has helped. He knew when I asked for it why I was asking for it because it wasn't like I had to explain because he knew it was going with the goals that I had set up. I liked that part about it.

Teacher C described the collaboration that took place at the goal-setting conference. She had some specific goals that she was interested in accomplishing that she discussed with the principal. In addition to those goals, the principal suggested that she serve as a mentor for a new teacher; therefore, she developed a goal related to her professional leadership skills.

In describing the process used for the end-of-year review, Teacher C indicated that she did not put anything in writing. She said, "We just talked about it." The principal took notes at the goal-setting conferences listing the goals for each teacher. Later in the year,
he wrote a memo to each teacher listing the goals they had discussed to remind them of their focus. Teachers at North Side were not required to put anything in writing at the end of the year. The principal chose to simply have them discuss their progress toward their goals through a reflective conference. As they reflected on their progress, they developed goals for next year.

Table 24 displays behaviors, attitudes, and perceptions of principals and teachers at North Side Elementary School. The principal at this school took a non-directive approach to the evaluation process. He expected his teachers to be self-directed and self-motivated. It appears that this approach worked for some teachers. However, the lack of structure resulted in minimal effort on the part of some teachers. This example supports the need to individualize the process to meet the needs of teachers at different levels of maturity. One major role of the principal is to identify the levels of maturity and use the leadership style and process necessary to move people along to higher levels of performance.

**Experimental Group**

Teachers from seven elementary schools were randomly assigned to the experimental group for this study. The number of teachers selected from each school was as follows: Cherokee (n=1), Towne Acres (n=2), Keystone (n=1), Stratton
Table 24

**Participant Behavior, Attitudes, and Perceptions During Pilot of The Professional Teacher Evaluation Model—North Side Elementary School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Feelings/Concerns</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Principal   | "I don't want it to go to that, to be that direct. I want it to be a collaborative thing." | "It involves goal setting and follow-up on those goals." | Partner in helping teachers "to look at what they do, think about what they do, and refine what they do." | • Better relationships  
• "It's going to be and ongoing process; there will be no end. It's just going to be a journey." | Create a collaborative work environment |

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Feelings/Concerns</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>Good attitude about concept -- but, felt frustrated without a specific framework. &quot;I probably should have had a deadline. ...I just kept pushing it back.&quot;</td>
<td>• Visited other schools to learn more about multi-age classrooms</td>
<td>• Professional day to visit other schools</td>
<td>• More structure with deadlines</td>
<td>• Time for meeting with principal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Feelings/Concerns</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td>Appreciated opportunity to pursue areas of interest</td>
<td>• Set goals</td>
<td>• Communication</td>
<td>• Self-evaluate</td>
<td>Individualize the process itself -- provide more structure for those who need more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Establish timeline</td>
<td>• Encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Feelings/Concerns</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Services Provided</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher C</td>
<td>&quot;I liked it. You feel like you are looked upon as more of a professional on an equal level and you feel like you can express yourself more openly, I think, or I felt that way.&quot;</td>
<td>• Set goals • Mentored a new teacher • Discussed progress with principal</td>
<td>• Resources • Encouragement • Support</td>
<td>• New knowledge • Improved Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four principals and eight teachers were initially selected for the interview process. However, as the process evolved, three teachers identified as information-rich participants were added. A total of 15 individuals from the experimental group were interviewed.

Those selected for the experimental group participated in an orientation meeting where the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model was explained. Materials on goal-setting strategies, action research, and the development of teacher professional portfolios were distributed. With the exception of one teacher, all teachers selected for the experimental group agreed to participate in the study.

An orientation meeting was also conducted for principals. The Professional Teacher Evaluation Model was explained and principals were given an opportunity to make suggestions for improvement. All seven principals agreed to participate in the pilot of this new model for evaluation. The level of enthusiasm was somewhat varied among the principals. The majority were very excited about the concept of providing an alternative form of evaluation for experienced teachers. Those who expressed reservations were mainly concerned about the time and uncertainty involved in the implementation of something new.

All elementary schools in Johnson City have basically the same programs and serve from 275 to 500 students.
Fairmont, Cherokee, Towne Acres, and Woodland have enrollments in the 400-500 range. Keystone, Stratton, and South Side have enrollments in the 275-400 range. The professional staff at each school includes a principal, librarian, guidance counselor, a number of classroom teachers, and instructors in art, music, and physical education.

During the interview process, each principal was asked to describe the evaluation process implemented during the 1994-95 school year. All principals indicated that they had basically followed the steps outlined in the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model. However, the level of involvement and interaction with the teachers varied among the four principals interviewed.

Principal Interviews. One of the first schools visited was Woodland Elementary School. This beautiful facility, a new school which opened in January of 1993, serves approximately 500 students in grades PreK-5 and is located on the west side of Johnson City. It has a large entrance foyer crowned with bursts of natural lighting. Standing in the center of the foyer is a heavy bronze statue of four life-size children. One child is pulling the other three with their books in a wagon. This statue, along with tall, green potted plants, creates a very warm and caring atmosphere for the school. A beautiful stained glass window adorns the wall of the office area entrance.
The principal of Woodland is a dedicated professional who believes teachers at certain levels of maturity should be given the opportunity to become self-directed learners who can self-evaluate. When asked to explain the process of evaluation that was being implemented at Woodland this year, the principal indicated that after teachers agreed to participate, they set goals for themselves and then discussed them with her. She explained:

Then the follow-up on those goals was real informal; just asking questions to see how people were coming. If they needed things, kind of setting up plans if people wanted to go to specific conferences, or you know journal stuff that I came across, or whatever it was they thought they needed. And the informal times observing, walking through the classrooms to kind of see what people were doing, and commenting on those things and trying to split the goals and finally having a final conference, which was a conclusion or summative that said these goals were met and agreeing....and reflection by both of us about how things are going.

Her perception of the value of this form of evaluation was evident when she said, "...it's a great opportunity for them [good, tenured teachers] to grow. It gets enough feedback and they are deciding their goals themselves,"
which I think is real important, and are looking for resources themselves that you could add on or enhance."
She feels, however, that some teachers have a problem recognizing their weaknesses and that in such cases, principals should have more direct control of the goals that are set.

Comparisons were made in the competency-based model and the Professional Evaluation Model. The amount of time spent on the evaluation this year "...would take more time, because they really have to think about what they are doing, getting together their own resources, and then after they have started whatever their goal is. Like [the physical education teacher] has started group activities in gym and he has worked on that all year long. And now I see a real change in what he does normally in teaching, which is wonderful." This extended time and involvement has more impact on teaching than the checklist observations. "It changes their attitudes, which of course then changes their behavior along the way, which is wonderful."

When asked how this form of evaluation affected her relationship with the teachers, the principal responded:

It's much more relaxing. I mean you feel like you are talking with someone. You are really communicating with someone rather than reporting on a set of criteria that someone sent you to report on. It's a more collegial relationship.
The principal also emphasized that experience with this form of evaluation has resulted in improved instruction and therefore improved student learning. She believes that the teachers are challenging themselves with goals that will have long-term lasting impact on teaching performance. She stated:

I really believe that the changes that you see that the teachers have implemented like [the physical education teacher] with the small group activities in gym rather than teaching a whole team and [the kindergarten teacher] with her portfolio assessment, things like that really have an impact with the kid, because the children....the teachers change the strategy or the style so much that of course it impacts the children. And I think it will have long term effects because I don't think people will go back to the old ways. I think they have been stretched to the point of allowing themselves to be stretched, because they choose the stretching, you know. They chose what they wanted to do.

Although the principal feels this process of evaluation has had a positive impact on teaching performance, she doesn't believe that it is for everyone. "I think it is for teachers that are mature in their growth as a professional." She thinks that some teachers have difficulty in evaluating themselves honestly. She
indicated that the principal should have more direct control on goals that are set and activities that are selected for these teachers.

Another school visited by the investigator, Stratton Elementary School, serves approximately 275 students in grades PreK-5 and is located on the southwest side of Johnson City. The professional staff includes, a principal, librarian, guidance counselor, 13 classroom teachers, and instructors in art, music, and physical education.

The principal of Stratton Elementary is a dedicated professional who has always recognized the value of having school-wide goals. When approached about the possibility of piloting the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model, she enthusiastically agreed to participate. Two teachers from Stratton were randomly selected to participate in the pilot.

The investigator interviewed the principal of Stratton on March 3, 1995 at 3:15 p.m. in her office. School was dismissed at 3:00 p.m.; therefore, when the investigator arrived, most students had left for the day. Near the beginning of the interview, a young boy, who was kept after school for disciplinary reasons, came into the office and asked if he could go home. The principal excused herself from the interview to talk with the student. After she addressed the students needs, she returned to the interview.

The investigator began by asking the principal to describe the teacher evaluation model she had been using
with tenured teachers. She responded:

The model was more or less built on the goals that they would want to accomplish within the school year. One of them is based on the school need and what we are addressing school wide, and then a professional goal that they have. Using those goals,...they provided activities or strategies to look at and develop throughout the year, that they would use to accomplish those goals. They range from everything, from attending workshops to training sessions, doing some activities in the classroom, reading some literature, making contacts with parents, talking with each other and peer groups. Each teacher wrote two goals, I think they wrote three, one of them was the school-wide goal.

The principal indicated that teachers need to "expand their goals...and challenge themselves." When the investigator asked if she felt a training session in goal setting would be helpful, she suggested that help with activities and strategies to reach goals would be useful.

This principal has always been supportive of the State Model of Local Evaluation and has served as a trainer for the Tennessee Instructional Model (TIM). She believes, however, that a model that requires teachers to be self-evaluators is more helpful and professional. She emphasized the importance of helping teachers learn to be reflective.
She described this evaluation model as being a collaborative process. The principal's role is to help the teacher in the development of specific strategies and activities for achieving goals. The major responsibility for the evaluation is placed on the teacher with the principal as a resource person. The principal explained:

I have to be the resource. If they need activities or if they need time off, or if they need ideas to go find something, or if they need literature or something, I'm that person they come to, or if I come across something I can offer that to them. I should be the resource. If they are the professionals they should be, it should take less time for me, but it will probably take more time from them. It's probably going to be less of a headache than the "I'm watching over you" situation.

The investigator asked the principal how this form of evaluation would impact visits to classrooms. She indicated that classroom observations would still occur. Teachers will be inviting the principal into to the classroom to observe instructional and curriculum changes that they have been working on. She anticipates observations to be informal and friendly. If anything, the principal feels she may spend more time in the classrooms with this model than with the competency-based model.
Benefits of the model were identified by the principal. She said, "it should make each one of them feel more like a professional and part of a team." She believes that this model will motivate teachers to do more by giving them "freedom to go about...I'm a professional, this is what I know, this is what I would like to know... It should give them the freedom to do that."

The issue of assigning scores to teachers' progress was discussed. The principal indicated that ranking teachers is difficult and their strengths do not always show up on the prescribed scale. She believes that, for teachers who have everything under control, assigning scores is not necessary. She does, however, feel that new teachers need that kind of feedback to know how they are doing. The principal also believes only self-motivated teachers should be given the opportunity to participate in the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model.

The principal mentioned the emphasis that goal setting and action planning is getting from other programs (Southern Association, Chapter I, and Goals 2000). She stated:

In the school improvement plan, it's an action plan, so if you could tie all those in together people will not feel so overburdened in trying to do so many different things at one time. But, if there is a natural lead of the individual goals going into the
school goals, the school goals going into the system
goals and what is required from the state, and what is
required from Chapter I, and what is required from
Southern Association, that's the way to look at it.
Sometimes it's difficult to tie them all in real
closely, but there is always one little area that you
can tie in.

The principal described the end-of-year process as a
time for discussion of progress toward goals that were
established at the beginning of the year. Teachers share
what activities they have done and what they have
accomplished. They are expected to evaluate their progress.
The principal emphasized the importance of viewing this as
a continuous process, allowing teachers to carry things
over for two or three years.

The next set of interviews were conducted at Keystone
Elementary School which serves approximately 310 students
in grades PreK-5 and is located on the southeast side of
Johnson City. Keystone, one of the oldest schools in
Johnson City, is being replaced with a new facility. The
name of the new school is Mountain View. The professional
staff includes a principal, librarian, guidance counselor,
14 classroom teachers, and instructors in art, music, and
physical education.

Since joining the Johnson City School System in the
fall of 1992, the principal of Keystone has been very
concerned about the effectiveness of the evaluation process. When approached about the idea of piloting the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model with tenured teachers, she was extremely interested in the concept and agreed to participate. One teacher from Keystone was randomly selected to participate in the pilot of this new form of evaluation.

The principal was interviewed on April 28, 1995 in her office. The investigator began by asking her to describe the steps she had taken in the implementation of the evaluation process. She explained:

We sat down at the beginning of the year and had a very informal discussion. There are basically two questions that I pose ... (a) What is that you feel the need to improve on yourself? ... (b) What do you need from me to help you achieve these goals? In some cases it is resources, professional development, conferences, or money to buy materials. I really try and get the funds for them. I think the professional growth should be ongoing and ... I mean teacher evaluation should be ongoing. I really think people don't grow until they have to consistently be challenged to grow. We began focusing in the goals and objectives meeting on how we would evaluate her growth and how we would look at student growth academically and socially. We sat down and mapped out
some areas that the teacher (given the change from kindergarten to first grade) felt were important. [One] area that she wanted to learn more about was how to implement and integrate the visual and performing arts, in her classroom. She began a really massive research study on the arts and education ... she focused on some very specific things for this year, but then began trying to develop some strategies for next year.

The principal conducted several informal observations of the teacher's classroom activities. Some of these were requested by the teacher and some were simply 10 or 15 minute "pop-in" visits. Through these numerous informal observations, the principal indicated that she saw evidence of new knowledge and skills learned through research being applied in the classroom. In addition to classroom visits, the principal reported having several informal conversations with the teacher about what she was learning through her research. The teacher provided some journal articles that were shared with the entire teaching staff.

Benefits of this new form of evaluation were discussed. The principal indicated that due to the individualization of the process, allowing teachers to choose areas of interest, the teacher felt ownership and therefore was motivated to do more than just the minimum. In addition to the benefits to the teacher involved in the evaluation, the
principal saw evidence of benefits for students, for other teachers, as well as for herself. She views the collaborative process with frequent dialogue and support from her as having a big impact on teacher performance.

Another benefit mentioned by the principal, was an improved principal/teacher relationship. With less anxiety, she feels this "...has been a very positive experience for both [her and the teacher]." To culminate the process, the principal arranged to visit a school in Kentucky and invited the teacher to accompany her. She stated, "I think that's the real gem. If administrators can work the time to share a conference or workshop with the teacher in some of these areas that they have identified...I think it just shows a lot of support..."

Plans for the end-of-year review were explained by the principal. She said:

We will pull out our beginning documentation where we talked about things, where we got our ideas and goals down. I will probably ask [the teachers] to submit to me in writing just where she felt she grew and where she might need a little more work. We'll talk about, over the summer, what professional development activities might be appropriate it they could be gotten, what type of things might be coming up that she might want to look into based on how she thinks she did at the end of the year.
As described by the principal, this end-of-year review will be a discussion between the principal and teacher as they examine progress made toward goals. The principal indicated that she would not assign scores to indicate the level of success. She said, "I'm going to make comments in narratives."

This principal's perception of how a marginal teacher would fit into this model for evaluation was that they would not do very well. She said, "I think the marginal teacher needs a very precise...I mean that's where you need something like a checklist." She feels that the principal should screen teachers who indicate that they want to participate in this new model of evaluation. She suggested that principals base their decisions on previous evaluations and observations.

In the discussion of areas of the model that need improvement, the principal mentioned some things that she would do as the administrator. If this model is implemented on a larger scale, the administrator must make a conscious effort to provide opportunities for frequent dialogue with the teachers. She emphasized the importance of follow-up and support by the administrator in the effectiveness of this form of evaluation.

The principal of Keystone Elementary feels that our competent teachers should have the opportunity and freedom to develop professional instructional goals that will help
them and their students improve. She thinks they should be released from the stress and structure of the formal type of evaluation and check list that has been used in the past. She is very much in favor of the narrative report and feels that it is unnecessary to give competent teachers scores to indicate their level of performance.

The last set of interviews involving principals were conducted at Fairmont Elementary School. Fairmont, serving approximately 475 students in grades K-5, is located in a residential neighborhood on the northeast side of Johnson City. The Florida style campus has several buildings joined by covered walkways.

After learning about the plans for piloting a new form of evaluation for experienced teachers, Fairmont's principal agreed to participate. Names of the five teachers from Fairmont who were scheduled for evaluation were included in the randomly sampling technique for identifying the control and experimental groups for the study.

On May 8, 1995, the principal was interviewed in the investigator's office. In describing his perceptions of the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model, the principal said, I see a lot of value. I think it's long overdue. I think for those teachers that are sort of self-driven and self-motivated that to use something like the state model for evaluation was redundant, remedial, and a farce. Therefore, I think that this, or something like
it, would be the way we need to go with our faculty. To take a professional person who has been through the State Model as it is now, several times, it's almost a game. It's not meaningful. You can always find little things in that observation that you can suggest that people work on and they'll do it fine for a while and then something else... I mean it's just... I wonder how much it really improves instruction. And also, now that we are looking at such different teaching strategies that I think that basically the old model is used for a teacher standing in front of the room lecturing, ... and that's something that's not very prevalent or will not be soon.

The principal emphasized that teachers who have been involved in this process have benefited. He has seen evidence of increased levels of self-confidence among his teachers.

The process that the principal followed in implementation of the new model of evaluation was discussed. He asked teachers to set goals in each of the following categories: (a) personal, (b) school curriculum, and (c) professional. He indicated that he met with teachers for a mid-year review to see how they were coming along with their goals. The principal implied that this process has been of an informal nature. However, he expressed an interest in having some kind of an instrument for classroom observations that would offer some consistency from teacher to teacher.
Through the discussion, he pointed out that whatever is used should be flexible enough to meet the needs of all teachers.

Time was also another topic of discussion. Comparing the time involved in the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model and the State Model for Local Evaluation, the principal said, "There is no comparison." He feels that the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model may require more time; however, the time is spaced over the entire year and is of higher quality. In comparing the two models, the issue of the rating scale always emerges. Fairmont's principal expressed his view by saying, "I don't think there is a need for [a rating scale]. I think that would take the wind out of the sails for what we are trying to accomplish." He feels that if teachers set challenging goals, "It's something that they want to work on for a while." The principal can give feedback at the end-of-year review, but the teachers "are the ones who really feel whether it has been successful or not." Teachers should be self-evaluators.

The investigator asked the principal to describe how he sees the marginal teacher fitting into a professional growth model for evaluation. He responded:

The marginal teacher would benefit most from a situation like this. You know sometimes we create marginal teachers. When we have a person learning, and we are critical and turning them off in their need for support,
and then they start questioning themselves. That seems to kind of compound things. Then all of a sudden, there is somebody sitting there watching and checking yes or no, they are or aren't doing it. That just adds to the anxiety, and we sometimes sort of keep those marginal teachers at a marginal process. Whereas if we could say to them, "Yea, you can do that. I'm behind you 100%." Then we can bring that confidence back to them, then they can make it.

The principal of Fairmont had a different perception of how the marginal teacher should be addressed. He feels, by putting them in this professional growth model and providing encouragement and support, we may see these teachers become excited and self-motivated, competent teachers. He indicated that these teachers may benefit most from this model.

The following ideas emerged from interviews with principals: (a) maturity and competence levels of the teacher need to be considered; (b) the principal's role is a very important factor in the success of the program; (c) the role of the administrator and the role of the teacher must be clearly defined; (d) collaboration and individualization are important motivators; (e) both evaluation and professional growth should be ongoing; therefore, linking them makes sense.

Teacher Interviews. Evidence of teacher growth and motivation was revealed through the interview process. The
extent of growth and motivation was directly related to the level of involvement and interaction of the principal.

When describing the evaluation process they had been involved in, all teachers mentioned the goal-setting conference with the principal. These conferences occurred at different times and under different conditions. The majority of teachers reported having the goal-setting conference in November or December. Times for conferences varied among the following: (a) before school, (b) after school, (c) during planning time, or (d) informally in the hallway. All teachers viewed the goal-setting component as being a collaborative process. They felt encouraged by this individualized approach to evaluation. One teacher stated:

This has turned out really well as far as I am concerned. I liked it. I think it has a lot of merit. You feel more involved with it. It's not like you are being reviewed. You're being worked with, as such, not just something that is under observation. You know, somebody is working with you saying, 'What do you want to do? What's going to help you in your job?' And I have appreciated that.

Another teacher shared her feelings by saying, "I really liked it because, by picking my own goals I got to choose things that were of value to me. I really enjoyed working on the things I chose." In their responses, all teachers who
were interviewed reflected positive reactions to the Professional Teacher Evaluation model (see Table 25).

The amount of teacher-principal interaction between the time of the goal-setting conference and the time of the end-of-year conference varied among schools. In schools with more interaction and follow-up, there was more evidence of teacher growth and motivation.

In five of the seven schools, principals interacted with teachers on a regular basis and provided support and encouragement. The following comments provide evidence of growth and motivation of several teachers:

You are more invested in it, because you really are thinking, "What do I need? What do I want to do? What areas do I need to really improve or learn about?"

With this [type of evaluation], the amount of time I spent was worthwhile. I don't mind to spend time on it if it is worthwhile for me and my children. I don't mind at all.

I actually did spend more time on this. But it was because I wanted to. The more I got into it, the more I wanted to do. You choose to put in more time because it was something you really wanted to work...and interested in.
With the other evaluation, I really didn't think about the growing process. But with this and with the integration, I feel like I am growing, becoming a better teacher.

Another important outcome of this type of evaluation is the development of reflective practitioners and self-evaluators. One teachers said, "The reflective part also helps you to think about what you are doing. ... When you look at what you've done it's sort of impressive." After reflecting on the activities she had been involved in, another teacher stated, "I wasn't extremely pleased with it, because I wanted it to look like the videos. But we are started and know what we can do to improve it." One teacher indicated that she regrets not keeping a portfolio of all the activities she was involved in during this evaluation process. She realized a project like that would have been excellent documentation of her work. Due to her experience this year, next year she plans to develop a professional portfolio of the implementation of strategies developed during this year's evaluation process.

Other components of the process that were predominant in the interviews with teachers were: (a) structure of the process and (b) outcomes. Of the 11 teachers interviewed from the experimental group, 7 indicated a need for more structure of the evaluation process. One teacher said, "It would have helped to have a little more structure--just to
get going." She also recommended that samples of goals and action plans done by other teachers be shared at the orientation meeting.

Without deadlines and a specific time frame, several teachers felt frustration during the process because they were not sure if they were on target and doing what was expected. One teacher said:

It might be helpful to have a timeline... I think the only thing that I can see that might really improve it might be scheduled meetings with your principal. That this one will happen around mid-October and this one will happen right after Christmas break. Just a timeline for that. Let's have our mid-year review by January 15 or something like that.

The majority of the teachers involved in the investigation were self-directed and had the ability to set their own deadlines and proceed with implementing action plans. However, for teachers needing more structure and direction from the principal, this evaluation process was very frustrating.

Another aspect of the structure was the issue of observations by the principal. In one school, the principal did not perform any classroom observations during the process. The teacher indicated that she wanted that kind of interaction and feedback from the principal. She said:
One area that I think might be good, just personally speaking, is to have an observation by the principal. Not with all the lesson plans and all the elaborate work that goes with that, but something... That would be one opportunity that she could come in and see what's going on in the classroom. As an old-timer teacher, it is a good feeling to know that your principal has been in to see you and they like what they see. It gives you a good feeling, even if you fail to do something. That's what I liked about being evaluated before, having those people come in and you could sit down and talk about what was good and what could be improved on.

Expressing her desire for external feedback, this teacher suggested that care be taken to ensure that informal classroom observations be a part of the evaluation process.

The investigator gathered evidence of specific outcomes of the evaluation process. Improved instruction was the most apparent outcome with this group. Many teachers established goals related to improving their instructional skills. As a result, staff development funds were used to support them in their efforts in learning new skills. The data provide many examples of teachers' transfer of knowledge and skills from the workshop to the classroom. One teacher shared:

Well, we have done a lot less paper/pencil work with the Math Their Way, and a lot more activities. The [children] are more enthused. I see them grasping the
concepts, especially when we did place value. That's one of the harder things that I think we do in first grade. We did a lot of hands-on activities before we did any sort of paperwork. Then when we did get to the paperwork, they knew the concepts. Another thing I used that I learned from a workshop was a song ... 'The hands of the clock go round and round...' and then you set the clock and they tell you the time. They really liked that. I feel like that helped them in learning how the hands go clockwise.

Another teacher researched the use of student portfolios, by reading journal articles, talking to other teachers who have used portfolios, looking at examples, etc. After conducting the research, she developed an organizational plan and check sheet for math portfolios. The math portfolios were used as an alternative form of assessment for her kindergarten students. Although the teacher had to modify her plan for completing the check sheet on each child, she and the students had a good experience with portfolios.

Working with cooperative learning and whole language was the focus for another teacher. As the teacher and students learned more about cooperative learning, they all became more skilled in the process. When the teacher reflected, she said, "I felt that I got a lot better at the cooperative learning and at mapping out a different strategy for putting children together." She also indicated the children's attitudes about
working with others improved tremendously. As the teacher learned more about whole language, she developed and implemented two units using the whole language approach. This is an area that the teacher feels she still needs to develop and plans to continue this goal again next year. She said, "With the whole language, I'm getting a little bit better, but I need to take more time."

Another teacher did extensive research on integrating creative dramatics and visual arts in the elementary classroom. Through her research, this teacher gathered a large assortment of ideas and immediately implemented them. She described one activity by saying:

I implemented activities integrating curriculum with creative dramatics, such as making puppets for story characters and performed the puppet shows in the library for every student. We also performed two plays for other classrooms.

Other ideas garnered from research were also implemented by this teacher. In addition, she was so excited about what she was learning that she proudly shared information and ideas with other teachers. She and another teacher did some team teaching and multi-age activities as a result of ideas gleaned from her research. As a result of her experience with the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model, this teacher has become very self-motivated. She has taken responsibility
for her own growth and has provided benefits for students as well as other teachers.

Table 25 presents a display summarizing predominant behaviors, attitudes, and perceptions of the experimental group that were exhibited during the pilot of the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model. Both teachers and principals revealed their feelings and concerns about this model and outlined activities they had been involved in as a part of the program. All principals reported providing resources, support, encouragement, and feedback. When interviewing teachers, the investigator found evidence of these services being provided; however, the extent of this interaction with teachers varied among the sites. Results also support the conjecture that more services provided to teachers by the administrators resulted in more growth and motivation.

The following issues emerged from interviews with teachers in the experimental group: (a) need for structure, (b) need for frequent interaction with principals — professional dialogue and feedback, (c) ownership produces motivation, and (d) growth — increased knowledge and skills — was experienced with successful implementation of the model.
Table 25

Participant Behavior, Attitudes, and Perceptions During Pilot of The Professional Teacher Evaluation Model—Experimental Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Feelings/Concerns</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Principal 1  | "It's a great opportunity for them [good, tenured teachers] to grow." | • Discuss goals with individual teachers  
• Observe informally  
• Reflection at end of year | "If they need things, ... if people wanted to go to specific conferences, or you know journal stuff that I came across,..." | • Collegial relationships  
• Improved instruction  
• Improved learning  
• Teachers are challenging themselves | Should be offered to "teachers that are mature in their growth" |

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Feelings/Concerns</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Principal 2 | An evaluation model that requires teachers to self-evaluate is more helpful and more professional. | • Assist in goal setting and action planing  
• Observe classrooms  
• Goal setting  
• Observe classroom  
• Follow-up | • Serve as a Resource  
• Feedback | • Teachers feel more like a professional  
• Self-evaluate  
• Link to school improvement | • View as a continuous process  
• Only offer to self-motivated teachers |
| Principal 3 | "I think professional growth should be ongoing...teacher evaluation should be ongoing." | | | | • Screen teachers  
• More dialogue |

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Feelings/Concerns</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Principal 4 | "I see a lot of value. I think it's long overdue." | • Goal Setting  
• Dialogue  
• Observation | • Communication  
• Encouragement  
• Follow-up | • Self-evaluate  
• Self-confidence | • Instrument for feedback  
• Encourage marginal teachers |

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Feelings/Concerns</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>&quot;I thought it was very constructive... It's not a process outside looking at you, but your looking inside to improve yourself.&quot;</td>
<td>• Set goals</td>
<td>• Resources</td>
<td>• New knowledge</td>
<td>• More structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussed progress with principal</td>
<td>• Encouragement</td>
<td>• Improved instruction</td>
<td>• Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Shared ideas with other teachers</td>
<td>• Support</td>
<td>• Self-evaluated</td>
<td>• deadlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Examples of goals and action plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Feelings/Concerns</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td>&quot;I really liked it... by picking my own goals, I got to choose things that were of value to me...It encourages growth.&quot;</td>
<td>• Research</td>
<td>• Resources</td>
<td>• New knowledge</td>
<td>• Framework for scheduling conferences with principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Developed math assessment portfolio</td>
<td>• Encouragement</td>
<td>• New Assessment for students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership</td>
<td>• Support</td>
<td>• Improved leadership skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Feelings/Concerns</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Teacher C  | "It's more one on one, professional to professional." | • Discussed goals with principal  
• Worked on goals  
• Conferences with principal | • Advice  
• Encouragement  
• Feedback  
• Support | • Improved instruction  
• Improved self-esteem of teacher  
• Reflective practice | (table continues) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Feelings/Concerns</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher D</td>
<td>&quot;We felt that we were being treated more as a professional... I felt like I was doing something to better myself as a teacher.&quot;</td>
<td>• Established goals • Attended a conference • Collaborated with another teacher • Discussed progress with principal</td>
<td>• Support • Encouragement • Resources</td>
<td>• New Knowledge • Reflective practice • Improved instruction • Improved self-confidence • Motivation</td>
<td>(table continues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Feelings/Concerns</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Services Provided</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher E</td>
<td>&quot;I really enjoyed the process. I think it made me feel like I was a professional...&quot;</td>
<td>• Established goals • Developed thematic units • Served on Curriculum Council</td>
<td>• Support • Resources • Feedback</td>
<td>• Reflective practice</td>
<td>• Better communication • Joint training for principals and teachers • Structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Feelings/Concerns</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Teacher F  | "I was able to really make it more my evaluation as such, rather than meeting somebody else's structure." | •Goals  
•Research  
•Workshops  
•Reflective Journal | •Support  
•Feedback  
•Encouragement  
•Discussions | •Motivated  
•Reflective practice  
•New knowledge  
•Improved relationship with principal  
•Improved self-esteem | •Joint training with principals and teachers |

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Feelings/Concerns</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Teacher G   | "I think it is more beneficial to the teacher to have goals instead of having someone just coming in to do an hour evaluation." | • Goals  
• Research  
• Professional journal  
• Discussions with principal | • Support  
• Feedback  
• Resources | • Continuous Learning  
• Motivated  
• Reflective practice  
• New knowledge | (table continues) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Feelings/Concerns</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher H</td>
<td>&quot;In the beginning, I wasn't sure just exactly what was expected.&quot;</td>
<td>•Goals •Discussions with principal</td>
<td>•Help with setting goals</td>
<td>•Feeling of ownership</td>
<td>•Structure •Require observations •More feedback (specific)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher I</td>
<td>&quot;The old model was more artificial. This was definitely more meaningful.&quot;</td>
<td>•Research •Network with other teachers •Use of new instructional activities</td>
<td>•Encourage •Resources •Feedback</td>
<td>•New knowledge •Self-evaluation •Improved instruction &amp; learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Feelings/Concerns</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Services Provided</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Teacher J  | "It's given me an opportunity to develop and work on ideas that I gained from both workshops... it's been beneficial to the children and to me." | • Goals  
• Workshops  
• Implementation  
• Discussions with principal | • Dialogue  
• Support  
• Encouragement  
• Resources | • New knowledge and skills  
• Reflective practice  
• Improved instruction  
• Improved learning | • Training  
• Framework and expectations |

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Feelings/Concerns</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Teacher K  | "It made me focus more. Instead of focusing on one or two observations and having a canned presentation for an hour, I have really focused on this." | • Goals  
• Research  
• Collaboration with another teacher  
• Implement research  
• Discussions with principal  
• Share with faculty | • Dialogue  
• Support  
• Encouragement  
• Resources | • New knowledge  
• Motivation  
• Reflective practice  
• Collegiality  
• Improved instruction  
• Improved learning | • Require teachers to keep a portfolio for documentation |
Cross-Site Analysis

Several critical elements influencing the linking of teacher evaluation, professional growth, and motivation emerged as the investigator conducted the data analysis using the Ethnograph v4.0 software package (Seidel, Friese, & Leonard, 1995). These elements fell into four major categories: (a) characteristics of the culture, (b) characteristics of the administrator, (c) characteristics of the teacher, and (d) characteristics of the process. The level of success of the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model varied somewhat among the groups investigated and was directly related to the presence of the critical elements identified.

All elements play an important role in the success of a growth-oriented model for evaluation. A trusting environment where creativity and risk-taking were encouraged, where collaborative relationships existed between principals and teachers, and where there were high expectations for growth described a culture conducive to a professional growth model of evaluation. As a result of the evaluation process, administrators who acted as facilitators and coaches and provided resources saw improved instruction and improved student learning. In addition, teachers who were mature, responsible, and self-directed experienced more growth and enthusiasm. Another important component in the success of the program was the evaluation process itself. Being an individualized, formative approach to evaluation, the process
created an awareness of the need for continuous growth and improvement. The amount of structure provided in the evaluation process emerged as a key factor in the success of the program. The majority of the teachers interviewed, including those who experienced tremendous growth and motivation during the process, indicated a need for more structure. They suggested that a broad framework with established deadlines for completion of mid-year reviews and end-of-year reviews be developed to assist in the successful implementation of the program. However, due to the varying levels of teacher readiness for self-directed learning, flexibility should be an important consideration.

Figure 4 displays the four categories and critical elements associated with each that emerged from the data analysis. These elements related to the culture of the school, characteristics of the administrators and teachers, and characteristics of the process itself all have a great impact on outcomes of the evaluation program. With these critical elements in place, the following outcomes were observed: motivation, creativity, transfer of training to the classroom, improved instruction, improved student learning, improved relationships, improved self-esteem, and a commitment to continuous growth (see Figure 4).

**Characteristics of the Culture**

The data collected through the qualitative methods of interviewing principals and teachers, observing activities and
Figure 4. Critical elements influencing linkages between teacher evaluation, professional growth, and motivation.
interactions, and reviewing journals and narratives revealed several critical elements of the school culture contributing to effectiveness of the evaluation process in producing growth and motivation. These elements included trust, collaboration, and an expectation of growth.

**Trusting Environment.** The first element to be discussed is that of a trusting environment. Trust among teachers and principals is essential for the success of an evaluation model that requires teachers to be self-directing, self-evaluating, and self-correcting. Data collected from interviews revealed some variation in the level of trust at different sites.

Principals talked about the issue of trust as they discussed the maturity level of the teachers. Most principals seemed to trust teachers who they felt were mature in their attitude toward growth. They also indicated that the process itself helps to provide a sense of trust by allowing teachers to take responsibility for their own evaluation and growth. Comments made by the principals concerning trust are as follows:

> I then basically left it open and completely voluntary and ask those that were interested to please let me know and let me know the type of topic that they were interested in working on.

> It's just that it was a much more comfortable way to do an evaluation. I mean it's very ... it's much more
relaxing. I mean you feel like you are talking with someone. You are really communicating with someone rather than reporting on a set of criteria that someone sent you to report on.

It gives them a little more freedom.

With the other one [teachers] learned to hide [their] weaknesses. Now it can be much more open to say...Hey, this is an area that I can do better in and how can you help me. It gives me an opportunity to be a helpmate rather than a supervisor.

Peer evaluation is going to enter into it. But at some point in time, teachers are going to have to trust each other to show them where they are bleeding and allow them to help to put Band-Aids on.

Most of the teachers involved in the process reported feeling more trusted and more like a professional by being involved in the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model. Comments revealing their feelings are as follows:

I felt good about that. That I was trusted to do this and that I was competent enough to do this.

He has felt that I have been professional enough to carry this on and do what I want to do and what I need to do. When we had our final conference, it was very relaxed and very beneficial, because we kind of shared some things.
I felt like that she knew I could do my job. She was just trying to help me broaden my horizons and expand on what I am already doing.

I did like being encouraged to try new things. I felt like with the TIMS model you had to be sure that you counted all the little things that you had to do. Whereas with this, you probably did naturally what you feel for you to be more creative, which I liked.

They [the administrators] have really encouraged us to open up and try new things.

She [the administrator] has been very helpful. She understands that we've got a lot of other things to do, and there hasn't been a lot of pressure to have such and such done by a certain time.

Well, it's not as threatening to see you walk in with [the principal] and say, 'oh my gosh it's evaluation time.' This way it's much more relaxing to know that something new you are experimenting with...if it doesn't work, I'm not going to get a two or a three on my records.

You feel like you are looked upon as more of a professional on an equal level and you feel like you can express yourself more openly, I think, or I felt that way.
You know you felt like you were off a lease and able to determine that process yourself.

Data collected from three of the 18 teachers interviewed revealed some feelings of distrust. At first, one teacher was concerned about the fact that no paperwork documenting the evaluation was going into her file. She was worried that something might be placed in her file without her knowledge. Another teacher felt that the administrator had not been as open about her expectations, deadlines, etc. as she should have been. This teacher emphasized the importance of clarifying the roles of administrators and teachers at the beginning of the process with expectations very clearly outlined. The third teacher indicating that trust was not apparent in her situation felt that she needed more direction from the principal. She wanted more structure and did not believe that the principal really knew what was going on in her classroom. In looking at outcomes experienced by these three teachers, there was very little evidence of growth or motivation.

**Collaborative Relationships.** The second critical element in a culture supportive of growth-oriented evaluation is collaborative relationships. In the context of collaborative relationships, consideration should be given to relationships between principals and teachers and to relationships among teachers. Principals discussed their
collaborative efforts through the data collection process. Several comments made by principals include:

...and refine what they do and I want them to feel that I can be a partner in it, and get away from the 'gotcha' feeling. I feel like that this is part of the larger picture, creating a collaborative work environment. Now I am much more comfortable sitting down and learning what's going on in the school and seeing it not from a me versus you perspective, but from a we perspective.

I've shared more information this year than I've ever shared.

...it's both people putting in information and coming out with a conclusion of where we are gonna go and how we work our goals.

Principals also described situations where teachers were working together collaboratively, as a result of this growth-oriented approach to evaluation. Some comments made by principals follow.

They are either working on it individually or as a team of teachers who have chosen a particular topic to work on.

She had invited me to come in at this particular time, she and some other teachers were doing an
activity...they did an integration of all ages in different activities during the day.

Something that I'm seeing come out of it, is in the goal setting process, many of the goals involve collaboration with another teacher, involved team teaching, and watching other teachers and sharing.

Teachers also shared experiences in which collaboration with the principal and other teachers was apparent. The collegiality that developed among teachers and principals seemed to be one of the most motivating factors in the process. Some comments made by teachers concerning collaboration with other teachers are as follows:

We are converting to the whole language approach pretty much totally, and so I have been doing some things with the other language arts teachers in that regard. And then [another teacher] and I have our own separate plan in which we are going to integrate language arts and social studies to...I am excited about both plans that I am involved with.

And we meet together and we have been sharing.

I value what my peers say, because they live it and they are there. I have gotten good ideas, you know when you bounce ideas and new things around you get new ideas and good things to do...
Teachers also described their feelings concerning collaboration with their principal in the goal-setting and action planning process. Comments made by teachers included the following:

Basically, [the principal] gave us an outline on how to write our plan, and we sat down as an English department and we followed her outline and answered questions about what we were going to concentrate on. And we would meet every six weeks with [the principal] and she would come to an English meeting and sit down and discuss where we were on the map.

...you have someone helping you by encouraging you with more ideas.

They were my goals, and then him assisting me and helping me on how I would reach those goals...this is more interaction on his part. He can probably feel free to give more suggestions and I think what's in my mind is that we sat down together and worked out these goals together.

It's not like you are being reviewed. You're being worked with, as such, not just like something that you are under observation. You know, somebody is working with you saying, 'What do you want to do? What's going to help you in your job?' And I have appreciated that.
All teachers and principals involved in the investigation considered collaboration to be an important component of the evaluation process. With teachers and principals collaboratively setting goals for improvement and working jointly to achieve those goals, a sense of ownership and responsibility was created for all involved.

**Expectation for Growth.** A culture that conveys an expectation for growth enhances the possibilities for positive attitudes toward continuous improvement. Data collected through the interviewing process reflected a belief that the quest for growth should be a continuous process that simply becomes a habit. A school culture permeated by high expectations for growth is needed for effective implementation of a growth-oriented form of teacher evaluation. Some comments from teachers and principals addressing the issue of expectations for growth are as follows:

With this you know that growth is expected. Therefore, you put a little more into it. It's just going to become a habit. Just something that we do. It is expected.

Instead of worrying about what score I will get in the summative. I can focus on really doing something to improve myself...to become a better teacher.

I'm very excited about it. First of all, it gives the teachers an opportunity to work on what they are really
interested in. Secondly, it gives us the opportunity as a school to form expert groups. Therefore, become our own staff developers in a sense.

It's going to be ongoing. There will be no end. It's just going to be a journey.

An expectation for growth was communicated by most principals during the goal-setting conference with teachers. One principal described this by saying,

You've got to think your way through and do some forward thinking here. What do you plan to do to insure that your teaching practices meet the needs of all students and reflect current theory and research about learning? My third question is how can I help you achieve those goals? I've tried to steer people toward learning more about whole language, integrated curriculum, collaborative learning, basically authentic learning.

Another principal indicated that all teachers were encouraged to develop Professional Improvement Plans in areas of interest. Teachers who chose to participate in improvement plans were required to join study groups in brain-based research on teaching and learning. This approach definitely communicated an expectation for growth.

**Characteristics of the Administrator**

The administrator plays an important role in the implementation of evaluation. This assumption was supported
by the data collected through interviews and observations. The greatest amount of growth and motivation was experienced in schools where principals provided the most support and encouragement and interacted with teachers on a regular basis. Teachers in these schools demonstrated a commitment to continuous growth, showed evidence of increased knowledge and skills, reported improved student learning, and were enthusiastic about their accomplishments. One major factor influencing these outcomes is the principal's fulfillment of the role as facilitator and coach and resource provider.

**Facilitator/Coach.** When allowing teachers to take responsibility for their own evaluation and professional growth, the principal's role in the evaluation process changes drastically. Administrators should be facilitators and coaches rather than experts with checklists on clipboards. Principals involved in this investigation expressed a desire to serve teachers in a facilitating role. They shared several examples describing their efforts in this area:

I think that they need to be encouraged to try.

I just guided them to make sure they set challenging goals for themselves that would somehow impact student learning positively.

It gives me an opportunity to be a helpmate rather than a supervisor.
You know sometimes we create marginal teachers. Where when they have a person learning, and we are critical and turning them off in their need for support, and then they start questioning themselves, that seems to kind of compound. Then all of a sudden there is somebody sitting there watching and checking yes or no they are or aren't doing it. That just adds to the anxiety, and we sometimes sort of keep those marginal teachers at a marginal process. Whereas, if we could say to them, 'Yea, you can do it. I'm behind you 100%,' then we can bring that confidence back to them, then they can make it.

Coaching helps to build self-esteem and self-confidence. Guiding, supporting, encouraging, helping, modeling, and advising are all responsibilities of the facilitating administrator.

During the interview process, teachers shared numerous experiences in which the administrator was fulfilling the role of facilitator and coach. Some comments from various teachers are as follows:

But it was so encouraging. When I sat down with [the principal], he was very encouraging. He really made me feel good.

[The principal] helped us with that. She encouraged us. She didn't force us at all.
He was just going to encourage me to try new things.

She encouraged the goals that I chose and even gave some ideas.

And at that point we were all pretty much stressed, and his suggestion was that we needed to learn to slow down. 'You don't have to ...you're pushing yourself. Nobody said you had to do everything.'

Actually I never did have much feedback before, but this year I was going to really have more feedback from my principal.

Well actually, and I'm not patting myself on the back...but, she was most complementary. When the career ladder person came, evidently she had talked to him and he was extremely complementary and that helps to boost your self-confidence.

Teachers responded very positively to the support they received from principals in their role as facilitator and coach. Increased self-confidence resulted from the encouragement and positive feedback. Another important function of the coaching administrator is to assist teachers in setting reasonable, doable goals and in knowing when to slow down or change directions.

Resource Provider. In addition to the characteristics listed in the previous section, being a resource provider is
an important function of the administrator. Resources, including things such as time, materials, research, and training, are necessary for implementation of many of the activities outlined in teachers' action plans. Principals revealed their thoughts by saying:

I have to be the resource and if they need activities or if they need time off, or if they need ideas to go find something, or if they need literature or something, I'm that person they come to, or if I come across something I can offer that to them.

I ask them, 'What do you need from me to help you achieve these goals?' And in some cases it is resources, professional development, conferences, it's money to buy materials, books, ...

I have been able to get materials for them...

Teachers also shared several instances where they considered the principal as being a great resource for them. Comments from teachers are as follows:

I think they have been wonderful about finding stuff to share with us to help us with our plans.

They made some very helpful suggestions, especially in the language arts instance about some things that we could do and think about. And she supplied materials to read and...
She is ordering materials for us that we have discovered through our reading; books that we want to read further to get more information. And she is helping us to find a conference and she is looking for other schools for us to visit that are close by.

...that if we need something...materials or something, he's been getting it for us, because he sees that it goes with the goals that we said that we wanted to do.

Time for professional growth activities is a difficult resource to provide. Several principals arranged professional leave days for teachers to attend conferences or visit other schools. One principal scheduled workshops during the regular school day and used staff development funds to provide substitutes to allow teachers to participate. One teacher expressed his feelings about this type of support by saying, "I have really enjoyed those days. It's stimulating. Not only professionally stimulating, but you get to see...this is a big campus and it's nice to see some of these other folks that we never get a chance to see."

When discussing ways to improve the process, several teachers recommended that efforts be made to create time for teachers to meet together in study groups, planning sessions, training sessions, or sharing seminars. Some teachers also expressed a desire to have more quality time for professional dialogue with the principal concerning their improvement
plans and activities. As one teacher said, "Then there's really not a good time during the day...that's probably a difficulty. Just finding a sit down time...an uninterrupted sit down time [with the principal]. You almost have to come in here at midnight."

**Characteristics of the Teachers**

Teachers who experienced the most growth and motivation during the implementation of the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model had high levels of maturity, responsibility, and self-directiveness. These teachers felt comfortable in setting challenging goals, developing action plans, and proceeding with implementation without guidance from the principal. Setting their own deadlines, feeling comfortable in discussing areas of difficulty, and keeping reflective journals were some of the characteristics exhibited by the more mature, responsible, and self-directed teachers. In implementing the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model, principals felt most comfortable in working with teachers who were mature in their attitudes about professional growth and who were responsible and self-directed. The general feeling from principals was that for this type of evaluation to be effective teachers must possess these qualities.

**Mature.** Data collection revealed the belief among principals that the maturity level of teachers played an important role in the potential for successful implementation
of a growth-oriented approach to evaluation. The majority of
the principals felt that teachers at a low maturity level
would need a more direct supervision model of evaluation.
Some comments made by principals are as follows:

Some people have very good concepts about where their
weaknesses are and some people don't see them at all.

I think it's for teachers who are mature in their growth
as a professional.

I think that would be...I would think that the principal
would have to consent to allow a teacher. I would think
that there would have to be an understanding that your
principal would have to agree that you are capable to go
through this model and grow from this model. And that's
the whole point. Going through is one thing, but
growing from what the model had the opportunity to do
for you is another.

Data collected from interviews with teachers and from
observations made during the process revealed a connection
between teachers' level of maturity and the amount of growth
and motivation experienced as a result of participating in
this evaluation. Teachers mature in their attitudes toward
professional growth were able to develop more challenging
goals directly related to improvement of instructional skills.
These teachers expressed the need for professional
development to be an on-going, continuous process. One
You know, I think about some of the goals that I used to write and then the goals that I wrote this year. I mean they are entirely different. And as a more experienced teacher, I think you are more aware of what your kids can do if you set goals for your students or set goals for yourself or whatever. Those goals do change as you get older and become more experienced.

**Responsible.** A growth-oriented approach to evaluation puts the onus on teachers to take control of their own evaluation. Principals shared the following comments:

The responsibility is on the shoulders of the teachers, not the principal.

It seems to have given them an era of confidence that 'I'm being treated like I know something about what's going on,' and seem to have a real good feel about it.

They really need to think about what they are doing, getting together their own resources.

Teachers also discussed the importance of taking responsibility for their own growth and development. Being responsible for selecting challenging goals, developing appropriate action plans and activities, and following through with the implementation and evaluation gives teachers an opportunity to experience feelings of empowerment and professionalism. Teachers shared the following comments:
I think this...I think if a person has ownership, if a person has responsibility, that the end product is usually better. And I think the teachers who chose this now have an ownership of their improvement and their evaluation and I think it's a great thing.

We felt like we were being treated more as a professional.

I feel like I have been treated like a professional. I was given responsibility for my own evaluation as to how I saw it. I felt very good about that.

I like the goals that I chose. I think that they have been very worthy. I think they have been very worthwhile to do, and with the kids, I think they have learned a lot.

In a sense, it puts more responsibility on me to really do something that will make me a better teacher. I know where I need to improve and what I am interested in.

Having a mature attitude about professional growth and taking the responsibility for what will be done increase the potential for successful implementation of The Professional Teacher Evaluation Model. Data revealed tremendous enthusiasm among teachers who were more mature and responsible.

*Self-Directed.* Data revealed that the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model was more successful with teachers who
were self-directed and felt comfortable having the freedom to explore areas of interest. Some comments from teachers that show evidence of their being self-directed are as follows:

I liked setting my own goals and determining how I was going to meet them and when I was going to meet them. You choose to put in more time because it was something you really want to work on and are interested in. The amount of time you spend is a choice of your own.

I wanted to do a self-study program, and I had one in mind, but it made me go and look for others that I felt like might be more appropriate, since it was something that I could use and really wanted to learn. The other one would have been fine, but what I came up with really ended up being right on target with what I needed to expand my skills.

I think had I not chosen any goals, I might not have been attentive to what I was hearing and reading, and would not have touched half of it as much as I did.

With this element having such an influence on the outcomes of the evaluation process, identifying a teacher's readiness for self-directed learning becomes an important role of the administrator. A variety of instruments for measuring self-directed readiness levels are available. Guglielmino (1978), who developed the Self-directed Learning Readiness Scale, defines self-directed learning as follows:
"Although certain learning situations are more conducive to self-direction in learning than others, it is the personal characteristics of the learner -- including his attitudes, values, and his abilities which ultimately determine whether self-directed learning will take place in a given learning situation" (as cited in West & Bentley, 1991, p. 72).

Guglielmino's definition clearly identifies the characteristics of the learner as the key for successful self-directed learning. All critical elements identified through this multiple-site case study play important roles in the success or failure of the program. The characteristics of the teacher, however, seem to be the determining factors.

**Characteristics of the Process**

The evaluation process itself has a tremendous influence on the effectiveness of the program in promoting the professional growth and motivation of teachers. Data collection revealed four critical elements related to the characteristics of the evaluation process. The process should be (a) continuous, (b) individualized, (c) formative, and (d) structured. Each of these elements is discussed in the following sections.

**Continuous.** Teachers and principals involved in this multiple-site case study expressed the belief that evaluation should be a continuous process. When implementing the goal-setting model for evaluation, two and three year goals
emerged from many improvement plans developed by teachers. Even when teachers started out with a one-year plan, many of them got so involved with what they were learning that they developed plans for next year to continue or expand the areas they worked on during this school year. A growth-oriented model of evaluation encourages a desire for continuous improvement. Comments reflecting feelings about the continuous process are as follows:

The way he explained it, it is open-ended. It's not a closure. This is not ending this year. Because I asked him if there was anything we need to sign off on...anything we need to put in our file. Usually we sign I agree, disagree, or whatever. He said no, it is an open-ended, continuing process.

And I really think people won't grow until they have to consistently be challenged to grow.

If they weren't having trouble or feeling a need to work on that goal, they have already accomplished it. So obviously it's not something that's going to come to them overnight. It's something that they want to work on for a while.

We carry things over for maybe two or three years. Well, if you're learning something about something, you can't probably do a whole lot with it and evaluate it
and come up with something in a year, it is going to take longer than that.

Teachers who have chosen this path...it becomes a continuous improvement plan. It is not something that they just do once every three years or five years or whatever.

It's an ongoing kind of process, which is really (I guess) what it should be.

When teachers and principals view this as an ongoing, continuous process, exciting results occur. Taking ownership and responsibility for growth by working in areas of interest, teachers become motivated to learn more and continue to expand their knowledge and skills from year-to-year.

**Individualized.** Another very positive characteristic of the process is the individualization it offers. Allowing teachers to choose areas of interest for development promotes a sense of ownership. All teachers reported that the evaluation process was more meaningful and allowed them to improve their teaching performance. Both principals and teachers expressed feelings concerning the individualization of the process. Some comments made by principals are as follows:

I'm excited about it. First of all it gives the teachers and opportunity to work on what they are really
interested in working on...I think it better addresses their professional needs at this particular point. It is not mechanical...

I think pretty much no matter how you design them, each person, each principal, and/or the staff or professional person is going to bring some views in as to the way it works best for them.

I think that there needs to be flexibility, there needs to be trust, not only within a school, but among schools.

And basically that's where the goals begin. You know some teachers feel that they need to do more whole language activities, and some teachers this year felt like...I need to do more of the lab sciences with my children, so I'm going to spend more time on developing experiments and activities that will get hands-on science. Some teachers felt the need....

She chose two areas that she was very, very interested in growing in, not so much just wanting to learn more about, but how could she take what she learned and use it in her classroom?

Teachers also made several comments in regard to their feelings about the individualization of the evaluation process. Selected comments were as follows:
Well, to me it looks like a model that encourages you to develop what you want to do, what you think you need to work on, where your strengths need to be, and it's very flexible as to how you want to do it, when you want to do it, whether you are doing it alone, or with a group, or whatever.

Well, I was telling [the principal] when I met with her, this has been so nice to be able to choose something that I wanted to do personally to help me in my teaching and that I felt would help students and yet, still get credit for it and it was more exciting to do that.

We had informal talks and of course we sat down at the beginning of the year and had the first one. About four weeks ago we sat and talked again about 30 or 45 minutes about what I had accomplished and what I wanted to continue or what I felt like I wanted to change.

I was really able to make it more my evaluation as such, rather than meeting someone else's structure.

This way part of you is more invested in it, because you really are thinking, 'What do I need? What do I want to do? What areas do I need to really improve or learn about?'

This system fits the type of person I am, as well as someone who would want to be very structured...
I really liked it because, by picking my own goals I got to choose things that were of value to me. By individualizing the evaluation process, meaningful opportunities for growth and development are created. Both teachers and principals overwhelmingly endorsed the individualization provided by the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model.

**Formative.** An evaluation model that involves facilitating and coaching by principals and reflective thinking on the part of teachers defines a very formative process. The Professional Teacher Evaluation Model was viewed by those involved as an opportunity to develop knowledge and skills through formative feedback, reflection, and support. End-of-year reviews consisted of teachers submitting narrative reports describing growth activities and the impact those had on their teaching performance and student learning and of having discussions with the principal on progress, results, and plans for continuing or expanding activities. With this type of interaction, evaluation becomes a formative - formative process instead of a formative-summative process as in the traditional models.

Data collected from both principals and teachers revealed a great interest in this formative - formative approach to evaluation. Some comments made by principals are as follows:
So what I am trying to do is a formative type evaluation that involves goal setting, and my follow up on those goals.

What I would want to do more of next year is spend more collective time just talking about ideas with the teachers on not only getting into their rooms, but the sitting down and sharing more informally about what I saw and my ideas informally.

And then informal times of observing, walking through the classrooms to kind of see what people were doing, and commenting on those things...

When asked to express feelings about giving scores to teachers to reflect levels of accomplishments of goals, principals indicated a desire not to give scores. One principal explained, "I don't think there is a need for [scores]. I think that would take the wind out of the sails for what we are trying to accomplish. It would probably wind up being a five or a four, no less, or a complete or incomplete. I think when we start putting that kind of value on it, it really takes away from what we are trying to accomplish."

Teachers also indicated a desire not to have scores assigned to their progress. Some comments made by teachers are as follows:
I left that meeting really feeling good about myself and about my job and what I would be doing. You know that it made me feel good. It was better than the old 5, 4, 3, you know whatever. You know, he really verbalized and he told me and I liked that, because I really had a chance to know what his opinions were.

The narrative report...in a way I think that tells more than a number.

It just didn't seem to be as judgmental. It seemed to be more advantage oriented. I think I had five goals and two of them I had accomplished. I was able to get both of them done. One continues to be on-going, and probably won't be finished for a couple of years.

Having a summative conference with scores assigned gives a sense of closure. If creating an environment which encourages continuous improvement is important, a formative-formative process makes more sense than a formative-summative process.

**Structure.** Data collection showed that some teachers need more structure in the process with more direction from the principal in setting deadlines for conferences and reports. Some comments made by teachers revealing feelings about the structure are as follows:

The thing that I didn't like about it is that I think it is too open-ended, and I work better with a deadline or
a goal to reach. I just felt like there wasn't one and I was struggling to think now where am I supposed to be... The frustrating thing about it is as far as working with other people with it, we all took it differently, since it wasn't a set down, you do this now, and this then. People weren't together that were working together. So I felt like I was either pulling them or struggling to get where I wanted to go, and that was frustrating.

I know that some people didn't do a lot of their goal setting until later in the year.

I guess that was probably one goal that was a very important goal, but I just you know, kept pushing it back. I probably should have had a deadline. That's probably one of the weak points, is that there was not a deadline. Because I didn't have a deadline, I just kept pushing it back.

Maybe it was just me. It would have been helpful to have a little more structure just to get going.

A deadline would be good. We were kind of late getting started. If you knew by April 15 you've got to have this and this turned in it might help.

Some sort of framework to work within, because we were given so much leeway that it was hard to focus on
exactly what you wanted to do and once you decided what you wanted to do, when was it going to be...I think I could have stayed on top of it throughout the year if there had been something.

Given these comments, it is also important to note that several teachers felt very comfortable in developing their own framework and timeline for setting goals, developing actions plans, and implementing them. Comments made by these teachers are as follows:

I think most teachers are professional enough to take care of that without having a timeline.

I think the paper work that you gave us and the things that you sent out to us; I think that gave us our guideline, because it is structured. It's not that it's structureless. It's just a different structure.

There are broad frameworks that we have in our plans of course. Certain things that we are going to do sometime next year, and certain things that we are going to do sometime the year after that and so on. But as far as having it by August 15th, or October the 1st, or whatever, it's not anything that strict, and I think that's good too.

I'm a very organized person. It drives my family crazy. On the weekends, I would get this out and make a list, for "a" I need to do this and each weekend I would take
it out and say, "Which of these do I still need to work on."

With our situation, I liked it the way it was. The way I did my plan book, I wrote in January "schedule conference with [the principal] to discuss my goals," and then I sent her a note: "We need to schedule a conference to discuss my mid-year evaluation" and then we could figure out a time that was good for both of us.

In view of these comments, the importance of individualizing the process itself to meet the needs of teachers based on maturity levels and readiness for self-directed learning is apparent. Teachers have varying levels of comfort with an open-ended, self-directed evaluation process; therefore, having a flexible process with various options is important. Broad frameworks and guidelines that can be adjusted according to a teacher's readiness could provide the structure needed.

Part III: Discussion of Data Analysis

Data were gathered through the survey instrument, The Teacher Evaluation Profile, to add depth to the descriptions of each group involved in this multiple-site case study. As reported in Part I of this chapter, analysis of survey data revealed the level of effectiveness of the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model in improving teachers' perceptions of the evaluation process for three
distinct groups of teachers. Two of the groups involved, the Liberty Bell Middle School group and the experimental group, showed significant improvement in their perceptions of several items on the survey. However, the North Side Elementary group showed no significant difference in perceptions of the evaluation process after participation in the pilot.

Data gathered through qualitative methods of interviewing, observing, and reviewing documents revealed similar results. Although teachers and principals in all three groups revealed positive feelings about the process and its benefits, Liberty Bell Middle School and the majority of sites in the experimental group showed the greatest amount of growth and motivation as a result of the evaluation process. With the North Side Elementary group, data revealed minimal effort on the part of some teachers; therefore, teacher growth and motivation were not as apparent.

An important question in an investigation of program implementation is: What are the reasons for the successes and failures of the program? Survey results revealed successful implementation of the evaluation program at Liberty Bell Middle School and with the majority of the sites in the experimental group. Why was implementation successful? As identified through the qualitative data analysis, twelve critical elements under four major
categories influence the linking of teacher evaluation and professional growth. When these elements were present, the desired outcomes of teacher growth and motivation were realized.

Data analysis of survey results provided the investigator with information concerning the effectiveness of a growth-oriented approach to evaluation. Analysis of interviews, observations, and documents provided insight into the processes and outcomes across many sites. Understanding how the results are influenced by specific contextual variables helped to clarify why the implementation was successful or unsuccessful. In other words, the qualitative data analysis combined with the survey results allowed the investigator to "read between the Likert scale" so-to-speak.
Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

The purpose of Chapter Five is to present a summary of this multiple-site case study, to provide conclusions drawn from the findings reported in Chapter Four, and to present recommendations for revising and refining the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model. This model of evaluation was designed to encourage reflective practice and to allow teachers to become self-directing, self-evaluating, and self-correcting.

Current research indicates that experienced teachers being evaluated under traditional, competency-based models of evaluation view the process as being non-productive. One contributing factor is the lack of a clear link between teacher evaluation and teacher development. According to Boyd (1989), for the evaluation process to be a positive experience for teachers and administrators, it must be meaningful, and not just an empty, disconnected exercise. Review of the literature revealed that little has been done in developing collaborative, growth-oriented approaches to evaluation. As a result, the investigator conducted a multiple-site case study involving the implementation of the newly developed Professional Teacher Evaluation Model.
Current literature emphasizes the need for supervisory processes that focus on reflective, collegial, and professional aspects, with a main goal of developing deliberative classrooms that encourage teachers and students to construct meaning from their interactions and investigations. With a shift to the primary purpose of growth instead of accountability, evaluation procedures will be descriptive instead of evaluative. They will consist of discussions instead of conferences, narratives instead of rating scales, and reflections instead of comments on strengths and weaknesses (Marczely, 1992). With the ultimate goal of "teacher autonomy: the ability to self-monitor, self-analyze, and self-evaluate" (Garmston, 1993, p.58), cognitive coaching fosters the ability of teachers to make changes in their own thinking and teaching.

In response to this shift in thinking, the Tennessee State Department of Education is in the process of developing a new state model for local evaluation. After hearing of the investigation being done in Johnson City Schools on the implementation of the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model, a State Department representative requested a preliminary analysis of the study's results to use in support of her proposal to pilot a new model which includes professional growth options for teachers who hold a professional license. This preliminary analysis was submitted to the Commissioner of Education in May, 1995.
Permission to pilot the proposed new model was granted and the Johnson City School System was selected as a pilot site.

**Purpose and Procedures**

The main purpose of the study was to investigate the implementation of a growth-oriented approach to evaluation paying close attention to the internal dynamics and actual processes. In addition, the investigator compared teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of this approach with their perceptions of the effectiveness of a competency-based approach.

Data were collected from a select group of teachers and principals in the Johnson City School System. The investigator used multiple-site case study research to investigate the nature of the activities, processes, and structures used to link a teacher evaluation program to professional growth and motivation. Both quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed. Qualitative data consisted of "detailed descriptions of situations, events, people, interactions, and observed behavior" (Merriman, 1988, p. 68). This is the raw data that provided depth and detail to the study. Quantitative data received from the Teacher Evaluation Profile survey instrument were used to provide support for the findings from the qualitative methods.

Both random and purposeful sampling techniques were used to select participants for this multiple-site case
study. A total of 52 teachers from nine schools responded to the Teacher Evaluation Profile survey instrument. From those selected, four distinct groups were formed: (a) control group, (b) experimental group, (c) Liberty Bell Middle School group, and (d) North Side Elementary School group. The SPSS/PC+ statistical software package was used to analyze the survey results. The t-test and ANCOVA statistical procedures were conducted to test the eight null hypotheses listed in Chapter 1. This part of the analysis involved all four groups. Since the control group did not participate in the implementation of the new model for evaluation, members of that group did not participate in the qualitative component of the study.

Analysis of data, both inductive and deductive, included looking at activities and expected outcomes as well as informal patterns and unanticipated consequences. Interviews were audio taped, transcribed, and then imported into the Ethnograph v4.0 text based analysis software package. Field notes, observations, reflective journals, and narrative reports were also entered into the Ethnograph program for analysis. Through the quantitative and qualitative data analysis, the investigator revealed the attitudes, behaviors, and perceptions of teachers and principals concerning the implementation of a growth-oriented approach to teacher evaluation.
Linking Teacher Evaluation, Professional Growth, and Motivation

Analysis of data revealed attitudes, behaviors and perceptions of those involved in the implementation of a growth-oriented approach to teacher evaluation. Although teachers and principals in all three groups reported positive feelings about the process and its benefits, the Liberty Bell Middle School group and the majority of the sites in the experimental group showed the greatest amount of growth and motivation as a result of the evaluation process. In the North Side Elementary group and some of the sites in the experimental group, growth and motivation of teachers was not as apparent.

What are the reasons for the success or failure of the program? Through the qualitative data analysis, the investigator identified 12 critical elements within four major categories that influence the linking of teacher evaluation, professional growth, and motivation. The four major categories are: (a) characteristics of the culture, (b) characteristics of the administrator, (c) characteristics of the teacher, and (d) characteristics of the process. The level of success of the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model varied somewhat among the groups investigated.

When the critical elements were present, the investigator found evidence of the following outcomes:
motivation, (b) creativity, (c) transfer of training to the classroom, (d) improved instruction, (e) improved student learning, (f) improved relationships, (g) improved self-esteem, and (h) a commitment to continuous growth. The more critical elements present in a given situation, the more positive the outcomes.

A trusting environment where creativity and risk-taking were encouraged, where collaborative relationships existed between principals and teachers, and where there were high expectations for growth described a culture conducive to a professional growth model of evaluation. As a result of the evaluation process, administrators who acted as facilitators and coaches and provided resources saw improved instruction and improved student learning. In addition, teachers who were mature, responsible, and self-directed experienced more growth and enthusiasm. Another important component in the success of the program was the evaluation process itself. Being an individualized, formative approach to evaluation, the process created an awareness of the need for continuous growth and improvement.

All elements did not appear to have equal impact on the dynamics and outcomes of the evaluation process. However, some patterns emerged from analysis of data.

Being self-directed was one characteristic of the teacher that seemed to play a major role in the effectiveness of the growth-oriented approach to evaluation.
For teachers who were not as self-directed as principals believed they would be, frustration and minimal effort resulted in little evidence of growth or motivation. These teachers wanted more direction from the principal and more structure in the process, but did not feel comfortable in discussing their frustrations with the principal.

The amount of structure provided in the evaluation process emerged as a critical element in the success of the program. The majority of the teachers interviewed, including those who experienced tremendous growth and motivation during the process, indicated a need for more structure. They suggested a broad framework with established deadlines for completion of mid-year reviews and end-of-year reviews be developed to assist in the successful implementation of the program. However, due to the varying levels of teacher readiness for self-directed learning, flexibility should be an important consideration.

The administrator's role in the evaluation process emerged as a key factor in the success or failure of the program. Grow's (1991) Staged Self-Directed Learning Model, based on Hersey and Blanchard's model for situational leadership, describes four distinct stages of learners: (a) low self-direction, (b) moderate self-direction, (c) intermediate self-direction, and (d) high self-direction. Principals should individualize their leadership strategies to match a teacher's learning stage (Merriman & Caffarella,
In the role of facilitator and/or coach, the administrator must have the ability to identify a teacher's level of readiness for self-directed learning and then to modify the structure to fit the needs of each individual teacher. When teachers are not ready for self-directed learning, more direction and structure should be given by the principal.

The critical elements defining the culture of the school are necessary for successful implementation of a growth-oriented approach to evaluation. A trusting, collaborative work environment with high expectations for growth will enhance the effectiveness of the evaluation program.

Twelve critical elements emerged from the data that influence the linking of teacher evaluation, professional growth, and motivation—cultures with trusting environments, collaborative relationships, and expectation of growth; administrators as facilitators/coaches and resource providers; mature, responsible, and self-directed teachers; and a process that is continuous, individualized, formative, and structured. These elements were delineated in four major categories: (a) characteristics of the culture, (b) characteristics of the administrator, (c) characteristics of the teacher, and (d) characteristics of the process. Due to the qualitative nature of the study these findings can not necessarily be generalized. However, since these findings are supported by previous research, the investigator believes that
the same critical elements would be key factors determining the effectiveness of growth-oriented approaches to evaluation in other school systems.

Conclusions

This multiple-site case study was conducted to investigate the nature of the activities, processes, and structures used to link a teacher evaluation program to professional growth, and motivation. The findings from this study supported previous research and current literature concerning implementation of effective growth-oriented approaches to evaluation (Barth, 1993; Boyd, 1989; Cunningham & Gresso, 1993; Hill, 1991; Johnson, 1992; McGreal, 1994; Root & Overly, 1990). Based on these findings, the investigator reached the following conclusions:

1. The culture of the school has a great impact on the effectiveness of a growth-oriented approach to evaluation. With a trusting environment, collaborative relationships, and high expectations for growth, teachers and administrators will feel comfortable in revealing, sharing, and celebrating what works for them. This type of culture will foster reflective practice and contribute to teachers' and principals' capacity for growth.

2. The administrator plays a very important role as facilitator/coach and resource provider in the evaluation process. Another important function is that of identifying
teachers' levels of readiness for self-directed learning and making adjustments in the process accordingly.

3. The greatest amounts of teacher growth and motivation were experienced by teachers who had frequent interactions with the principal and were supported and encouraged by the principal. Informal classroom observations and opportunities for professional dialogue with the principal should be encouraged.

4. Both principals and teachers can contribute to a school culture that supports professional development by working together collaboratively to build trusting relationships that encourage risk-taking and creativity.

5. The more mature, responsible, and self-directed a teacher, the more likely there will be a level of comfort with the freedom to self-evaluate and self-correct.

6. Teachers should be involved in the development of the evaluation process under which they will be evaluated. Ownership is an important motivator.

7. Teachers consider the structure of the evaluation program and the guidance and support of the principal as key attributes for a successful evaluation program that promotes professional growth. However, due to the varying levels of teacher readiness for self-directed learning, flexibility should be an important consideration.

8. The evaluation process can enhance professional growth by being individualized and allowing teachers to
choose areas of interest to work on.

9. Making a clear link between evaluation and professional development creates meaningful learning opportunities for principals and teachers.

10. The goal setting process with periodic reviews of progress inspired reflective practice. Teachers began to think deeply about what they were doing and why.

11. Principals should have the authority to use a more direct approach to evaluation with teachers who have demonstrated low levels of competency.

12. When the critical elements were present, the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model enhanced professional growth and had a positive impact on teacher motivation. The degree of success was directly related to the characteristics of the culture, the administrator, the teacher, and the process.

The investigator began this research project due to a strong commitment to the concept of linking teacher evaluation to professional growth to produce highly motivated teachers, improved teaching performance, and improved student learning. As a result of past experiences and information gained through reading current literature on evaluation and growth, the investigator expected to find the following: enthusiasm, motivation, growth, interest, improved relationships, improved instruction, and improved student learning. These outcomes were found in cases where the
critical elements were present. The investigator, however, did not expect to find: (a) the need for more structure, (b) the need for training in goal setting, (c) the desire of some teachers to have formal observations and feedback, nor (d) principals' concerns regarding the use of the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model with less competent or marginal teachers.

Recommendations

Based on the findings from this study, the following recommendations are suggested for revising and implementing the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model.

1. The culture of the school should be assessed before implementation of the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model, to determine the level of trust and collaboration in the environment. When necessary, steps should be taken to develop a culture supportive of growth and development.

2. Prior to implementation, teachers and principals should be trained in the purpose and procedures of the evaluation program. Expectations and specific roles and responsibilities of administrators and teachers should be clarified. Having a clear understanding of these factors will help build a trusting environment and collaborative relationships.

3. Provide the opportunity to be involved in a professional growth evaluation model to all tenured
teachers who desire the growth-oriented approach.

4. Principals should explore methods of identifying teachers' levels of readiness for self-directed learning. Once these readiness levels are identified, modifications and adjustments should be made in the structure of the process to meet the individual needs of the teachers.

5. Although the major responsibility is on the teacher to set challenging goals and develop action plans and activities for achieving those goals, it is recommended that principals take seriously their responsibility to provide frequent feedback and support. Informal classroom observations and opportunities for professional dialogue are recommended as integral parts of the evaluation process.

6. Every possible measure should be taken to ensure the presence of the 12 critical elements identified by the investigator as important to the success of a growth-oriented approach to evaluation.

7. The Professional Teacher Evaluation Model should be considered as the professional growth option component of the proposed Tennessee State Model for Local Evaluation that is being piloted during the 1995-96 school year.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

THE PROFESSIONAL TEACHER EVALUATION MODEL
JOHNSON CITY SCHOOLS
PROFESSIONAL TEACHER EVALUATION MODEL

Introduction

The Johnson City School System has been using the state model of evaluation to evaluate all teachers. It is our belief that our evaluation process needs to be improved to address the various needs of our teachers. In an effort to create a professional model of evaluation that encourages reflective practice and enhances professional growth, the Johnson City School System will pilot a collaborative, growth-oriented evaluation model during the 1994-95 school year.

Qualifications

To participate in this alternative form of evaluation, teachers must be tenured in the Johnson City School System. Non-tenured still must be evaluated using the state model. Tenured teachers may choose the alternative model or the state model of evaluation.

Procedures

When a teacher selects the "Professional Teacher Evaluation Model," the following steps should be followed:

1. The principal and teacher will have an orientation conference.
2. A goal setting and action planning conference with the principal and teacher will be held to set a minimum of two goals (short-range - one to three year goals) that fall into the following categories:
   a) Professional Goal
   b) Classroom Goal
   c) School Goal
   d) System Goal
   e) *Team Goal - If teachers are teaching in a team situation, one of the two goals may be a team goal.
3. Once the goals are set, the teacher will select appropriate activities collaboratively with the principal.
4. The teacher will develop and implement action plans designed for the attainment of the goals.
5. Observations and conferences are held at the request of the teacher with the principal and/or supervisor.
6. The principal and teacher will have a mid-year review for sharing of progress, feedback, request for resources, etc.
7. Observations and conferences are held at the request of the teacher with the principal and/or supervisor.
8. The principal and teacher will have an end-of-year review. At this time the teacher will present documentation of accomplishment or partial accomplishment of goals. The end-of-year review should be in narrative form; but, also may include other documentation such as portfolios, journals, video tapes, etc.
Menu of Suggested Activities

Possible activities for use in the "Professional Teacher Evaluation Model" are suggested below. Additional activities, that are collaboratively planned with the principal, may be used.

1. Serve as a mentor (student teacher or new teacher)
2. Participate in peer coaching
3. Keep a professional journal
4. Conduct an action research project
5. Develop a professional portfolio
6. Learn about a new teaching strategy and implement with follow-up (video tape, keep journal, participate in sharing seminars, etc.)
7. Serve as a trainer-of-trainers
8. Participate in other professional development and leadership activities
9. Serve as a poor evaluator
10. Request a poor evaluator
11. Other -- additional activities collaboratively planned with the principal
   a) ______________________________________
   b) ______________________________________
   c) ______________________________________

In an effort to evaluate the effectiveness of this model for evaluation, I would like to ask all principals and teachers involved to keep a reflective journal to record thoughts about the procedures and activities. As you move through the various phases of the process, jot down how you feel about what is happening. The following are suggested questions that you might ask yourself: How does this approach to evaluation affect the relationship between the teacher and the principal? What are some strengths of the collaborative approach? What are some weaknesses? How does this process affect your energy, motivation, enthusiasm, etc.? How has this process influenced you as a professional? Evaluate the improvement of your teaching practices as a result of the evaluation process. You may think of other questions that you might consider.
PLEASE NOTE

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.
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APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW GUIDES
INITIAL INTERVIEW GUIDE
(For Principals)

1. Describe the model for teacher evaluation that you have been using with tenured teachers this school year.

2. How do you feel about the value of this “new form” of teacher evaluation?

3. What steps have been taken up to this point?

4. How have teachers responded to the goal setting process?

5. What aspects of the process have gone well?

6. What needs to be improved?

7. How does this process compare to the old model?

8. Does this evaluation model require more or less time on the part of the administrator? On the part of the teacher?

9. Have you benefited from this process? If so, How?

10. How has your understanding of professional growth changed as a result of this project?

11. Of what value, if any, was the entire evaluation process to you in terms of your professional growth and motivation?

12. Have the teachers benefited? If so, How?

13. Have students benefited? If so, How?

14. What are the strengths of the model?

15. What are the weaknesses?

16. What problems do you foresee if we adopt the “Professional Teacher Evaluation Model” as the standard model for tenured teachers?
INITIAL INTERVIEW GUIDE
(For Teachers)

1. How do you feel about the value of this "new form" of teacher evaluation?
2. What steps have been taken up to this point?
3. Did you understand what you are supposed to do in this new model?
4. Are your goals clearly your goals?
5. Did you understand how your performance will be measured?
6. Did you have deadlines?
7. Have you been encouraged to reach your goals?
8. What was your role in deciding goals and activities?
9. What kind of credit or recognition would you expect for achievement of your goals?
10. Does trying for goals make your job more fun, interesting, exciting?
11. How do you feel when you accomplish a goal?
12. Did other teachers encourage you to reach your goals?
13. What aspects of the process have gone well?
14. What needs to be improved?
15. How does this process compare to the old model?
16. Does this evaluation model require more or less time on the part of the administrator? On the part of the teacher?
17. How has your understanding of professional growth changed as a result of this project?
18. Of what value, if any, was the entire evaluation process to you in terms of your professional growth and motivation?
19. Have you benefited? If so, How?

20. Have students benefited? If so, How?

21. What are the strengths of the model?

22. What are the weaknesses?

23. What is it like to be a part of this new form of evaluation?

24. What services have been provided to you?

25. What problems do you foresee if we adopt the “Professional Teacher Evaluation Model” as the standard model for tenured teachers?
June 16, 1995

Dr. Carolyn Brown
Chair, Department of Behavioral Science
1350 King College Road
King College
Bristol, TN

Dear Dr. Brown:

Thank you so much for agreeing to serve as auditor for the multiple site case study I am conducting. My purpose in writing this letter is to formally confirm our agreement and to present a framework for the audit trail and report.

In keeping with suggestions made in Hannan's work (1983), you will be provided the following items for examination: a copy of my prospectus, audio tapes of interviews, transcriptions of interviews, field notes, reflective journals, narrative reports, preliminary analysis, summary reports, survey results, and a copy of chapter 4.

According to Guba and Lincoln (1985), authors of Naturalistic Inquiry, the charge of an inquiry audit is to determine dependability and confirmability and to review credibility measures of an investigation. As you review the items mentioned above, please respond to the following questions:

Dependability:
1. Are all data accounted for?
2. Were all reasonable areas explored?
3. Did the inquirer find negative as well as positive data?
4. Was the study influenced by Pygmalion and Hawthorn effects?
   
   Assess the overall design of the study.

Confirmability:
5. Are the findings grounded in the data? Can a linkage be established between the findings and the raw data?
6. Are the inferences logical? Determine the appropriateness of the category labels and the quality of the interpretations.
7. Is there evidence of investigator bias?
8. Was confirmability ensured through triangulation?
   
   Credibility:
10. Is referential adequacy provided?
11. Is there evidence of member checks?
12. Is there evidence of triangulation?

Thank you again for agreeing to serve as the auditor for my investigation. If you have any questions about this framework, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Nancy Wagner
APPENDIX E
AUDIT REPORT
The external audit procedures have been completed and the following report is submitted. The audit was conducted from August 4, 1995 through August 13, 1995.

According to specified criteria based on the work of Guba and Lincoln, the audit addressed the dependability, confirmability, and credibility of the tapes and hard copy transcriptions. Since the tapes focused on qualitative data analyses, the auditor also compared categorical (classifications) of data with classifications outlined by the researcher to determine congruence of categorical coding for validity purposes.

The following procedures were completed:

(1) A meeting was arranged with the auditor on August 4, 1995. During that meeting, the following data or information was provided to the auditor: 1) the number and names of interviews conducted (principals and teachers in the Johnson City School System), 2) school locations of interviews, 3) cassette tapes, 4) notebook of hard copy transcriptions, 5) interview guides for principals and teachers, 6) the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model, and 7) a copy of the classifications or categories for data analysis.

(2) A stratified random sample from the total number of interviews was selected based on participation in the pilot project and further stratified based on school locations in the Johnson City School System. Two principal tapes were audited--the principal from Liberty Bell Middle School and the principal at Northside Elementary School.

(3) Six tapes of teacher interviews were audited. A random sample was selected with initials only of teachers reflected: H. J. and S. T., Liberty Bell Middle School; P. H. Northside Elementary School; P. V. Southside Elementary School, J.D. Woodland Elementary School; and L. C. Towne Acres Elementary School. The audited sample represented a cross-section of teachers from different schools and different grade levels ranging from sixth grade middle school language arts teachers to kindergarten teachers.
During the actual auditing process of listening to the tapes, the interview guides were followed to determine continuity of questions. The actual initials of the interviewees were placed beside the question if that particular question was asked or if respondent voluntarily supplied the information. The same process was followed for auditing of both the principal interviews and the teacher interviews. This process allowed a visual picture of the questions and provided further validity. A cluster of questions appeared that were routinely asked of the two principals and was more evident in the questions asked of the teachers due to a larger auditing sample. The actual copies of the worksheets were presented to the researcher to further aid in data analysis.

The auditor listened to the tapes and simultaneously read the hard copy for verification of transcription accuracy. Omissions or corrections were noted on the hard copies.

At the conclusion of listening to the tapes, the auditor reviewed the classifications or categories noted in the margins by the researcher for data analysis based on the factors linking teacher evaluation, professional growth, and motivation. In the majority of instances, the auditor's classifications were in congruence with the classifications of the researcher based on criteria previously provided.

In addressing Guba and Lincoln's criteria, in the area of dependability, data from the selected samples were accounted for and all reasonable areas were explored. Minor transcriptionist and typing errors were noted on the hard copies, but these omissions and errors would have little or no affect on data analysis or categorization. Both negative and positive comments were noted. However, it should be noted that on a few occasions, the researcher's commitment to the new evaluation process was quite evident and at times, could be construed as leading the interviewees for added support of the new evaluation model and ultimately biases the positiveness of the process. When teachers did offer suggestions for improvements or even a negative aspect, the researcher took careful note of those as well and followed through with a specific question that addressed how to improve or change the process should it be implemented in the near future.

The confirmability of the findings are grounded in the data. After the initial listening of the tapes for transcription accuracy and dependability, categorical classifications determined by the researcher were compared with classifications determined by the auditor. In a final meeting on August 16, 1995, the verification of the categories, as well as the
incidents themselves, identified by the researcher and the categories identified by the auditor were in congruence. This process further reduced researcher bias in categorization and confirmed that the coding and classifications were logical.

In conclusion, the data gathering process (interviews), transcriptions, categorization, congruence of classifications were dependable, confirmable, and credible.

It has certainly been my pleasure to work with Ms. Wagner and I wish her continued success in her dissertation endeavors. I truly believe this body of work will have a positive impact on the evaluation of teachers in the Johnson City School System and possibly expansion in public school systems across the state of Tennessee.

Respectfully submitted.
DATE: AUGUST 25, 1995

TO: DR. MARIE HILL, CHAIR, DOCTORAL COMMITTEE, ETSU
   DOCTORAL CANDIDATE: NANCY WAGNER

FROM: DR. CAROLYN H. BROWN, CHAIR, DEPT. OF BEHAVIORAL
      SCIENCE, KING COLLEGE, BRISTOL, TN

RE: EXTERNAL AUDIT REPORT PART II TRIANGULATION

According to specified criteria based on the work of Guba and Lincoln, Part I of
the audit report (previously submitted) addressed the dependability, confirmability, and
credibility of the interview tapes, accuracy of hard copy transcriptions, and confirmed
categorical classifications outlined by the researcher to determine congruence of
categorical coding for validity purposes.

Part II of the audit report addresses the issue of triangulation for the purposes of
qualitative data analyses.

The following instruments and documents were submitted to the auditor for
examination during August 1995:

(1) The Teacher Evaluation Profile used for pre- and post-test administration.

(2) Hard copy transcriptions of the actual data analysis for the quantitative
    component of the research project.

(3) Researcher field notes [Comments and notes from the researcher were
    included on the tapes and transcription hard copies of those notes.
    Observations of a principal in a goal-setting conference and actual teacher
    observations are included in the field notes.]

(4) Journal guidelines provided to participants in study.

(5) Examples of completed reflective Journals by participants in the study.

(6) Selected sample of member check memos and hard copy transcriptions for
    verification of accuracy by actual participants (included both principals and
    teachers). Member checks included actual quotes from participants.
From the material submitted as evidence of quantitative data analysis, the auditor reviewed the data analysis results using SPSS/PC+ that included demographic and other descriptive data for the components of the Teacher Evaluation Profile Instrument and also checked the accuracy of the data analysis of the various t-tests for significant differences. Any questions were brought to the attention of the researcher to discuss with her major professor. Results of data analysis were logical and accurate and derived from the items on the actual instrument.

Additionally, the auditor read the field note transcriptions that were included at the end of the interviews and confirmed the dependability and accuracy of those notes. The guidelines outlined in the Reflective Journal Booklet for the completion of the reflection journals were examined, as well as, examples of completed reflective journals by actual participants in the study. Even though this was not a requirement, several teachers did complete the reflective journals thus providing another source of data collection or further triangulation. In relation to the procedures for member checks, the auditor reviewed the cover letters and hard copy transcriptions of the interviews that were mailed to selected participants for verification of accuracy of interview comments and field note observations by the researcher.

The documents and evidence examined by the auditor reflect that a variety of means (interviews, observations, journals) and other means of description were emphasized. Not only does the body of work contain quantitative data analysis, but extensive qualitative data analysis which further supports the depth of the research. In conclusion, the different methods and approaches utilized in this study provide evidence of triangulation and documents examined by the external auditor appear authentic, reliable, confirmable, and dependable.

Respectfully submitted.

[Signature]

Dr. Carolyn H. Brown
King College
APPENDIX F

LETTER OF PERMISSION FROM

NORTHWEST REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY
September 30, 1994

Nancy Wagner
Secondary Supervisor
Johnson City Schools
PO Box 1517
Johnson City, Tennessee 37605

Dear Nancy:

Please feel free to use the TEP questionnaire in your research. I understand that you will do scoring, analysis and reporting on your own. A copy of the instrument is enclosed for your use.

In return, please send a description of the "Professional Teacher Evaluation Model" and a summary of your study.

Thanks for your interest in our work.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Blum
Director
School, Community and Professional Development

REB/lg
Enclosure
VITA

NANCY CALLOWAY WAGNER

Personal Data: Date of Birth: July 13, 1948
Place of Birth: Kingsport, Tennessee
Marital Status: Married

Education: Holston High School, Blountville, Tennessee, May 1966
East Tennessee State University; mathematics, B.S., 1982, summa cum laude
East Tennessee State University; supervision and administration, M.Ed., 1987
East Tennessee State University; administration, Ed.S., 1990
East Tennessee State University; Doctorate in Education in the department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis, Ed.D., 1995

1988, Instructor for "Engineering and Engineering Technology for Women," East Tennessee State University
1990, Danforth Intern at Science Hill High School and Towne Acres Elementary, Johnson City, Tennessee
1991-present, Supervisor of Secondary Instruction, Johnson City Schools

Honors: 1994, Phi Delta Kappa, Vice President for Programs, 1994-95
1991, Selected as a participant for the Eastman Chemical Company Summer Science Program for Teachers
1991, Building Level Nominee for Teacher of the Year
1990-93, Phi Delta Kappa, Secretary, ETSU Chapter
1989, Selected as a Danforth Intern
1988, Tennessee Science League: Physics II Coach of the Year
1982, Outstanding Student Award - Senior Mathematics major with highest QPA
1982, Association of University Professors Award - highest academic average in the College of Arts and Sciences
1981, Kappa Delta Pi Honor Society in Education
1981, Kappa Mu Epsilon Mathematics Honor Society (Vice President)
1981, Phi Kappa Phi National Honor Society

Presentations: Tennessee Association of School Supervision and Administration, July, 1995
Mid-South Educational Research Association, Nov., 1994
National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Regional Conference, March, 1993
The Ninth International Precision Teaching Conference, Nov., 1990
Tennessee Association of Behavioral Analysis, Oct., 1990
American Educational Research Association Conference, April, 1990
Tennessee Association of Secondary School Principals, March 1990
Mid-South Educational Research Association Conference, March 1990
Tennessee School Board Association Meeting, Nov., 1989
Tennessee Association of Behavioral Analysis Conference, Oct., 1989
The Eighth International Precision Teaching Conference, March, 1989

Professional Affiliations: Phi Delta Kappa
Tennessee Supervisors' Study Council
Mid-South Educational Research Association
Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (1994 Associate for ASCD)
Tennessee Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (Elections committee 1989-90)
National Staff Development Council
Tennessee Staff Development Council
Kappa Delta Pi
Tennessee Association for School Supervision and Administration
Upper East Tennessee Supervisors Study Council