The perceptions of secondary school teachers, principals and education officers of the administrative procedures, content and use of a teacher performance evaluation instrument for Jamaican schools

Claudette H. Williams
Clark Atlanta University

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.auctr.edu/dissertations

Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation
ABSTRACT
EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

WILLIAMS, CLAUDETTE H. M.A. ATLANTA UNIVERSITY, 1989

THE PERCEPTIONS OF SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS AND EDUCATION OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES, CONTENT AND USE OF A TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR JAMAICAN SCHOOLS

Advisor: Professor Trevor A. Turner

Dissertation dated December, 1990

This study was designed to investigate the perceptions of secondary level teachers, principals and education officers in Jamaica on the content, administrative procedures and use of teacher performance evaluation. Using the stratified random sampling technique, a sample of 480 teachers, 30 principals and 6 education officers was selected from 30 high and new secondary schools.

Analysis of variance, Scheffe's test of significance, the Student "t" and crosstabulations were used to test the hypotheses and research questions posed. The primary findings indicated:

1. a significant difference at the .001 level among teachers, principals and education officers on content;

2. no significant differences in the perceptions of teachers, principals and education officers on administrative procedures and use of evaluation information;

3. significant differences at the .05 level for high and new secondary school
teachers on content;

4. significant differences at the .002 and .000 levels respectively for high and new secondary school teachers, in terms of qualifications, on administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation;

5. significant differences at the .001 and .043 levels respectively for high and new secondary school teachers, in terms of years teaching experience on administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation;

6. no significant differences between high and new secondary school principals on any variable.

The findings also indicated that:

7. heads of departments should be the primary evaluators;

8. teachers should receive a copy of their evaluation report;

9. all teachers should be evaluated.

The findings suggested that the differences of opinions and understanding of the teacher performance evaluation process among the three subsamples could affect the successful development and implementation of a teacher performance evaluation system in Jamaica. The main recommendations were that the Ministry of Education should:

1. ensure the representation and participation of all the stakeholders in the teacher evaluation exercise;

2. in conjunction with the Jamaica Teachers' Association, conduct seminars on teacher evaluation to ensure a common understanding among stakeholders;

3. train evaluators to conduct teacher evaluations.
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CHAPTER I
Introduction

Reforms in education are not new. Like other industries, educational systems are forced to respond to changing societies. According to Porter (1971), the first major reform in the United States educational system was in the post sputnik period which saw a return to the basics of education: Stress being placed on mastery of the three "R's", namely, reading, writing and arithmetic.

The second reform came in the 1960s, when the educational system sought to respond to the demands of the civil rights movement and a more humanistic type of education. This resulted in changes in the curricula offerings in schools nation-wide, the desegregation of schools and special provisions for handicapped students.

The third reform occurred in 1983, with the publication of *A Nation At Risk*. Students were not achieving at a satisfactory level in academics. Increased expenditure in education and efforts to motivate students to improve academically became the focus of educational systems nationally. Despite these efforts, however, student achievement continued to decline and this resulted in the fourth reform which focussed on the performance of teachers.

Research into the underachievement of students in the classroom indicated that the answer to this problem did not lie in the students alone but also in their teachers. According to the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983), good teaching was seen to be the single most important piece in solving the puzzle of achieving excellence in the classroom. Teachers were now being seen to be part of the problem rather than the solution to the problem. No longer would good teaching
be taken for granted, instead, teachers would have to exhibit the characteristics necessary for good or effective teaching. There would be more formal and organized methods of monitoring and evaluating the performance of teachers, in the hope that weaknesses and strengths in instruction could be identified and treated appropriately.

The fourth reform, which emerged in the late 1980s, has resulted in a massive search for methods of ensuring an evaluation process which is satisfactory to all concerned. Not only is the process critical to the exercise, but so too are the content of the evaluation measure and the use of information gathered in this process. Despite the concerns about the whole evaluation process, it has generally been accepted that there is a need to evaluate the performance of teachers in the classroom. Evaluation is, perhaps, the most acceptable method of ensuring accountability, monitoring performance and measuring the extent to which the goals and objectives of schooling are being met.

Statement of the Problem

The problem which was studied in this research exercise surrounds the need for a Teacher Performance Evaluation system in the Jamaican Education System. This small, developing nation continues to educate its children without any formal, institutionalized and reliable means of monitoring or appraising the extent to which the goals and objectives of the system are being met (Taylor, 1990). Consequently, there is little or no accountability on the part of individuals who work in the system, productivity is seemingly low and there is no source through which inefficiency can be identified and addressed.

In light of this situation, this research was conceived as a method of presenting
a solution to this problem by:

a) developing and validating an instrument designed to evaluate the performance of teachers in secondary schools;

b) comparing the perceptions of teachers, principals and education officers on;
   i) administrative procedures to be used in the evaluation process;
   ii) the content of an evaluation instrument, measured in terms of establishing the validity of an evaluation instrument, and
   iii) the use to which teacher performance evaluation results should be put.

Background to the Problem

The Jamaican Educational System has evolved over the years with the basic goal being that of providing, at least, a basic level of education for its students. Teachers, many of whom used to be untrained, have progressed through the system and have, seemingly, become competent at their jobs either through experience gained from the job, formal on-the-job in-service training, or through formal institutionalized training.

Despite the many obstacles experienced by this small, developing country, primarily in terms of the availability of resources in general, a fairly satisfactory level of success has been achieved in the educational arena. In 1981, the General Certificate Examination Office reported that approximately 43% of the students who took the General Certificate Examinations at the Ordinary Level (G.C.E. O'Level), were successful in three or more subjects (Williams, 1981). Although the success rate was
below 50%, it was considered by many people in the society to have been fairly satisfactory when this success was measured against the limited resources which were available for education in general, and specifically to prepare students for these major examinations. There are, no doubt, a number of factors which have contributed to this success, among which, might be the performance of teachers in the classroom. Unfortunately, the extent to which this is true is unknown as there is no formal system in place to assess the performance of teachers in the classroom (Davis, 1990).

Traditionally, teacher performance has been evaluated in very informal and subjective ways (Taylor, 1990). The primary method used is that of student performance in major exit examinations. These examinations are taken at the end of grades 6, 11 and 13, and the success or failure of students in these examinations is usually attributed to the teachers of these particular grades. It is also known, however, that the children who succeed in these examinations, for the most part, receive additional private tuition to prepare them for these examinations. The extent to which the teacher’s performance is a major contributor to the success of the students is, therefore, unknown and in question.

Another method of informal teacher performance evaluation which obtains is that carried out by students. It is inevitable that this method of evaluation will take place as people who interact on a daily basis tend to evaluate other people with whom they interact; hence, students will evaluate their teachers just as teachers evaluate students. Unlike most evaluations done by teachers, the students’ assessments usually reflect the type of relationship which exists between the teacher and his or her students (Smith, 1990). The teacher who is liked and has a good relationship with students will oftentimes be perceived as being a good teacher. The converse opinion will be
held where there is poor relationship between teacher and students. It should be noted, however, that the higher the grade level of the students, the less likely it will be that a relationship will be the primary contributor to such an assessment (James-Reid, 1990).

Students at the high school level, who are strongly academically inclined and achievement oriented, will consider other factors in making an assessment. From the experience of this writer, as well as from opinions expressed by her colleagues and associates (Lewis, 1990; James-Reid, 1990), it would seem that these students take other factors, such as the teacher's competence in instructing, teacher's knowledge of their subject area, and the extent to which they are prepared for classes, as indicators of satisfactory teacher performance. Fortunately or unfortunately, depending on the situation which exists and the person perceiving the situation, these evaluations do not affect the teacher in terms of tenure, salary or promotion. Some teachers, if they are aware of these evaluations, might modify their relationships with students but are not otherwise affected or disturbed. If such evaluations affected the three factors previously stated, that is, tenure, salary or promotion, it is hardly likely that any evaluation, even those by students would be ignored. It is difficult to find jobs in Jamaica, and although the salary and benefits in the teaching profession are not considered phenomenal or even satisfactory, it would be worse for the individual to be without work and be unable to supply himself or herself with the primary necessities of life. A situation like this would, therefore, force the teacher to heed any type of evaluation as this could adversely affect his or her employment.

Although student evaluations of teachers might not be considered by many in the system to be of great importance, it is believed that there are some administrators who listen to these evaluations and use them if, and when, they see fit to do so
(Aiken, 1990). If these evaluations can be used to substantiate the administrator’s perception of a teacher, then these evaluations will be taken into consideration. More often than not, these evaluations are used in negative situations. There is no evidence, either in researches or in papers produced, that principals/administrators in Jamaican schools engage in regular or even ad hoc observations of teachers in the classroom. In fact, no research which considers the evaluation of the performance of school personnel has been conducted locally, hence, there is a dearth of information in this area of study.

From interviews with school personnel conducted in December 1989 and May, 1990, by this researcher, it would seem that the extent to which any form of evaluation takes place is dependent on the exposure and training of the administrator and his or her efforts to operate an effective school. Such administrators will occasionally observe teachers and they may or may not give feedback to the teachers. It has, in fact, been this writer’s experience to have regular visits to her music classes by her principal who expressed pleasure at what was being done in these classes. The use of percussion instruments to produce enjoyable music was novel in the school and that, no doubt, interested the principal and other teachers in the institution. In this case, the teacher was aware of some type of informal evaluation being done; however, suggestions for improvement or changes in instruction or behavior were never given by the evaluator. There were also no known records of the principal’s visits to the classroom, neither was there documented evidence of an evaluation having been done.

Another method which might be used as a measure of informal teacher performance evaluation is that of the evaluation of lesson plans by administrators. Some administrators require teachers to present written lesson plans at stated periods.
Some administrators check these plans for content and methodology and will make comments or give instructions while other administrators may simply affix their signature to the document and return it to the teacher (Smith, 1990). The extent to which the administrator will evaluate these lesson plans also depends on the education officer who monitors the school. Some education officers review a sample of lesson plans and use this to form part of their assessment of the school. In such cases, therefore, the administrator will ensure that he or she complies with the expectations of the education officer since this will be a part of the assessment of the school and the administrator (James-Reid, 1990).

The use of lesson plans as method of assessment is in question, however, since there are no stated standards or criteria by which these plans are assessed. In addition, there are some principals who require lesson plans while others do not. Consequently, there would be no equity in the system and the reliability and validity of this as a method of evaluation might not be acceptable. This method, as is, would also not be satisfactory as there are no established standards by which the evaluations are made, neither are administrators trained to effectively conduct evaluations.

The final type of teacher performance evaluation which may occur is that which is carried out by education officers. As was previously mentioned, these officers visit schools occasionally to monitor their performance and to examine school records. There are some occasions when they might briefly observe a token few teachers at work, but this again, is at the discretion of the education officer (Lewis, 1990). Consequently, this method of evaluation cannot be deemed to be reliable or valid since it is purely subjective and inconsistent, and stated criteria do not exist to guide the evaluation process. It should be noted that the primary reason for the lack of close
monitoring or evaluation of schools by education officers is the lack of financial resources to provide travel for these officers to visit the schools. In addition, there is a scarcity of officers, (also due to lack of finances) which results in one officer's having to oversee the operations of between 30 and 105 schools spread out in wide geographical locations. This means, therefore, that some schools might be visited once in three or four years. Interviews with education officers (Jones, 1990; Lewis, 1990; Taylor, 1990), revealed that schools which are usually visited infrequently are those which seem to be functioning satisfactorily. Contact is maintained with such schools through telephone calls or letters to the administrators.

From the background of the situation described, one can see that there is no formal teacher performance evaluation system in the Jamaican educational system. That there is a need for such a system is obvious if one is to take the business of education seriously and be able to effectively enforce and maintain a satisfactory level of performance. In addition, it is important to be able to monitor and evaluate expenditures and resources so that meaningful planning can take place. The need for a teacher performance evaluation system will be discussed in the section which addresses the purpose of the study. In order, then, to have a clearer idea of the study, definitions of pertinent terms are given.

**Definition of Terms**

In order to ensure a unified understanding of certain terms which are used in this research, this section provides the reader with a clear definition of the meaning of specific terms, and the context in which they are used in this study.
Institutional Terms

Ministry of Education - the official government body which directs all operations of the public education system.

Minister of Education - the parliamentarian who has been designated by the Prime Minister to oversee the operations of the Ministry of Education.

11+ Common Entrance Examination - the national examinations which are administered to students at the elementary level and who are seeking entry to traditional high or grammar schools. Students who are between the ages of 11 and 12+, and are at the Grade 6 level, are eligible to take these examinations.

General Certificate in Education Ordinary Level Examinations (G.C.E. O’Level) - standardized Grade 11 exit examinations which are set by the University of Cambridge in London, England, and are taken in countries which were, or are, British colonies.

General Certificate in Education Advanced Level Examinations (G.C.E. A’ Level) - standardized Grade 13 exit examinations which are set by the University of Cambridge in London, England, and are taken in countries which were, or are, British colonies.

Caribbean Examinations Council (C.X.C.) Examinations - examinations which are set and marked by a special council comprised of Caribbean educators. These examinations presently equate the G.C.E. O’Level examinations and are subsequently to be developed and used to replace the G.C.E. examinations in their entirety.

Secondary Level Schools - all post-elementary schools classified as either New Secondary, Traditional High or Grammar School.

Traditional High/Grammar Schools - terms used interchangeably for schools which provide an academic secondary school curriculum. Students entering these
schools must have been successful in the 11+ Common Entrance Examinations. The schools have grades 7-13.

**New Secondary/Secondary Schools** - post-elementary institutions which were created in the 1970's to provide a less academic type of secondary education to students who had not been successful in the 11+ Common Entrance Examinations. The curriculum here is primarily vocational, however, some of these schools prepare students to take a limited number of subjects in G.C.E. O'Level and C.X.C. examinations.

**Single Sex Boys Schools** - Traditional High/Grammar schools which enroll boys only.

**Single Sex Girls Schools** - Traditional High/Grammar schools which enroll girls only.

**Coeducational Schools** - New Secondary/Secondary or Traditional High Schools which enroll both girls and boys.

**Education Officers** - senior central office administrators, employed by the Ministry of Education to monitor and supervise the operation of schools across the island. These officers equate to the Area Superintendents in the Atlanta Public School System.

**Teachers' Colleges** - post-secondary level institutions which prepare and certify individuals to teach at the elementary and secondary levels, these are not degree granting institutions and the certificates given here do not equate to degrees from four year Colleges in the United States of America; instead, they may equate to two year Junior or Community Colleges.
Personnel Terms

**College Trained Graduate** - individuals who have been certified to teach by a Teachers Colleges.

**Trained Graduate** - the individual who holds a diploma from a degree granting institution, as well as Teachers' College certificate or a Diploma in Education from a degree granting institution.

**Pre-Trained Graduate** - the holder of a diploma from a degree granting institution, but who has not been certified to teach.

**Trained Post-graduate** - the individual who has been certified to teach and who has also completed a post-graduate degree.

**Pre-trained Post-graduate** - the individual who has completed a post-graduate degree but who has not been certified to teach.

General Terms

**Tick** - a check mark ( ). This is the term which is used and understood in the Jamaican situation.

The Purpose of the Study

As countries seek to develop, they try to institute systems and programs which have proven to be beneficial, effective and efficient elsewhere in similar situations. In order to do this effectively, however, they must first evaluate those programs and systems to see the extent to which they would be applicable or suitable in their own situation. As was pointed out earlier in this paper, Jamaica does not have a teacher performance evaluation system in place, but just as tax payers in developed countries require accountability from school systems for their hard earned tax dollars, so too is
it in developing countries. School systems in developed countries have been forced to respond to these demands or have seen a need to pre-empt such demands, and so have developed methods by which they can monitor and evaluate not only how the tax dollar is spent but also how well systems are working. Methods have been sought to improve systems by monitoring and evaluating the structures of the system as well as the people who work within them.

In their quest for greater development, Third World countries often copy many of the policies and systems of First World countries. Sometimes these policies and systems are needed and can, with modification, be applied at times to the situation which exists in a particular country. In the Jamaican society, the time has come when individuals and groups within the system are crying out for that move toward greater accountability in the education system (Jones, 1989). This cry was exacerbated by a release from the G.C.E. O'Level Office in September 1989, which stated that the results of the G.C.E. O'Level and C.X.C. examinations were the worst in the history of those examinations (Davis, 1990). This information has generated much concern in the population at large, and more specifically, in the Ministry of Education. A team of educators has been retained by the Ministry to investigate this situation and to make recommendations to appropriately address the problem.

The outcry against the dismal failure of students at the secondary level has also brought a response from many school administrators. In interviews with secondary level school administrators conducted by this researcher, many administrators expressed disgust at the level of apathy displayed by a large number of teachers to their jobs and suggested that there was a direct relationship between the results in the examinations and teachers’ performance in the classroom (Morris, 1990; Dawes, 1990; Harrison,
1990; Aiken, 1990). They stated that there was dire need for some type of formal evaluation process to be implemented in the school system. The administrators also indicated that this would mean additional work for them, but it was necessary as poor results did not only give a bad reflection of teachers but also on schools and their administrators. These administrators did not want to be associated with failure and suggested that something concrete had to be done to correct or improve the situation.

There is an obvious need to try to implement an evaluation system which can improve a situation which has a failure rate in excess of fifty percent. One such method is by examining the inputs into the school system in terms of the outputs, and seeing the extent to which such inputs are adequate or appropriate to produce the desired outputs. Teachers form part of the input into that system, however, no one knows the extent to which they are adequately prepared, or are complying with the expectations of the institution in terms of roles and adherence to institutional guidelines set out in their job descriptions. It is important to have this information since it will help the system to assess the extent to which its goals and objectives are being achieved.

Having identified the problem, it was useful to see the extent to which a solution could be found. Again, the solution was present in the developed countries which have already experienced the problem and have found workable solutions. Consequently, this research sought to modify a solution which has been found in the United States, a First World country, to see the extent to which it could be used to solve the problem identified in this research.

As an educator from Jamaica, this researcher joins with others who see a dire need for a system of teacher performance evaluation within that country, and through
this medium, hopes to make a worthwhile contribution to the solution of some of the problems being experienced in the education system. Research, especially that on effective schools, has shown that the performance of teachers bears direct relationship to the performance of students. It would therefore, be very useful to find out how well Jamaican teachers perform their jobs. This can only be done by way of some valid and reliable process of formal performance evaluation.

Although the entire school system needed to be evaluated, there had to be a starting point, and implementing a teacher performance evaluation system is as good a place as any other from which to start. This conviction led this researcher to embark on an exercise that would not only bring attention to the need for such a performance evaluation system, but would also offer a reliable and tested point from which to start. This study was therefore conceived with a view to:

a. validate a newly developed instrument designed to evaluate the performance of teachers in secondary schools, and

b. compare the perception of teachers, principals and education officers on:

1) administrative procedure to be used in the performance evaluation process;

2) content of a performance evaluation instrument, in terms of establishing the validity of a performance evaluation instrument developed for use in Jamaican secondary schools; and

3) use to which results of the teacher performance evaluation should be put.

These particular aspects of the performance evaluation process have been identified in the literature as being critical to the successful development and implementation of any
performance evaluation system and are discussed in greater detail later in the study.

By conducting this study, this researcher also hoped to be able to generate interest in the whole evaluation process in schools and motivate the Ministry of Education as well as other educators to become more interested and involved in efforts to develop and institute a comprehensive performance evaluation program within that education system. By having a path charted and information gathered through empirical means of the perceptions of the individuals who were involved in the evaluation process, educational planners would be better guided in developing and implementing an appropriate, acceptable, effective and efficient performance evaluation program.

Another reason for conducting this study was that the researcher also hoped to provide some basic information on the perceptions of individuals within the school system on evaluation and performance evaluation in general. This study, as an empirical research into this area, was the first study of its kind to be undertaken in Jamaica. The area of evaluation, and in particular teacher performance evaluation, lies unexplored and information gathered here would, no doubt, offer solutions to many of the problems which are being experienced in the achievement of educational goals. It also created the opportunity for others to engage in similar research to build up a reservoir of information concerning evaluation in schools.

**Research Questions**

As a method of guiding this research as well as posing direct questions to which answers were sought, the following broad research questions were posed.
1. Is there a difference in what secondary level school teachers, principals and education officers perceive should be the content of a teacher performance evaluation instrument?

2. Do secondary level school teachers, principals and education officers differ in their perception of the procedures which should be used in the evaluation process?

3. Do secondary level school teachers, principals and education officers differ in their perception of the usage of information gathered from the evaluation exercise?

4. Do School Type, qualifications, or Years of Teaching Experience affect the perception of secondary level school teachers and principals on the administrative procedures, content and use of teacher performance evaluation.

5. Does Qualification or Years of Teaching Experience affect the perception of secondary level school education officers on the administration procedures, content and use of teacher performance evaluation?

6. Is there a significant difference in the perception of secondary level school teachers of the content, administrative procedures and use of evaluation information based on teaching experience?

7. Is there a significant difference in the perception of secondary level school principals of the content, administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation information based on school type?

8. Is there a significant difference in the perception of secondary school principals of the content, administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation information based on qualifications?
9. Is there a significant difference in the perception of secondary level school principals of the content, administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation information based on years of teaching experience?

10. Is there a significant difference in the perception of high school principals and teachers on content, administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation information.

11. Is there a significant difference in the perception of secondary school principals and teachers on the content, administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation information?

Summary

This chapter discussed and set into perspective the problem which is to be examined in this research exercise. The problem identified is the need for a formal teacher performance evaluation system at the secondary school level in Jamaica. In order to bring about unified understanding of information discussed, terms which will be used in the research project were defined.

In this chapter also, the purpose of conducting the research questions which were to help guide the research as well as for which answers were to be found, were stated. In brief the questions will seek to find out:

1. If there is a difference in the perception of secondary school teachers, principals and education officers on the administrative procedures which should be used in teacher performance evaluation;

2. If there is a difference in the perception of secondary school teachers, principals and education officers on the content of a teacher performance
evaluation instrument;

3. If there is a difference in the perception of secondary school teachers, principals and education officers on the use of teacher performance evaluation;

4. If variable such as School Type, Qualification and Years of Teaching Experience influence the perception of secondary school teachers and principals on:
   a) The administrative procedures which should be used in teacher performance evaluation;
   b) The Content of a teacher performance evaluation instrument at the secondary level; and
   c) The Use of Performance Evaluation.

5. If variables such as Qualification and Years of Teaching Experience influence the perception of Secondary Level Education Officers on:
   a) The Administrative Procedures which should be used in teacher performance evaluation;
   b) The content of a teacher performance evaluation instrument for use at the Secondary Level; and
   c) The Use of Performance Evaluation.

In an effort to substantiate the selection of the variables to be studied, and to give a clearer insight into literary information on the topic. Chapter II, which follows, will give a review of related literature and research.
CHAPTER II
Review of Relevant Literature

Introduction

According to the American Association of School Administrators and Research Division (1979), the performance of teachers in the classroom has been under scrutiny since the introduction of formal schooling into the society. However, the thrust towards developing and ensuring effective methods to evaluate teachers did not become national priority in the United States until the late 1980s, following the publication of researches which showed a direct relationship between teacher performance and student achievement in the classroom (Education Research Services, 1988). These researches led to the fourth educational reform, discussed in Chapter I, and saw the introduction of state-wide systems being implemented to ensure proper and effective methods of teacher performance evaluation.

These systems, however, were not developed in an ad hoc manner but saw the use of extensive research and the development of a better understanding by the developers of the whole performance evaluation process from the users' perspectives in addition to the theoretical concepts established. It is the basic background information and understanding of evaluation; the concept, purpose, methods, administration and effects that one must first establish before trying to develop or implement a performance evaluation system which hopefully can be effective. Consequently, this chapter is designed to provide a deeper insight into the whole concept and use of performance evaluation, and specifically teacher performance evaluation.
The Concept of Evaluation

According to the Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary (1979), evaluation is the process of determining worth or value. De Roche (1987), similarly, describes evaluation as a process which is used for determining the value, amount or worth of something: be it a program, a product, a procedure or other factors. Barber (1985) on the other hand, does not see evaluation as only being a process which judges worth, but also that which measures the degree to which specified tasks are accomplished, or provide assistance in developing new programs or skills. For the purpose of teacher evaluation, either concept is applicable as a teacher’s value or worth may be measured in terms of the extent to which the teacher is achieving the goals and objectives designated by the institution, given specific resources, while accomplishment of tasks could be measured in relation to the teacher’s job description and his or her efforts to perform in keeping with such stated tasks.

Basically, evaluation comes in two forms: formative and summative. According to Barber (1985), evaluation which is designed to help teachers to know how they are doing and to improve their performance is formative evaluation. In this type of evaluation, the teacher’s strengths and weaknesses are identified to enable appropriate reinforcement or remediation to take place. Formative evaluation is developmental in nature and is designed to improve teacher performance. Barber claims that teachers want to know how they are doing and they favor a system which is formative in nature as it will help them to improve instruction and their performance in general. Frels and Cooper (1982) contend that improving teacher performance is the best way to enhance education of each child in school; hence, evaluation should, for the most part, be formative in nature.
Frels and Cooper (1982), state that although professional growth and development are of great importance, sometimes specific teacher inadequacies must be addressed. If, despite intensive and appropriate remediation attempts, a teacher still does not meet the school district's standards of minimum competency, then evaluation must then perform its summative function (p. 1-2).

Summative evaluation is described by De Roche (1987), to be a process used to provide a measure of accountability. He claims that this type of evaluation is usually employed by administrators to determine retention and tenure, hiring or firing, promotion or reassignment. In the final analysis, this type of evaluation is used to judge the net worth of a teacher's performance.

Summative evaluation is usually conducted at the end of a specific period, project or process and is used primarily to determine the effects of the program, product or procedure. It usually results in a decision being made as to whether or not a change should occur, the situation should continue or it should be cancelled. Barber (1985), claims that oftentimes, administrators see themselves being more involved in this type of evaluation. They see themselves faced with accountability and making decisions about retention, promotion or termination of teachers; therefore, the evaluations which they conduct are used as tools to judge the net worth of the teacher's performance. This is one of the reasons teachers and other individuals in general view performance evaluation as serving negative purposes.

In the Education Research Service Report (1988), it is suggested that summative evaluation may also be used to reward outstanding teachers. According to this Report, several education reform proposals have called for school districts to provide monetary incentives or compensation rewards for outstanding teacher performance. These
proposals are usually aimed at attracting and retaining highly qualified persons in the teaching profession as well as to attract additional funds to improve teachers salaries generally. Approximately 30 percent of school districts which responded to an ERS survey reported that one of the major emphases of their evaluation system was rewarding outstanding teachers.

According to Rieck (1989), most experts agree that formative and summative evaluations are so different and serve different purposes, that they should be conducted by different people. He claims that this would greatly reduce anxiety on the part of teachers while tending to promote trust, at least between the formative evaluator and the evaluatee. In the real world, however, formative and summative evaluations are more intertwined than would be desired and are usually conducted by the same person.

Despite efforts to clarify formative and summative evaluations, there is still one school of thought that claims that it is almost impossible to separate the two as there is a "gray area" in the theory. Scriven (1981), claims that there are strategies that should be considered formative yet they are part of summative evaluation. He suggests that ideal formative evaluation would consist of evaluation with diagnostic and therapeutic recommendations, but diagnostic and therapeutic recommendations are usually components of summative evaluation. Knapp (1982), and Barber (1984) agree with Scriven that there is a need for a clearer, more definitive definition of these types of evaluation. This, they suggest, is necessary for the effective use of these types of evaluation.

The figure below describes how Barber perceives the theory and practice in evaluation.
## Figure 1

Congruence of Philosophy
Theory and Practice in Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formative Evaluation</th>
<th>Summative Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philosophy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each individual strives for excellence.</td>
<td>Individuals achieve excellence only if supervised or evaluated by others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theory</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluations done to improve the performance of the individual. Reward or punishment should be decided internally.</td>
<td>Evaluation is done to improve the performance of the social system. Reward or punishment should be decided externally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practice</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the process of instruction but not the person.</td>
<td>Evaluate the products of instruction as well as the process and the person.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation of Teaching: A Formative Process
(p. 80A, 1984)
Personnel Evaluation

As the term personnel suggests, this type of evaluation has to do with assessing the performance of an individual engaged in doing a particular job. It is basically concerned with trying to ascertain or determine the proficiency of the worker in the tasks outlined in the job description. Various methods have been devised to measure this proficiency and will be discussed later in this chapter.

Personnel evaluation is not usually a welcomed event. It is seen by many to be oppressive, subjective and unfair. Much of the dissatisfaction emanates from the fact that the evaluatee has very little input into the evaluation process. In studies conducted by various researchers, notably Wise et al (1984), and McGreal (1983), a number of factors have been identified to be prerequisites of an effective evaluation system. Among them are acceptance of the system by the participants, knowledge of the mechanics of the system and knowledge of performance criteria by evaluatee. Further discussions of these factors indicate that only by having some type of input into the system, can these prerequisites be met.

There is often much discrepancy surrounding the administrative procedures used, the content of the measure being used for the evaluation and the person who is doing the evaluation. These discrepancies, however, are often the result of anxiety on the part of the person who is being evaluated. They sometimes fail to see the true purpose of the exercise, neither do they understand it since they are never a part of the exercise in the formative states. They only receive the decisions of the end result (ERS Report, 1988).

It is natural, however, that where there is lack of understanding or acceptance, there will be opposition or rejection. It is because of growing dissatisfaction that
increased efforts are being made to familiarize the individuals involved in the evaluation process with the use of evaluation instruments, their content, the proper use of the evaluation exercise and the benefits to be derived.

From the suggestions of various writers including Rieck, 1989; ERS Report, 1988; Conley, 1987; Hall, 1980; Griego, 1981; Soar et al, 1984; and Tucker 1981, the following have been suggested to be guidelines which should be used in order to ensure some measure of acceptance of a performance evaluation system. These include:

1) Seeking input from the users of the instrument in the development of the instrument.
2) Checking for validity (both face validity and content validity) on the instrument.
3) Pilot-testing and verifying outcomes.
4) Training individuals in the use of the instruments.

There are also some basic characteristics which the evaluator should cultivate. These include:

1) Credibility - having valuable knowledge of direct relevance to the teacher, the content area(s), the grade level, or the particular group of children.
2) Persuasiveness - being able to persuade the teacher to alter his/her actions by providing clear, convincing reasons why change is needed.
3) Patience - giving adequate time to support teachers as they react to evaluation data, draw their own inferences, respond to evaluator's analyses and speculate on growth strategies.
4) Trust - being genuine in actions in order to gain teachers' respect and feelings of reliability.

5) Track Record - being or having consistency and professionalism in your behavior.

6) Modeling - being able to demonstrate new ideas and techniques.

Teacher Performance Evaluation

According to James Lewis, Jr. (1973), the appraisal of an educator's performance has been identified with many titles: teacher evaluation, teacher observation, administrator and teacher's progress reporting, merit rating and, most recently, performance appraisal. He claims that, regardless of the title, they mean the same thing: The judgement of one or more educators, usually the immediate supervisor, of the manner in which another educator has been fulfilling his professional responsibilities to the school district over a specified period of time.

For years, there has been a debate as to whether or not teachers should be evaluated. With the reforms surrounding education in the 1980s, however, much of the debate has vanished. It would seem that there is general agreement that there is a need for teacher performance evaluation. The Michigan Education Association is quoted by the National School Public Relations Association (1974), as pointing out that systematic, documented, and regular evaluation can be a powerful protective device for the teacher. Evaluation, they say, provides a continuous record which is the best long range protection against unjustified criticism. Since one can never be sure whether or not a teacher will be available at a future time to answer questions which might arise and which pertain to their performance, it is perceived that formal performance
evaluation provides a continuous record which can be used as testimony as to the teacher's effectiveness, and which may be necessary in a time of crisis (p. 54, 1974).

Tanner and Tanner (1987), also underscore the need for continuous evaluation. They see it as a protective device against haphazard introduction of systems without any type of accountability device. In addition, teacher evaluation has taken on a new level of importance with the introduction of unions and the collective bargaining procedure into the educational system. A Rand Corporation study found that between 1970 and 1975, the percentage of contracts examined that contained teacher evaluation provisions increased from 42 to 65 (McDonnell & Pascal, 1979). Strike and Bull (1981), in commenting on this aspect of teacher performance evaluation, claim that contracts often specify methods of information gathering, frequency of observations and evaluation, processes for communicating evaluation criteria and results, opportunities for teacher response and remediation in the case of negative evaluations, and due process procedures.

Teacher performance evaluation is also seen to be an objective method of identifying and rewarding outstanding teachers. The ERC Report (1988), claims that, of their sample, 9.2 percent of school districts use teacher performance evaluations as the basis for giving incentive pay increments, and 20.5 percent used them for promotional purposes. Performance Evaluations were seen to be the system which offered the opportunity to use generally accepted criteria to make judgements about individuals in the system and to openly acknowledge their achievements.

Methods of Evaluating Teacher Performance

Observation

According to Englehart (1972), systematic observation of instruction can be
traced back to the early 1990's. The scope of this historical profile, however, has been concentrated more so in the period from the 1940's to the present time. During this period, observation has become popular as a method of influencing the thinking of educators relative to the knowledge base on teaching. It is through the use of this tool, that new and exciting advances are being made in classroom instructional techniques.

Good (1984), attests to the many benefits to be derived from this method of assessment. He claims that a trained observer is able to effectively identify the behavior of the teacher in respect of the task at hand, and therefore, eliminates a great deal of subjectivity from the process. He continues, that being able to witness classroom events, better enables more pointed development of strategies to deal with problems which are present in the classroom. This will eventually lead to improvement in instruction, as teachers, too, can observe alternative methods of instructing rather than simply read about them. The value of this method, suggests Good (1984), has led to the increased popularity of observation in the classroom.

Presently, observation would seem to be the most popular method of assessing the performance of teachers. Good (1984) suggests that its popularity is due, in part, to the fact that, through observation, solid evidence which has been used to help make a difference in student learning can be found. He also states that observation has revealed a number of findings which have confirmed or refuted theories associated with classroom activities. He accepts, however, that there are also many problems associated with this method of evaluation. He suggests, however, that many of the problems associated with observation can be solved through proper training and understanding about the nature and use of this method by both parties involved.

Buch and Parsely (1984), also agree that there is much controversy surrounding
the effectiveness of observation as a reliable method of evaluation. They claim that the supervisor's own competence, subjectivity, as well as observer bias, which are associated with this method of assessment, have led to questions about its reliability and accuracy as a method of performance assessment.

Thomas Brophy (1984), after examining classroom observation, its potentials and problems, also concluded that there was much to be gained from this method, however, he cautioned users of this method about some inherent dangers of which they should be aware. Like Good (1984), he sees that the great potential for observations to help practitioners conceptualize their classroom behavior and to encourage teachers to consider alternative ideas about teaching is very high; if this is not used judiciously, observational data can result in over-control and over prescription of classroom teaching. This can do more harm than good; consequently, observers must be cautious.

Goldstein (1982), also agrees that direct observations is a useful method of assessing teacher performance. He suggests, however, that the method of observation which is employed need not be the same as most people think. He suggests that observation can take place in very indirect ways through telephone calls, letters and even through conversations about teacher behavior at the family dinner table. These observations have a way of filtering through the administrators and supervisors who are in close touch with their communities. Although these observations by Goldstein (1982), might be true, it seems that the possibility also exists for inaccuracies to filter through the system in the same way, and the administrator would not be aware of this; hence he or she could arrive at false conclusions.

Despite the problems associated with observation as a method of performance evaluation, no other single method of evaluation has yet been found to totally eliminate
observation as a method of evaluation. Other methods of evaluation have been
developed, but they are, for the most part, used in conjunction with observation. From
a review of observational researches which were conducted in the 1970's, Good
concluded that the practice of observation has revealed valuable information which has
helped educators to convincingly demonstrate that teachers can be trained to improve
their instructional efforts and that teachers do make an important difference to student
learning. In addition to observations, interviews could also be a useful source of
information regarding teachers.

**Interviews**

According to Rebore (1987), an interview is a conversation between two
individuals set to generate information about the person being interviewed or other
matters that are familiar to the respondent (p. 102). It may be structured or
unstructured, depending on the situation and the individuals involved. When structured,
the content and procedures are standardized in advance, and here the interviewer is
interested in procuring specific, predetermined information. In the structured form, there
is freer and more open expression; the interviewer can easily expand on the responses
given and seek additional information as he or she sees fit.

If interviews are used as a method of gathering information, Hewton (1988),
suggests that caution must be exercised since this method can yield very subjective
data. He further suggests that effective interviewing requires the development of
certain skills which require practice and training to procure the best results. In
investigating the use of interviews as a method of teacher evaluation, Hewton, (1988)
found that interviews worked best when both parties came prepared for the interview.
He also found that this method was an effective way of ensuring that the teacher was
given the opportunity to submit any information which he or she deemed necessary for
his or her evaluation. Here too, the evaluatee is given the opportunity to give his or
her perception of factors affecting his or her performance. Hewton also found that
teachers welcomed the opportunity to have this type of exchange with their evaluator,
and it, in fact, helped to add some credibility to the performance evaluation process.

Gronlund (1976), agrees that there are merits to the use of interviews as a
method of evaluating teachers. However, he sees it as being more effective when it
is used in conjunction with other less subjective methods of evaluation. One of the
merits of the interview to which he draws attention is the opportunity which it provides
for rebuttal and clarification of previous observations and perceptions. Here, both the
interviewer and the interviewee can discuss or seek explanations to information as it
is revealed, thereby providing greater information and understanding to both participants
and allowing for a better and more comprehensive evaluation process.

Interviews, although not seemingly popular in the ongoing evaluation process,
are almost mandatory in the recruitment process. Here the teacher is being evaluated
in terms of past performance academically and/or practically. For the beginning
teacher, such an interview would consider attitudes, personality, knowledge and
suitability for the job. For the veteran teacher, the interview would not only consider
the factors previously stated in the case of the beginning teacher, but it would also
consider past performance on the job (Rebore, 1987). A final device that could be
used for evaluating teachers is rating scales.

Rating Scales

Rating scales, according to Borman (1982), are the oldest and one of the most
widely used methods of evaluation appraisal. This is a more rigid type of measure which indicates characteristics and rating for each characteristic which can be used, usually on a continuum, to measure an individual’s performance. These characteristics can be of either a quantitative or qualitative nature, and are more commonly used with hourly paid workers. Because this instrument is very specific, easy to rate and easy to code responses, it has become very popular and has found its way into a variety of performance evaluation programs.

Seashore, Indik and Geogopoulos (1960), conducted a research into the use of rating scales to see the extent to which the factors of a specific rating scale correlated with the actual behaviors being measured. They found a low relationship between the two and cautioned that findings such as these could be widespread. This does not mean that a rating scale cannot be effective; however, statistical methods should be used to determine the validity of the instrument.

Reed (1983), suggests that there are a number of situations in which rating scales can be used and are very effective as a method of evaluation. He conducted research into the use of rating scales with Management By Objective, and found that it could be used very effectively as this system has clearly defined and measurable goals and objectives. He agrees that the rating scale method of evaluation is easy to understand and to use. It also permits the statistical tabulation of scores in terms of measures of central tendency, skewness, dispersion, and permits ready comparison of scores among employees, a factor which is very important to evaluatees. In addition, rating scales are also relatively easy to construct.

Despite the merits of rating scales, there are also some problems and concerns about this as a method to measure the performance of teachers. According to Soar et
al (1984), rating scales lack the minimum properties necessary for accurately measuring the performance of teachers. These researchers claim that rating scales are more useful in situations where:

1. the examinee has a standard task
2. there are clear "yes" and "no" responses to performance evaluation questions
3. there is an agreed response scale
4. there are publicly available norms or standards against which the individual's performance is measured.

In the cases of teachers, the typical rater observes what is going on in a classroom, notes student and teacher behaviors that seem relevant, combines these impressions into a composite picture that seems to make sense, and then compares this composite to his or her own standard of effective teaching. In this case, the rater is required to do "high inference" rating because the teacher's behavior is abstracted from the behavior it represents (Soar et al, 1984, p. 51). For this reason, rating scales are not considered suitable.

Another argument advanced by Medley et al (1983), against the suitability of rating scales to be used in teacher performance evaluations is that the validity of rating scales depends almost entirely on the accuracy of the belief about effective teaching on which the scale is based. If the beliefs are accurate, the rating scale may be valid, but if they are not, the rating scales are not expected to give valid evaluations. Medley et al, (1983), therefore, conclude that rating scales are useless for diagnosis and therefore add nothing to the understanding of the teaching process.
Teacher Performance Evaluators

In this section, four major groups of teacher performance evaluators will be examined. These are supervisors, peer teachers, students and teachers as self evaluators.

Supervisors

A review of the literature in this area indicates that one of the most popular persons involved in the teacher performance evaluation process is the supervisor. This individual is usually charged with the responsibility of monitoring and supervising the performance of his or her subordinates, and consequently, he or she is faced with having to evaluate the performance of that subordinate.

Performance evaluation by a supervisor is currently the most common form of evaluation in use (NEA, 1964). Although this statement was made over twenty years ago, a review of the current situation indicates that this is still the case today. According to Lewis (1979), the modal practice of evaluation by supervisors consists of two or three half hour visits by the supervisor to the classroom, followed by a meeting with the teacher. These visits may be scheduled or unscheduled, depending on the practice which obtains in specific situations. In addition, there might be no previous communication between the supervisor and the teacher concerning the evaluation process. Robinson (1978), in commenting on evaluation by supervisors, stated that, for the most part, these evaluators had little or no training in observation techniques, and did little or no preparation before observing the teacher. This had led to much dissatisfaction among teachers who claim that their evaluation might not be a true reflection of their competence.

The 1980s, however, saw some change in this situation. A review of current evaluation systems indicate that the training of the observer is an integral part of the
evaluation process. This was evident in the orientation programs for systems such as the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTOI), the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI), the Phoenix Elementary School District Teacher Evaluation Instrument, Duval County Public Schools Teacher Performance Evaluation System and the St. Vrain Valley Teacher Performance Evaluation System among others. Despite efforts to train evaluators, criticisms are still being leveled against the ability of the supervisor to objectively evaluate teachers. Smock and Crooks (1973), suggest that supervisors are best suited for judging course development and improvement rather than evaluating the competence of a teacher in giving instruction in the classroom. It is considered that supervisors are often removed from the situation which they are asked to evaluate and, therefore, are not necessarily competent in evaluating the teacher’s performance as an instructor. Sergiovanni and Starrat (1983), contend that most fundamental to the process of supervision and evaluation, is that the supervisor has a firm and informed knowledge of substantive aspects of education programs. They accept, however, that even amateurs can successfully evaluate certain aspects of teaching. They can, no doubt, pick up indicators such as warmth, patterns of classroom interaction, differences between on-task and off-task behaviors, describe classroom arrangements and detect teacher or student boredom, since these are factors which an evaluator can assess without being versed in pedagogy, principles of learning or curriculum development. Discerning the appropriateness of a teaching strategy, given a particular set of objectives, commenting on the adequacy of an advanced organizer, detecting whether the interest center is functioning properly, understanding how the inquiry method works, judging the adequacy of chosen curriculum materials, and commenting on the implications of a particular reinforcement pattern on student
long term motivation require a higher level of sophistication in matters of education (p. 282). It is for reasons such as these, that Smock and Crooks (1973), suggest that peers rather than supervisors should evaluate the performance of teachers in the classroom.

**Peer Teachers**

Heller (1989), describes peer evaluation as evaluation which is carried out by individuals at the same rank within an organization (p. 7). He claims that many supervisors feel threatened by this mode of evaluation as they perceive that teachers want to usurp their authority and take evaluation into their own hands. There are also times, he claims, when the teachers themselves fear the thought of being evaluated or supervised by their peers. The fear experienced in this case is attributed to the fact that the individuals are being inspected and a judgement is being made about their performance by their equals. Batista (1976), agrees that it is for these and other reasons why this method of evaluation has been largely ignored and not many school systems use it.

Lazovik (1981), contends that, despite some of the inherent fears, peer evaluation is very beneficial to the teaching profession. For her, this represents a method of quality control, in that, members of an academic community control their own standards, their own membership, and the future course of their discipline. She also suggests that this method of evaluation process because it is necessary of those who are rendering judgement to have the appropriate background against which to compare their observations. The judgements about teaching that peers should make are those that require a thorough knowledge of the discipline, that is the substance of
teaching. They also judge what is taught, its accuracy, currency, sophistication, depth and the level of learning it fosters. Faculty peers, she contends, are uniquely qualified to judge the substance of teaching because faculty possess two distinctive requirements for the judgement task: (1) their knowledge of the discipline being taught provides the background against which comparisons can be made and (2) their long training in the evaluation of evidence enables them to weigh what is revealed through documentation.

Smock and Crooks (1973), support the utilization of colleagues in the teacher evaluation process. They agree that colleagues are more appropriate judges of the quality and appropriateness of course content and related matters. Inclusion of peers in the evaluation process could, therefore, lead to greater validity of the performance evaluation. According to Lasovik, however, despite the obvious benefits to be gained through peer evaluation, there are inherent dangers in using this method. She points out that it would be untrue to assume that any process of peer evaluation will automatically improve the validity of the teacher evaluation process. For validity to be obtained, using peer teachers in the teacher evaluation process, she suggests that much will depend on what questions are addressed by the review, what documentation is provided to the evaluation reviewers, what principles are followed in selecting peer judges and what procedures govern the conduct of the review process.

Lewis (1970), also accepts that there are numerous merits to the system of peer evaluation and cautions about the problems which accompany this method. He claims that there is an abundance of evidence of the extent to which peer judgement of merit can be contaminated by extraneous and non-professional criteria. Batista (1976), and Stinph (1980), also address some of the problems of peer evaluation. They identify a number of factors which could be deemed to affect evaluation by peers. These
include factors such as:

1. too close friendships between the candidate and the judges.
2. too few judges.
3. judges lack sufficient knowledge in the candidates field.
4. judges are in competition with the candidate
5. lack of anonymity of judges
6. lack of independence in the judgement process, permitting some peers to act as advocates or adversaries, and
7. failure of peer evaluation committee to provide reasons for negative decisions.

According to Shipka (1977), advocates of peer evaluation committees will say that the recommendations of peer committees reflect conscientious academic judgements, not the whims of the members. He suggests that this may be in question, considering how peer evaluation committee function. He claims that these committees usually meet in executive sessions, keep perfunctory minutes, if any, and state no rationale for their recommendations. If, indeed, they do operate in this manner, there would seem to be much room for conflict and discrimination.

Despite the objections to peer evaluation, there is the possibility of introducing some credibility into the process. One way in which this could be done, is by being selective about the individuals who serve on peer evaluation committees. Lazovik (1981), claims that selection is one of the most crucial points of control in trying to eliminate sources of bias in the evaluation process. She suggests that objectivity may be achieved by having a standing committee or an ad hoc committee, either of which may be appointed, selected, partially selected and partially appointed, or appointed from
a nominated or elected group. These methods of selection, she cautions, are not fool proof since it is difficult to ensure total objectivity in any method of evaluation. The last two methods of evaluation, Student Evaluation of Teachers and Self Evaluation also fall in the previously mentioned category.

**Student Evaluation of Teachers**

One of the areas of disagreement about teacher performance evaluation surrounds the question of whether or not students should or should not evaluate the performance of their teachers. Some individuals even question the capability of students to evaluate their teachers, yet, at some time or another, teachers have attempted to gather opinions about their methods of teaching. Hayes, Combe and Neiman (1967), from an investigation conducted among high school teachers in which they sought information on how these teachers dealt with student feedback, reported that 90 percent of their sample found student feedback on matters relating to their performance as teachers to be useful. These finding are supported by Jacobson (1973), and Shaw (1973). Jacobson, from her research into the value of student feedback about teacher performance, found that although some of the feedback did not relate specifically to actual instruction, they addressed factors which impinged upon effective teaching/learning in the classroom. She also noted that some of the factors which were identified in this process, were sometimes overlooked by teachers as being insignificant, but which, to the students, presented barriers to learning. These researchers also concluded that there is a wealth of empirical data to support the use of student evaluation of teacher performance rather than to reject it.

Butler and Tiplon (1976), on the other hand, do not agree that much of the
information about student evaluation of their teachers' performance is supportive of its usefulness as an authentic method of teacher performance evaluation. They claim to have reviewed a substantive number of researchers in this area, which support the view that students are not capable of recognizing effective instruction. Lahat - Mardebaum and Kipmus (1973), from their research which adapted Fleishman's Supervisory Description questionnaire to student evaluation of instructors, reported that students who rated teachers high on the Performance scale almost always rated those instructors high on the Consideration scale. Haslett (1976), in his research into student evaluation of teacher's performance in the classroom, found that class size, major field of raters, gender as well as other demographic factors seemed to play a part in student rating.

Some researchers, like Murray (1972), and Doyle and Crichton (1978), contend that the type of appraisal which is used in evaluating teachers, affects the effectiveness of student evaluation of teacher's performance. Shaw (1973), suggests that if evaluation instruments are highly structured, asking students to respond to multiple choice questions and measuring performance dimensions on which the teacher should be evaluated, then they might be able to evaluate their teachers' performance more effectively and accurately. In addition, he suggests that the instruments should be at a level that the students can understand. Inclusion of considerations such as these could conceivably lead to increased credibility of student assessment of teacher performance.

Self Evaluation

Despite the benefits to be derived from being evaluated by others, it is imperative that teachers take time out to evaluate themselves. Whether or not this evaluation could be used by the administrator as the sole measure of teacher
performance is, however, doubtful. The importance of self assessment has begun to receive recognition in teacher evaluation literature. According to Bodine (1973), Clark and Blackburn (1971), Riley and Schaffer (1979), Bailey (1981), and Knapp (1982), the literature does not only recognize the merit of self assessment, but also the importance of allowing teacher input into the performance evaluation process in general.

Rosner (1980), sees self assessment as an integral part of a professional's development. The self directed professional, he claims, is a highly motivated and dynamic individual who builds standards through a process of successive constructions and experiences, and who ultimately emerges with a theoretically and practically sound conceptualization of teaching and learning which are predictable and measurable. Carroll (1981), on the other hand, sees self evaluation as a process which enhances self understanding and improves instruction. He defines self evaluation as making judgements about one's own teaching. In making such judgements, instructors can use any type of evaluation method such as student ratings, colleague rating and measures of student achievement. He suggests five major aids for self evaluation. These are:

1. self rating forms
2. self reports
3. self study ratings
4. observation of colleague teaching
5. video tape and audio-video feedback of ones own teaching.

Carroll (1981), contends that there is much to be gained from self assessment if it is objectively conducted.

Heneman (1980), examined self assessment in terms of its validity and usefulness to the performance evaluation process. He concluded that there are many
deficiencies in the system in terms of its method of measurement and its impact on behavior. He also found a strong leniency error for self appraisal when compared to other biases. He suggests that if teachers were more confident about how the results of the assessment would be used, and if they were trained in the evaluation process, the possibility exists for more useful outcomes of this process.

**Measures of Teacher Performance**

A variety of measures have been developed in the United States of America to measure the performance of teachers. With the thrust in the 1980's to monitor and evaluate the performance of teachers in the classroom, individual states or counties within the states, have developed instruments to evaluate the performance of their teachers. This section examines six such instruments to give an insight into either their development, purpose, content and/or format. With the exception of the GTOI, the use of which is described in detail, review of the other five instruments is confined to the content of the instruments, the format and/or the method of scoring. These were considered very important as the researcher was primarily concerned with these aspects in developing an instrument for use in the Jamaican situation. Copies of the instrument can be viewed in the appendices.

**The Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTOI)**

The GTOI is used to evaluate certified veteran teachers, although it may be used to evaluate non-certified teachers. It was developed in 1986 as a direct response to the Quality Basic Education Act (QBE) which mandated the development of performance evaluation system for all personnel employed by local units of
administration, including elected and appointed school superintendents (QBE - 20 - 2 - 210, 1985). A timeline for the implementation and use of the instrument was set for field-testing in 1988-89 and full implementation in 1989-90.

The basic philosophy underlying the development of the evaluation program is that teacher evaluation is an integral component of the process of improving teaching and learning. In addition, it is perceived that effective evaluation is possible if teachers and evaluators use evaluations to reinforce effective practices and to improve teaching. The purpose of the GTOI program are threefold:

1. To identify and reinforce effective teaching practices
2. To identify areas where development can improve instructional effectiveness
3. To identify teachers who do not meet the minimum standards so that appropriate action can be taken.

There are seven (7) steps to the GTOI process. These are set out in figure 2.
Figure 2 - GTOI Evaluation Process

1. Orientation
2. Pre-Evaluation Conference
3. Observation
4. Scoring and Written Comments
5. Post-Observation Conference
6. Annual Evaluation Summary Report and Conference
7. Professional Development Plan
Orientation

The principal is responsible for providing an orientation for all teachers who will be evaluated using Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program. Orientation for teachers must include the following: (a) an overview of the procedures and the content of the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program as prescribed in the Orientation guide and (b) a description of the supplementary orientation materials provided by the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program.

Pre-Evaluation Conference

A pre-evaluation conference is not required, but one may be conducted at the request of either the teacher or the evaluator. This conference is designed to provide an opportunity for (a) further clarification of the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program (GTEP) content, evaluation procedures or scoring criteria; (b) sharing of background information concerning the classes and/or students which may be observed; (c) sharing of other information which may have an impact on the teacher's evaluation; and (d) review of the past year's Professional Development Plan, if appropriate. The request for the conference must be made after the conclusion of the orientation activities and prior to the teacher's first evaluation observation.

Observation

Standard Evaluation Requirements

The standard teacher evaluation in Georgia will consist of classroom observations for scoring the Georgia-Teacher Observation Instrument and ongoing school wide observations for scoring the Georgia Teacher Duties and Responsibilities.
Instrument (GTDRI). The GTDRI is part of the total GTEP. Its purpose is to describe the expectations in addition to the teaching tasks outlines in the GTOI.

**Extended Evaluation Requirements**

Teachers who fail to meet an established criterion during observations with the GTOI will be required to move from the standard phase to an extended phase of evaluation. This phase begins with an announced diagnostic observation of at least one class or lesson. The observation is scored on the extended form, then the conference on the results of this evaluation will be held. The evaluator will determine, based on the results of the extended evaluation, the appropriate course of action for the teacher and additional unannounced observations. As a point determined by the principal, the teacher may return to the extended phase or continue in the extended phase.

**Extended Evaluation Options**

The extended announced observation is an important diagnostic tool and is encouraged for use at any time.

**Scoring and Written Comments**

The dimensions on the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Instrument are scored on the basis of satisfactory (S) or needs improvement (NI) with one exception. Building for Transfer (Task 1: Dimension C) may be scored not applicable (NA) during the student-focused content development. Content Development (Task 1: Dimension B) may be scored either teacher-focused interactions or student-focused interactions or both.

Each classroom observation is scored and written comments prepared. The teacher must receive a copy of the observation record with the written comments within five working days. Teachers may attach written comments to their observation records.
and may request a conference to discuss the observation. They cannot change the score. Items on the GTDRI are scored by exception. All areas are considered satisfactory unless teachers have been notified and the unsatisfactory performance has been documented.

Post-Observation Conference

A conference to discuss each observation may be initiated by either the teacher or the evaluator. Formal and informal conference to discuss instruction are encouraged. Post-observation conferences are required in the extended evaluation phase.

Annual Evaluation Summary Report and Conference

Each teacher will attend an Annual Evaluation Conference at which time a summary of the results of the GTOI and GTDRI will be presented. This conference is designed to (a) provide the opportunity to communicate the overall results for the school (b) provide the opportunity to review specific areas of strength and areas identified for improvement and (c) provide the opportunity for the teacher and the primary evaluator to sign, date and receive copies of the Annual Evaluation Summary Report.

Professional Development Plan

Professional Development Plans are encouraged for all teachers. Teachers who are in the "needs improvement" or the "unsatisfactory" category must have a plan. The plan is optional for others. The plan includes (a) identification of specific objectives (b) activities, procedures and a timeline for meeting those objectives and (c) a plan to determine progress towards meeting the objectives.

Validity and Reliability of the GTOI

No validity or reliability levels have been reported. The GTOI has just
completed its field test-year and no results are yet available.

The LaVega School District Teacher Evaluation Instrument

This instrument was developed for use in Texas in 1986. It examines critical teaching domains in terms of indicators. There are five domains, each having individual indicators. This instrument will be reviewed only in terms of its content. In measuring content, the instrument divides this information into domains which are further measures in terms of criteria for each domain. It should be noted that this system has been implemented in the last two years and is currently being reviewed.

Domain I: Instructional Strategies

Criterion 1. Here the teacher is assessed in terms of the general provision of opportunities for students to participate actively and successfully. This criterion is measured in terms of specifically defined indicators such as the appropriate variety of activities, solicitation of student participation, and the provision of ample time for student responses (p. 109).

Criterion 2. The evaluation and provision of feedback to students during instruction are examined by this criterion. The indicators include the communication of learning expectations, monitoring students' performance as they engage in learning activities and reinforcement of correct responses or performance.

Domain II. Classroom Management and Organization

Criterion 3. This criterion focuses on the organization of materials and students. Its indicators include such behaviors as securing the student's attention, giving clear administrative directions and classroom procedures and the ready
availability of teaching aids/materials.

Criterion 4. Maximizes the amount of time available for instruction. The indicators include the promptness with which class is begun, maintaining appropriate pace during instruction and keeping students on task.

Criterion 5. Manages student behavior. Such factors as the consistent application of rules, the reinforcement of desired and appropriate behaviors and the use of creative techniques to prevent student going off-task are some of the indicators of this criterion (p. 109).

Domain III. Presentation of Subject Matter

This domain is measured in terms of four criteria, 6-9. Criterion 6 assesses the teacher's ability to teach for cognitive, effective and/or psychomotor learning. The indicators include relating lesson content to prior or future learning, providing opportunities for application and presenting information in an appropriate sequence.

Criterion 7 measures the use of effective communication skills and is measured in terms of the teacher's ability to explain content and/or learning tasks clearly, use correct grammar and accurate language.

Domain IV. Learning Environment

Criterion 8 uses strategies to motivate students in learning, is used to assess this domain. Some of the indicators are relating content to student interests/experiences, reinforcing/praising learning efforts or students and challenging students.

Criterion 9 assesses the maintenance of a supportive environment. This is measured through indicators such as avoiding sarcasm and negative criticism, establishing a climate of courtesy and respect and establishing and maintaining
positive rapport with students.

Domain V. Professional Growth and Responsibilities

Four criteria were also used to assess this domain. Criterion 10 addressed the teacher’s plans for staying current in content taught, staying current in instructional methodology and progressing in professional growth requirements.

Criterion 11 considers the effective interaction and communication with parents. It is assessed through indicators such as initiating communication with parents, conducting parent-teacher conferences and reporting student progress to parents.

Criterion 12 addresses compliance with policies, operating procedures and requirements. It is assessed through indicators such as following district and campus policies, performing assigned professional duties and following statutory regulations.

Criterion 13 considers the promotion and evaluation of student growth. Its indicators include the teacher’s participation in campus goal-setting for student progress, documenting student progress and maintaining accurate student records (p. 109).

Although there are a number of indicators for the individual criteria, those selected were highlighted because of their general nature and their appeal for use, or consideration in the development of the Teacher Performance Evaluation Instrument for Jamaica.

San Bernardino City USD Teacher Evaluation Instrument

This instrument was included for review because of the indicators of teacher performance which it measures. Many of the indicators are similar to those reviewed
in the LaVega instrument and are in-keeping with characteristics and behaviors identified in the effective teaching literature. As the instrument states, the indicators are not absolute and only act as guides in the evaluation process (1988, p. 116).

Interestingly, this instrument relies, to a large extent, on the evaluators judgement, rather than just the specific indicators listed. Criteria for rating are also incorporated within the instrument.

The instrument is divided into four main sections: (1) student progress (2) instructional techniques and strategies (3) adherence to curricular objectives and (4) suitability of the learning environment. It sets the criteria for measurement in terms of the satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance of the teacher.

The format of this instrument is, somewhat, unique and offers an alternative to the more popular rating scales. It does, however, offer the opportunity for evaluator to be accused of subjectivity since much of the judgement is left to the evaluator. It also offers the opportunity for the evaluator to assess the teacher on characteristics which are not specified, thus leaving the teacher at the disadvantage of not knowing some evaluation criteria which might be assessed. Although this system is, no doubt, workable, it would have to be adopted with extreme caution since there is the possibility of introducing negative factors into the evaluation process (p. 116).

Vestal Central Schools Teacher Evaluation Instrument

This instrument was included for examination because of its format and the indicators of effective instruction which it purports to measure. An examination of the instrument (please see appendix I), will show a very simple response mode, clearly set out for easy scoring. The evaluatee either meets or does not meet expectations in terms of certain stated indicators. Evaluators are also given the opportunity to make
additional comments on the same form. This dual response mode allows for greater flexibility on the part of the evaluator. When the simple response mode which has been provided is inadequate to give an accurate assessment of the teacher’s performance, the evaluator has the option of using this additional section to make clear or justify his or her assessment (1988, p. 151).

Closer examination of this instrument will also show that the dimensions measured are similar to those of the other instruments. Teachers are assessed on preparation and planning, techniques of instruction, classroom management and student performance.

Gloucester County Public Schools Teacher Evaluation Instrument

The format and scoring of this instrument contributed to its selection for reviewing. This is a fully coded response scale which offers a five point rating system. For the most part, each indicator is rated on this scale; however, the evaluator is also offered the opportunity to give a narrative report (1988, p. 83).

The scale is divided into five sections: Teacher effectiveness, personal qualifications, professional attitudes, personal/professional relationships and special education. Each section is measured in terms of indicators and the evaluative level code used to rate the teacher’s performance. The evaluative code is:

5 - Superior
4 - Above Expectations
3 - Met Expectations
2 - Below Expectations
1 - Poor.

All evaluations of 1 or 5 must be explained in the comment section of the evaluation
instrument.

Although a very detailed instrument, this researcher would be somewhat wary to adopt the rating scale. In a situation where an evaluation system is just being introduced, it might be better to require individuals to meet expectations, and where they have either failed to do so or have surpassed them, provisions are made on the instrument to indicate this.

Generally speaking, the review of these instruments helped to introduce a number of possible formats and rating systems for information and consideration. They also helped to provide information on the criteria and indicators which are used to measure teacher performance. In the case of GTOI, the administrative procedure of that system was reviewed, thereby, adding information for consideration in developing items to gather information on this variable.

**Georgia Teacher Duties and Responsibilities Instrument**

This instrument was reviewed because it specifically addresses the evaluation of duties and responsibilities other than those pertaining directly to instruction, which are performed by the teacher. Following interviews with a number of respondents, and reviewing the literature, this researcher thought it would be useful to add a dimension to the evaluation instrument to be developed by this researcher, which would measure the teachers performance of duties and responsibilities other than those directly related to instruction. It was therefore decided to review this instrument to ascertain what was being measured as additional duties and responsibilities as well as to examine its format.

The Georgia Teacher Duties and Responsibilities Instrument (GTDRI), was developed to be used in conjunction with the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument
(GTOI). Its purpose is to describe the expectations for teachers in addition to the teaching tasks outlined in the GTOI. Evaluation of the performance of these duties and responsibilities is based on schoolwide observations of teachers throughout the school year. If a teacher’s performance is consistently acceptable with the factors addressed in this instrument, then that teacher is given an overall satisfactory score. Unsatisfactory performance, however, is immediately brought to the attention of the teacher for corrective actions to be taken (1988, p. 50).

The GTDRI is divided into 3 sections, namely: Sections I, II and III. Sections I and II each have subsections A, B and C, while Section III is open-ended. Section IA evaluates the professional practices consistent with school and system policies in working with students, students records, parents and colleagues. Among other factors, the items in this section specifically seek information on factors such as the interaction of teachers and students, the type of home/school communication which the teacher initiates, confidentiality of information pertaining to school personnel and parents, and the type of professional conduct exhibited by the teacher in terms of speech and general behavior.

The items in Section IB address the teacher compliance with school, system, and state administrative regulations as well as Board of Education policies. Among others, these items seek information on factors such as the teachers’ use of class time as it relates to policy guidelines, the enforcement of regulations concerning student conduct and discipline, punctuality, implementation of designated curriculum and compliance with conditions stated in their work contract.

Section IC is concerned with gathering information whether or not the teacher acts in a professional manner and assumes responsibility for the total school program.
its safety and good order. Specifically, the evaluator is asked to consider if the teacher takes precautions to protect records, equipment, materials, and facilities, as well as to assume responsibility for supervising students in out-of-class settings.

Section II is a narrative section and its completion is optional. It requests information on the duties and responsibilities prescribed by the local school system which the teacher is expected to carry out. Section III is also a narrative section but it addresses the Professional Development Plan, which has been prescribed for the teacher. Here the evaluator must check to see if the teacher completes all prescribed activities outlined in the Professional Development Plan previously created. A copy of the GTDRI can be found in appendix B.

Summary

This chapter has examined both research and literacy reviews on teacher performance evaluation. Initially, it examined the concept of evaluation, its definitions and the suitability of those definitions to the school situation. It then examined teacher performance evaluation per se, the relevance and usefulness of this evaluation and the need for such an evaluation in school systems. It showed that, despite objections to, and problems which might be associated with teacher performance evaluation, the benefits to be derived were far reaching and necessary for the more objective and systematic development of education in general.

Consideration was also given to methods used in evaluating teacher performance. Three methods, deemed to be the most commonly used, were examined. These were observation, interviews and rating scales. The pros and cons of each method as an effective and appropriate method of assessment of teacher performance were discussed.
The least favored was the rating scale since it tends to measure discrete factors which are not necessarily exhibited in the classroom in the way it is in hourly paid, task oriented jobs.

The final section of this chapter was devoted to a presentation and discussion of individuals or groups involved in the teacher performance evaluation. The appropriateness and value of supervisors, peers, students and the teacher themselves as evaluators were discussed and it was seen that each of these participants could be very useful in the evaluation process, and if properly trained, could all help to produce a more valid method of performance evaluation of teachers in the classroom.
CHAPTER III
Theoretical Framework

Rationale Theory of the Research

"Good, Better, best,
Never let it rest.
Until good becomes better,
And better become best."

This is how Madeline Hunter (p. 33, 1988), reflects on teacher evaluation. She sees this as an appropriate slogan for teacher evaluation, as researchers seek to develop new techniques to improve teaching. It is through the performance evaluation process that individuals are able to identify the strengths and weaknesses of classroom instruction, and thereby develop strategies to improve these characteristics.

As was indicated earlier in this study, the need to give account for what takes place in the education system is critical. According to Darling-Hammong, Wise and Pease (1983), the demand for accountability in education has shifted from broad based issues of finance and program management to specific concerns about the quality of classroom teaching and teachers. They suggest that the public has come to believe that the key to educational improvement lies in upgrading the quality of teachers rather than in changing school structure or curriculum.

Similar perceptions were made public as far back as 1979 when the most frequent response to the Gallup poll’s question about what public schools could do to earn an "A", grade was that of improving teacher quality. This indicated a consciousness of the effects of teacher performance on the achievement of students and the school in general. It was also accepted that, in order to improve teacher
performance, the school system would first have to be able to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses. Having done so, programs could then be developed to remove the weaknesses and to increase the strengths, or to use those strengths positively in the educational process. Only through a formal and accepted evaluation process can weaknesses be removed, since this is a method through which objective and suitable measures can be applied to provide the data for which to plan.

Braskamp (1984), sees teacher evaluation as serving three primary purposes: a) it assists the individual instructor to improve as a teacher; b) it provides information to colleagues and administrators for decisions about promotion, tenure, annual salary increases and new responsibilities; and c) it provides information to students for course selection. On the other hand, Darling-Hammond et al (1983), identify four purposes of teacher evaluation; three of which are encompassed in Braskamp’s theory. These are set out in the next figure 2.

Figure 2

Four Basic Purposes of Teacher Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose/Level</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement (formative information)</td>
<td>Individual Staff Development</td>
<td>School Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability (summative information)</td>
<td>Individual Personal (job status) decisions</td>
<td>School Status (e.g. certification) decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, these researchers focus on the purpose of the evaluation, the level at which it is done, the effect on the individual and the effect on the organization. They suggest
also, that many teacher evaluation systems are normally intended to accomplish all four of these purposes, but different processes and methods are better suited to one or another of these objectives.

Development is important to any organization or individual. To the educator, staff development can be used as a method of building staff morale, preparing the teacher to assume new responsibilities or training the teacher to attain competence and expertise in his or her job. Through the process of evaluation, information which is critical to staff development programs is obtained. Floden and Freiman (1981), also support this view. They agree that staff development is designed to help the teacher to move to higher developmental stages in order to enable him or her to develop multiple perspectives about teaching and learning, and to become more flexible, adaptive and creative. In light of these benefits, they suggest that, as teacher evaluation is able to focus on the teacher’s personal stages of development and areas of confidence, it would be most suitable for individual improvement purposes.

If the benefits to be derived are so varied and many, it would seem that there is a need for an educational system to have a teacher performance evaluation system. If Jamaica is to try to keep abreast of changing times and technology, it must institute measures which will allow it to, more effectively, account for the use of its material and human resources, while at the same time, trying to build a more efficient and effective educational system. It must find methods to develop the potential of those it employs so that they will be better able to attain the goals and objectives which have been set for the system. It is important to identify programs which will assist in this process. The research reviewed here has indicated that an evaluation process is critical to objective and meaningful assessment, and therefore, it would seem to be expedient
and wise for a system such as this to be implemented. Before being able to implement a teacher evaluation system, however, the literature suggests that an exercise such as the one being undertaken in this project, will help to identify some of the problems which might affect its effective implementation. By doing so, plans can be made to deal with, or circumvent, the problems and therefore result in a more problem free implementation and greater user acceptance.

Assumptions

The Jamaican education system is plagued with a myriad of problems. Among them are low student achievement, low teacher productivity, absenteeism, low morale, lack of professionalism, lack of staff development and low salaries (Davis, 1990, Morris, 1990; Lewis, 1990). While this study is not conceived as one which will address these problems, it is conceived on some basic assumptions which relate to the ability of this exercise being able to make a contribution towards the solution of some of these problems. Based on the information gleaned from reviewing literature, this research assumes that:

1. The performance of the teacher in the classroom is related to the academic performance of the students he/she teaches.

2. There are indicators of effective instruction which have been identified through empirical means for which one can test and analyze data gathered.

3. Poor instruction can be identified, and therefore one can develop programs to help improve related skills.

4. Evaluation is an objective method through which poor and satisfactory
performance can be identified, and this will aid in the development of effective and efficient staff development programs, which will lead to improved teacher performance and student performance.

Based on the foregoing assumptions, therefore, this research has been conceived as an empirical method of collecting information which could affect the development and implementation of a performance evaluation system for secondary school teachers in Jamaica.

Figure 3 gives a diagrammatic representation of the variables being investigated in this research as well as the relationship between the variables. Technically, the variables being investigated fall into three types, namely, dependent variables, independent variables and moderator variables.

**Dependent Variables**

The dependent variables are those variables which will remain constant and will not be subject to manipulation by the researcher (Tuckman, 1974). In this case, the dependent variables are Perceptions of Teacher Performance Evaluation in terms of (a) Content (b) Administrative Procedure and (c) Utilization of Data. It is about these variables that three groups of respondents will be asked comment. These three groups form the independent variables.

**Independent Variables**

The independent variables are those variables which will be manipulated by the researcher against the dependent variables, as well as in terms of moderator variables. The independent variables in this instance are Teachers, Principals and Education Officers.
Moderator Variables

According to Borg and Gall (1979), moderator variables aid in differential analysis. They can be used to moderate the predictive validity of tests very effectively. They broaden the scope of analyses, thereby providing additional information from the research. The moderator variables in this study are School Type, Qualifications and Years of Teaching Experience.
Figure 3

Figural Representation of Research Design

Respondents Status

- Teachers
- Principals
- Education Officers

Respondents Perception Of Teacher Performance Evaluation

- Content
- Administrative Procedure
- Utilization of Data

School Type
Qualifications
Years Teaching Experience

Moderator Variables
Theory of the Research

This research was conducted based on the broad theory that teachers, principals and education officers, because of their different statuses, experiences, qualifications and the type of schools in which they teach differ in their perceptions of certain salient aspects of teacher performance evaluations, namely, content, administrative procedures and utilization of data collected. The review of literature indicates that the diversity of perceptions and opinions held by these groups has resulted in various problems being experienced in the implementation and effective use of teacher performance evaluation programs.

According to Knapp (1982), the tension which is created among stakeholders in the evaluation process is the result of divergent views on the purpose of evaluation systems. For teachers, there is interest in maintaining their job, self respect and sense of efficacy. They want a teacher evaluation system that encourages self-improvement, appreciates the complexity of their work, and protects their rights. Administrators, made up of principals and education officers in this case, have a different perception. They have a stake in maintaining stability in their organization, allowing them to respond to parental and bureaucratic concerns for accountability, while keeping staff morale in tact. They want an evaluation system that is objective, not overly time-consuming, and feasible in the organizational context (p. 6).

These different views, says Knapp, make choices about teacher evaluation processes very difficult. They also affect the implementation of programs because even after a policy is adopted, its terms and emphases are renegotiated at every level in implementing the system. Elmore (1979), in commenting on this situation, claims that it is sometimes difficult to solve the problems, because all the stakeholders argue
for understanding teacher evaluation plans in the context of organizational behaviors and processes.

Robinson (1988), also agrees that a number of questions have arisen about teacher performance evaluations, especially in the 1989s. He claims that some of the common questions asked are: "Who should evaluate teachers?" "What are meaningful criteria for assessing teacher performance?" and "Are incentive pay plans helpful or counterproductive in improving education?" Although this research is not directly concerned with incentive pay plans, this factor falls under the question of "For what purposes should evaluation data be used?" He continues that school officials, among others have widely divergent views which sometimes give contradictory answers to the questions asked (p. iv).

Wise et al (1984), from extensive research, concluded that there are five prerequisites for an effective evaluation system. These are:

1. A teacher evaluation system must suit the education goals, management style, conception of teaching, and community values of the school district.

2. There must be top-level commitment to, and resources of evaluation, outweigh checklists and procedures.

3. The school district should decide the main purpose of its evaluation system and then match the process to the purpose.

4. To sustain resource commitments and political support, teacher evaluation must be seen to have utility. Utility depends on the efficient use of resources to achieve reliability, validity, and cost-effectiveness.

5. Teacher involvement and responsibility improve the quality of teacher
McGreal (1983, p. 53), though not disagreeing with Wise et al, has identified what he calls commonalities. There are seven such commonalities which he describes.

Commonality One: There is an appropriate attitude toward the evaluation process.

Commonality Two: The evaluation model employed is complimentary to the desired purpose of evaluation in the school district.

Commonality Three: There is a logical and workable separation of administrative and supervisory behaviors and responsibilities.

Commonality Four: Goal setting should be the central element and major activity of evaluation.

Commonality Five: A narrowed focus on teaching is necessary to develop a common understanding of effective instruction.

Commonality Six: Administrators must have improved classroom observation skills to provide teachers with focused feedback.

Commonality Seven: Additional data sources such as parental input, student performance, student evaluation, peer evaluation, self evaluation and teacher materials should be employed in the evaluation process.

Conley (1986), in writing about the Colorado Teacher Performance Evaluation system, states that systems have eight critical attributes to ensure its effectiveness. These are (1) that the validity of the system must be accepted by all participants (2) all participants must have a thorough knowledge of the mechanics of the system (3) the performance criteria have a clear, consistent rationale and be known by the
evaluatee (4) evaluators are properly trained in the use of the system (5) levels of evaluation are employed, each with a differing goal (6) there is a distinction between the formative and summative dimensions of the evaluation process (7) a variety of methods of models of evaluation are utilized and (8) evaluation is a district priority.

A review of various suggestions given for developing and implementing an effective teacher performance evaluation system will reveal that the areas of concern being investigated, as well as the design of this research embrace many, if not all, of the criteria given. It is from this review, as well as the literature review given in the previous chapter, that the theory for this research has been developed and upon which it is founded.

**Definition of Variables**

The following are the definitions of the variables as they are used in this research.

**Variable 1: Respondent’s Status-Teacher**

The position classification of instructor in an educational institution. In this position, the individual is responsible for giving instruction to students in keeping with the institution’s curriculum requirements and their job description.

**Variable 2: Respondent’s Status - Principal**

The position classification which is given to the administrator of an educational institution, and indicates that he or she has the responsibility for the day to day operations of the institution over which he is put in charge.

**Variable 3: Respondent’s Status - Education Officer**

The position classification which is given to a central office administrator who
has the responsibility for monitoring and evaluating specific educational institutions named by the Ministry of Education.

**Variable 4: Respondent’s Perception of Teacher Performance Evaluation - Content**

The cognition, thoughts or views which the respondents have about the factors or categories of behavior/performance, on which teachers are assessed, and the items in each of those categories or factors, which are used to measure specific aspects of that factor or category of behavior/performance of the Teacher Performance Evaluation Instrument. This includes the classroom environment, the teacher’s perception of instruction, classroom instruction, the learning environment, classroom management, the assessment of student progress, extra curricula activities, community relations, personal characteristics, additional duties and responsibilities and student welfare support services.

**Variable 5: Respondent’s Perception of Teacher Performance Evaluation - Administrative Procedures**

The cognition, thoughts or views which respondents have about how teacher performance evaluation should be conducted. This includes all activities and processes concerned with pre-evaluation preparations and discussions; method(s) of evaluation to be used; persons who will be involved in the evaluation process and length, time and place of the evaluation exercise.

**Variable 6: Respondent’s Perception of Teacher Performance Evaluation - Use**

The cognition, thoughts of views which the respondents have about what should be done with, or for what purpose (s) the information which is gathered in the teacher performance evaluation process, should be used. It includes such considerations as whether or not the evaluation report should be placed on the local or Ministry files.
given to the teacher or destroyed: and whether or not the information should be used to make decisions on promotions, temporary or permanent appointments, firing, staff development, salary increases, or for giving references/recommendations.

**Variable 7: School Type**

Classification of a school as being New Secondary/Secondary or Traditional High/Grammar.

**Variable 8: Qualifications**

Certification which the respondent has received from an accredited institution of higher learning, and which indicates that he/she has successfully completed a specific course of study.

**Variable 9: Years of Teaching Experience**

The number of calendar years that an individual has spent instructing students in a government recognized, academic, technical or vocational institution.
HYPOTHESES

The following are the hypotheses which this research will seek to test. These are stated in the form of null hypotheses.

1. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of secondary level school teachers, principals and education officers regarding the content of a teacher performance evaluation instrument.

2. There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary level school teachers, principals and education officers of the administrative procedures which should be used in the teacher performance evaluation process.

3. There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary level school teachers, principals and education officers on how information gathered through teacher performance evaluation, should be utilized.

4. There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary level school teachers on the content, administrative procedures, or utilization of evaluation information in the teacher performance evaluation process, in terms of the teacher's school type.

5. There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary level school teachers of the content, administrative procedures or utilization of evaluation information in the teacher performance evaluation process based on the teachers' qualifications.

6. There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary level school teachers of the content, administrative procedures or utilization
of information in the teacher performance evaluation process, based on the teachers' years of teaching experience.

7. There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary level school principals of the content, administrative procedures and utilization of information in the teacher performance evaluation process, based on the principals' school type.

8. There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary level school principals on the content, administrative procedures and utilization of information in the teacher performance evaluation process based on the principals' qualifications.

9. There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary level school principals of the content, administrative procedures and utilization of information in the teacher performance evaluation process, based on the principals' years of teaching experience.

10. There is no significant difference in the perception of high school principals and teachers on content, administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation information.

11. There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary school principals and teachers on the content, administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation information.
CHAPTER IV
The Development of an Instrument to Evaluate the
Performance of Secondary School Teachers

Development of the Instrument

In constructing this instrument, some basic steps suggested by Borg and Gall (1979) were used as a guide. These include:

Step 1 - Defining the objectives for developing the scale
Step 2 - Defining the target population
Step 3 - Reviewing related measures
Step 4 - Developing an item pool
Step 5 - Preparing the prototype
Step 6 - Evaluating the prototype
Step 7 - Revising the measure if necessary
Step 8 - Pilot testing the instrument
Step 9 - Statistically analyzing the scores.

Step 1 - Defining The Objectives For Developing The Scale

The teacher performance evaluation instrument is divided into two parts: the first part addressing the evaluation of teachers' performance in the classroom by way of observation and the second part addressing the teacher's execution of their professional duties and responsibilities, not necessarily carried out as part of instruction, by way of interviews and the review of reports. It is designed to assess the performance of teachers in the areas of:

1. Classroom Environment
2. Teacher Preparation For Instruction
3. Classroom Instruction
4. Learning Environment
5. Classroom Management
6. Assessment of Student Progress
7. Extra-Curricular Activities
8. Community Relationships
9. Personal Characteristics
10. Additional Duties and Responsibilities

Items are designed to measure each of the content categories listed above, but together, they will still measure the unitary concepts of the teachers performance in the classroom.

**Step 2 - Defining The Target Population**

The population for which this instrument is designed to be used is that of all teachers in secondary and high schools in Jamaican Educational System. At this level, teachers give instruction in specific courses for which they have been specifically trained, or have demonstrated their command of the subject matter in the area in which they wish to give instruction, hence, it is easier to readily assess these individuals. At the elementary level, where teachers are expected to teach all courses, and where there are no departmental divisions, some restructuring in the system or a different type of instrument would be needed to adequately and fairly assess those teachers.

**Step 3 - Review of Related Measures**

The review of related measures was presented in Chapter II of this research.
The measures reviewed were the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTOI), the Georgia Teacher Duties and Responsibilities Instrument, the LaVega School District Teacher Evaluation Instrument, the San Bernardino City USD Teacher Evaluation Instrument, the Gloucester County Public Schools Teacher Evaluation Instrument and the Observation Forms used in the Vestal Central Schools teacher evaluation process.

It must again be noted that, reviewing these measures was necessary as there are no instruments which have been developed for use, or are being used in Jamaica; hence, measures developed for and used in a different culture had to be reviewed. Despite this, it is recognized by this researcher, after reviewing the literature, that the dimensions or factors which are measured in these instruments, are those which have been identified in related researchers to be indicators of effective instruction or are characteristics of the effective teacher. These are the primary factors which will be measured by the instrument being developed for use in Jamaica.

**Step 4 - Developing The Item Pool**

An item pool of 75 items, with at least five items measuring each dimension, was prepared. These items, although theoretically related in terms of the unitary concept of teacher performance evaluation, were, nevertheless, grouped to measure particular categories or dimensions of teacher performance. Another consideration in developing this item pool was the fact that there are situations peculiar to Jamaica which had to be measured, since they form part of the duties which teachers are expected to perform but are not stated in their job descriptions, yet help to enhance the effectiveness of teachers. In addition, teachers place as much emphasis on these duties as they do on classroom instruction, and, at times, without performing these duties, teachers' primary purpose of instructing, would be very ineffective. These
additional dimensions are discussed in Chapter III.

Step 5 - Preparing The Prototype

Having examined previous scales and alternative forms, coding and scoring, the decision was made to use a simple response mode to facilitate ease in scoring and coding. The response mode which was adopted was taken from the Georgia Teacher Professional Duties and Responsibilities Instrument and requires a response to one of two possible responses: Needs Improvement, (NI), and Satisfactory, (S). Occasionally, Not Applicable (NA) are used where items refer to duties which are not necessarily carried out by all teachers.

Although a teacher’s performance might vary along a continuum from poor to excellent, this researcher believes that if the categories or responses are limited to that which is considered to be satisfactory or needing improving, this helps to eliminate some subjectivity on the part of the observer and the observee, since the performance is considered to be either that which fulfills expectations in terms of stated criteria or does not fulfill those expectations. This response mode could, therefore, eliminate some amount of dissatisfaction and discontent which could arise in trying to justify performance variations along a continuum.

Another benefit to be derived from this simple response mode, is the ease it presents in scoring. The observer is only required to concentrate on two possible responses, rather than a number of variety of responses. In addition, coding is made simple, rather than complex, as it is in some instruments which require points to be allocated and totalled. This aspect of the instrument is very important as ease of scoring and coding are considered by researchers to be major considerations in developing an instrument. User’s of the instrument are more likely to complete the
instrument properly, if the response mode is not complex or does not require a great deal of writing.

In addition to the simple response mode given, the instrument also allows the evaluator to make additional comments on the evaluatee’s performance. In this section, the evaluator is given the opportunity to expand on or comment on factors relating to or affecting the teacher’s performance on each dimension measured. This section is completed at the discretion of the observer and therefore does not have to seem burdensome to the evaluator. It is completed only if, in doing so, it will enhance or give credence to the evaluation exercise.

Step 6 - Evaluating The Prototype

As the initial step in evaluating the prototype, three judges, considered to be representative of the expertise required for this exercise, were asked to independently evaluate the draft in terms of:

a) its format and presentation
b) suitability of the wording of the items;
c) clarity and brevity of instructions and items;
d) relevance of items to the specific dimension each was intended to measure;
e) sensitivity of items.

The judges were all of professorial status, having taught in the field of teacher education and particularly in the area of testing and evaluation of programs and personnel. In addition, they have all served in the Jamaican Educational System and are, therefore, familiar with the situation there. In addition, they have all majored in the area of Educational Administration and bring to the arena some measure of
expertise in research and the development of instruments to measure different concepts.

Step 7 - Revising The Instrument

Based on the evaluation and comments of the judges, the researcher revised the items which were considered to be either ambiguous, unclear or unsuitable. The instrument was then resubmitted for evaluation and was subsequently approved for administration. At this stage, the prototype was considered suitable for use in this research exercise.

Step 8 - Piloting The Instrument

As the aim of this research was to test the validity of the instrument being produced to measure the performance of teachers in the secondary school system, the instrument was only piloted to establish its validity. This was done by gathering data pertaining to the content of the instrument and subjecting the data to the Item to Scale statistical procedure. This procedure was used to determine the strength of relationship between the individual item scores and the total test score. The Item to Scale statistical procedure indicated the validity through the reliability coefficient which was produced for the teacher performance evaluation instrument.

Another questionnaire, designed to obtain the views of these respondents was administered to see the extent to which they considered the items and dimensions being measured by the instrument, to be indeed those which should be measured in a performance evaluation exercise of this type. This will help to establish the validity of the instrument as a measure of teacher performance at the secondary school level.

The possibility of the instrument being pilot tested to see how practical and effective it is in a teacher evaluation exercise, its scoring, coding and application to the real situation, will occur if, or when, an attempt is made to implement a teacher
performance evaluation system, and if this instrument is being used as a part of that system.

The questionnaire which was used to secure responses on the perception of teachers, principals and education officers to the newly developed teacher evaluation instrument, was only used to gather information to help to determine the validity of this instrument as a measure of teacher performance at the secondary school level. The responses given will help to determine if the instrument will need further revision to be a more valid instrument for the purpose for which it was intended.

Step 9 - Statistically Analyzing The Scores

The scores that were analyzed in this case were those which reflect the responses of the sample on the questionnaire given. These scores were analyzed in terms of the variance and correlation of responses using Cronbach's internal consistency analytical technique. This yielded a reliability coefficient of 0.86.

For the purpose of this research, this coefficient is highly satisfactory as it is close to the highest reliability coefficient of 1.00, which denotes perfect reliability, and which is never attained in practice (Borg & Gall, 1979, p. 219). A reliability coefficient of 0.75 and above, is considered to be very satisfactory by many researchers (Tuckman, 1974).

The Teacher Performance Evaluation Instrument

In constructing this instrument, major consideration was given to what the literature presents as being the indicators of effective teaching and teacher effectiveness. These have been identified, for the most part, in the Effective Schools literature, as well as in other reports of independent research studies. The following section
examines literature of effective instruction, and specifically those indicators of effective teaching which have been included in this teacher performance evaluation instrument. **Effective Teaching**

Since the 1960's, there have been increased efforts to try to identify the traits or characteristics which render one teacher more effective than another. This proved to be a more complex task than was initially perceived, as various researchers were identifying various factors which they claimed to indicate teacher effectiveness. Researchers used, for the most part, the presage, process, product background to their research, as it was perceived that certain characteristics and experiences which the teacher brought to the classroom affected the process of teaching which in turn affected the product or outcome.

Cruickshank (1986), reviewed a number of researchers on effective teaching, including researchers by Brophy and Good, Rosenshine, Medley, Walberg, Gage, Mitzel, Soar and Soar, and Good among others, and concluded that some teachers do make more of a difference than do others, and that behaviors of effective teachers can be, and to some extent, have been found. He summarized the factors identified to be indicators of effective teaching, under three main headings: Classroom organization, didactic teaching and classroom management. He reports that the findings for classroom organization seemed to support the teacher playing a central, dominant classroom role but involving students in planning and organizing, having a structured curriculum, setting high goals and communicating them to students, working mostly with the whole class and less often with supervised small groups, providing independent work that is interesting and worthwhile, and minimizing "busy work."

For didactic teaching, he claims that the findings support the teacher's
persistence in setting high goals, putting the daily schedule on the chalkboard, providing extensive content coverage, providing learning activities at an appropriate level of difficulty, differentiating instruction between high and low socioeconomic students, teaching systematically step by step, providing adequate opportunity to learn criterion material, providing structure and structuring comments, maintaining a brisk lesson pace, using questions suitable to the lesson’s cognitive level, requiring public and overt student participation, providing adequate "wait time," waiting and using student ideas, providing immediate individual feedback, shaping student responses so they are correct, maintaining task involvement, monitoring individual progress, using little criticism, individualizing, reviewing, summarizing, providing teaching variety, and maintaining a classroom absent of negative emotional climate. Further, effective teachers were seen to involve all students, limit student choices, hold students responsible for their work, attend to students equitably and capitalize on unexpected student wants (Cruickshank, 1986).

In terms of classroom management, Cruickshank (1986), claimed that the findings here suggest that effective teachers set and maintain clear rules and consistently apply them using positive reinforcement, limit student behavior, hold students responsible for their behavior, direct students upon completion of their work, minimize transition time, deal with misbehavior quickly, negotiate student compliance and demonstrate "withitness," smoothness, momentum, ability to overlap, challenge, variety and grouping alertness.

In addition to these three major categories, Cruickshank (1986), suggests that, generally speaking, it would seem that teachers need to be well-organized, efficient, task-oriented, knowledgeable, verbally fluent, aware of student developmental levels,
clear, enthusiastic, self confident, confident of student abilities, hold high expectations, be friendly and warm, encouraging and supportive, attentive, accepting and tolerant.

Sergiovanni and Starrat (1983), also reviewed literature on effective instruction, but concluded that there are eight factors which they perceive to be criteria for evaluating effective instruction. These are (1) explain objectives of the learning unit. (2) engaged time or time on task (3) attention to diversity of learning (4) variety of instructional techniques (5) feedback (6) review and recapitulation (7) a caring relationship with children and (8) holding students responsible through expectations. These researchers accept that, there are, no doubt, other factors which could be added to this list. In addition, they do not consider that any of these effective criteria on their own can guarantee effectiveness. Rather, it is through the complex inclusion of all of these behaviors on student learning that teachers will find their work with students leading to the enhancement of student learning (p. 286).

Further examination of what teachers do in the classroom to classify them as being effective is presented by Berlinger and Tikunoff (1976). These researchers identified a number of behaviors which discriminated between more effective and less effective teacher at various grade levels and in different subject areas. They categorize them as either being "effective teacher behaviors" or "ineffective teacher behaviors." The "effective teacher behaviors" are behaviors in which the teacher reacts constructively to students’ feelings and attitudes, actively listens to what a student is saying, reading, and reciting, gives direction or a threat and follows through with it, seems confident in teaching a given subject and demonstrates a grasp of it, checks on student progress regularly and adjusts instruction accordingly, expresses positive, pleasant, optimistic attitudes and feelings, encourages students to take responsibility
for their own work, capitalizes instructionally on unexpected incidents and prepares students for learning by reviewing, outlining, explaining objectives and summarizing.

Among the "ineffective teacher behaviors" are unpreparedness for instruction, embarrassing students openly, poor organization, filling time with busy work, calling attention to self without any good reason, threatening a group for the misdemeanor of an individual as well as giving meaningless threats. These behaviors are not peculiar to the findings of this research, but are also evident in those previously presented.

Effective teaching for some researchers is not limited to instruction alone, but includes other behaviors which are not usually identified to be necessary for effective teaching to take place. According to Purkey, Novak and other motivational specialists, effective teaching goes beyond instructional techniques to encompass all types of interactions between teachers and learners: it values respect for human beings over concern for efficiency and effectiveness. Motivational teaching is based on stimulating the interest of students and by communicating their own caring to them. Purkey and Novak identify seven such skills, namely:

1. Developing trust
2. Reaching each student
3. Reading situations
4. Making invitations attractive
5. Ensuring delivery
6. Negotiating
7. Handling rejection.

Madeline Hunter (1983), also recognizes the role of motivation in academic achievement, but she places a far greater emphasis on lesson design and instructional
expertise as is presented in her "Mastery Teaching."

Following the review of the literature on effective teaching, this researcher concluded that it is towards this ideal that educators strive, and for which they are trained; consequently, teachers should be measured on these expectations. This researcher, therefore, selected from these findings, those dimensions which were applicable to the Jamaican situation, and added any which she thought were present in the Jamaican setting, but were not necessarily addressed by any of the instruments used in the American setting. The dimensions identified for the purpose of this research are set out below, and each is defined in terms of its indicators.

**Classroom Environment** - the physical appearance of the classroom. This incorporates such factors as cleanliness, orderliness, easy access to students, orderly display of charts and teaching aids, compatible seating arrangement and attractiveness of the classroom.

**Teacher Preparation For Instruction** - the readiness of the teacher to give instruction in terms of the plans he/she has made for the class. It considers details of the lesson plan, clarity of goals and objectives, relevance of student activities to goals and objectives, appropriateness of subject matter, appropriateness of teaching aids and logical sequencing of activities.

**Classroom Instruction** - the quality and types of teaching activities which take place in the classroom. It refers to the level of instruction, content development, building for transfer, promoting engagement, use of time, practice and reinforcement activities, attention to the three major learning styles and written oral expressions in the class.

**Learning Environment** - the climate or feeling which is generated in the classroom, which will foster and encourage learning. This includes such factors as the relevance of the learning/teaching content to the students experience/interest, the feeling of
courtesy and mutual respect which exists, avoidance of sarcasm and negative criticisms, recognition of the students efforts to learn, challenging students, varying stimuli and establishing and maintaining positive rapport with student.

**Classroom Management** - the teachers ability to control and monitor activities which take place in the classroom. It incorporates such activities as the communication of behavioral expectations, maintenance of consistent behavioral standards, verbal and non-verbal feedback to students about their behavior, maintenance of contact with students and the continuous monitoring of activities in the classroom.

**Assessment of Student Progress** - all methods which the teacher uses to find out the extent to which the student has learned what he was taught. This includes such activities as checking for understanding, questioning, creating opportunities for application, giving independent practice and testing.

**Extra-Curricular Activities** - the teachers involvement in activities which are not a part of the regular school curriculum, but which officially take place in the school and play a vital role in the every day activities, in the school. These include fund-raising activities, school fairs and exhibitions, soliciting assistance on behalf of the school, coaching after school games, involvement in school clubs and organizations and participating in activities for professional development.

**Community Relationships** - the teachers efforts to involve community personnel in school activities. It includes activities which help to maintain close contact between school and parents, between school and community, using community resources in instruction, involving parents, in school activities and working cooperatively with colleagues and administrators.

**Personnel Characteristics** - those behaviors and traits which the teacher displays while
carrying out his or her duties in the classroom. It includes such characteristics as warmth, enthusiasm, encouragement, flexibility, resourcefulness, human and sensitivity to students needs and feelings. It also includes the extent to which the teacher is appropriately attired, and exhibits professional behavior.

Additional Duties and Responsibilities - duties and responsibilities related to general school activities which the teacher is expected to perform and which are necessary for the efficient functioning of the school. It includes such duties as record-keeping, handling written communications, organizing school/class related meetings, handling routine tasks and assuming their share of school responsibilities.

Student Welfare Support - assistance which teachers give to students in need, and which are not required in their job description. These include services such as counseling for students and parents, financial help, extra unpaid tutoring, protecting students from abuse and securing for them assistance which will enable them to attend school and to better participate in the learning process.

Validating The Instrument

In order for an instrument to be truly worthwhile, it must first be validated. Gronlund (1971), suggest that the most important question to be considered when developing an instrument is whether or not the results which will be ascertained will serve the particular purposes for which they were intended. This, he claims, will indicate the extent to which the instrument is valid. Borg and Gall (1979), on the other hand, simply describe validity as the degree to which a test measures what it purports to measure. They claim that there are four types: Content, predictive, concurrent and construct validity.
Content validity is described as the degree to which the sample of test items represents the content that the test is designed to measure. It is not expressed in numerical terms as coefficients, instead, it is usually appraised through an objective comparison of the test items with curriculum content and the skills they propose to teach, (as in mathematical test instruments).

Predictive validity, on the other hand, is described as the degree to which the predictions which have been made by a test are confirmed by the later behavior of the subjects. Gronlund (1971), refers to this type of validity as criterion validity, in that the predictive behavior is measured against a set of established criteria. This type of validity is usually established for standardized tests before deciding to use such test results as predictors.

Concurrent validity, according to Borg and Gall (1979), is a second type of criterion-related validity. It is determined by relating the test scores of a group of subjects to a criterion measure administered at the same time as the standardized test. It supposes that the criterion measure against which another measure is being tested has high predictive and construct validity, since without these, the researcher would never be sure that his/her measure has concurrent validity.

The last type of validity discussed by Borg and Gall (1979), is construct validity. Construct validity is described as the extent to which a particular test can be shown to measure a hypothetical construct. Intelligence, anxiety and creativity are said to be examples of hypothetical constructs because they are not directly observable, but are inferred from observable behavior. In establishing this type of validity, the researcher usually sets up hypotheses about the characteristics of one individual showing a particular type of behavior against another who does not show that particular
type of behavior. The extent to which the researchers hypotheses are proven true, will determine the construct validity of the instrument being tested.

In this particular research, the researcher was primarily concerned with establishing content validity. Face validity, which resembles content validity, was also established as the researcher asked experts in the field of study to assess, at face value, if the instrument seemed to contain items which were measuring a particular content. This helped lend further credence to the process of developing the instrument. The content validity, per se, was established in keeping with the three criteria suggested by Borg and Gall (1979), and which were previously discussed. The content of the instrument was the result of extensive research into the area being researched, and sought to measure all the dimensions which have been identified as being critical to teachers performing their duties effectively in the classroom. The researcher also described the objectives of the exercise and stated how items for the instrument were selected. The responses of the three sub-samples being used, (teachers, principals and education officers), was compared to see the extent to which they agree on what truly are the behaviors which should be expected by teachers when performing their jobs, and therefore, should be evaluated in the Jamaican situation.
CHAPTER V
Research Methods and Procedure

The purpose of this research exercise is to conduct a comparative study of the perceptions of Jamaican Secondary School teachers, principals and education officers of the administrative procedures which should be used in conducting Teacher Performance Evaluation, what the content of such an instrument should be, and how the information which is gathered from such an evaluation should be used, based on a newly developed Teacher Performance Evaluation Instrument. In addition, the responses of teachers and principals will be examined in terms of years of teaching experience qualifications and school type.

As was stated earlier in this research, a number of research questions were formulated to guide the research process as well as to seek for specific information based on the questions posed. These questions are:

1. Is there a difference in what secondary level school teachers, principals and education officers perceive should be the content of a teacher performance evaluation instrument?

2. Do secondary level school teachers, principals and education officers differ in their perception of the procedures which should be used in the evaluation process?

3. Do secondary level school teachers, principals and education officers differ in their perception of the use of information gathered from the evaluation exercise?

4. Does school type, qualifications or years of teaching experience affect
the perception of secondary level school teachers and principals on the administrative procedures, content and use of teacher performance evaluation?

5. Does qualification or years of teaching experience affect the perception of secondary level school education officers on the administrative procedures, content and use of teacher performance evaluation?

6. Is there significant difference in the perception of secondary level school teachers of the content, administrative procedures and use of evaluation information based on teaching experience?

7. Is there a significant difference in the perception of secondary level school principals of the administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation information based on school type?

8. Is there a significant difference in the perception of secondary level school principals of the content, administrative procedures and use of evaluation information based on qualifications?

9. Is there a significant difference in the perception of secondary school principals on the content, administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation information based on years of teaching experience?

10. Is there a significant difference in the perception of high school principals and teachers on content, administrative procedures and use of teacher performance evaluation information?

11. Is there a significant difference in the perception of secondary school principals and teachers of the content, administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation information?
The diagrammatic representation set out in Chapter III also outlined the variables to be studied and the interrelationship between these variables. In keeping with the research questions and the design of the research, it also indicated the use of moderator variables to help give more specific information in respect to the questions outlined.

In this chapter, a description of the research design, population, sample, instruments - their validity and reliability, administrative procedures, statistical analyses and limitations of the study are presented.

Research Design

This study is designed to compare the perceptions of a selected sample of individuals in the educational system in Jamaica on certain aspects of teacher performance evaluation. By nature of the topic being investigated, the specific research design used is the survey research design. According to Borg and Gall (1979), a survey research is one in which the researcher typically employs the use of questionnaire and interviews, in order to determine the opinions, attitudes, preferences, and perceptions of persons of interest to the research (p. 27). In this type of research design, the researcher also has the opportunity to select random samples from the national population. These features are all employed in this research, and therefore justify the research design which has been chosen.

The Population

The general population from which the sample for this research exercise is taken, is that of all secondary school teachers, principals and education officers in the Jamaican Educational System. This population embraces personnel from both private
and public secondary institutions as well as those located in urban and rural areas.

The Sample

The sample is comprised of the specific group which will participate in the research exercise. It was selected from the population previously described and reflects the characteristics of that population.

Within the limitations and conceptions of this research design, the sample was taken from both rural and urban New Secondary and Traditional High schools. The New Secondary schools are all co-educational, but the Traditional High schools are divided into co-educational, single sex boys' and single sex girls' schools. Efforts were therefore made to get equal representation from each of these types of schools, therefore the schools were stratified in terms of these divisions and then schools were randomly selected from each of these stratified school groups. There are sixty four New Secondary/Secondary schools and fifty six Traditional High/Grammar schools in the island. Approximately twenty five percent of each type of school was selected.

As rural/urban factors were not critical to the type of data which was being sought, it was not necessary to stratify the schools in terms of these dichotomies to ensure representation of schools from either zone. In fact, the researcher was confident that, through random selection of schools from each school type, schools from both rural and urban areas in the island had equal chances of being selected since these schools are not clustered in any one area, but are fairly well distributed across the island.

Males and females are represented in the sample; however, since the data will not be analyzed in terms of sex, there was no need to ensure any specific type of
representation of these sexes in the sample.

Through a process of stratified random sampling, the researcher ensured that the sample is a true reflection of the population from which it was taken, yet contains the subsamples required for analysis. These subsamples are teachers, principals and education officers. The principal of each school from which teachers were selected, made up the principal subsample while all the education officers who monitor and service the secondary schools selected, formed the education officer subsample. This latter group is very small, with only nine education officers to monitor secondary level schools in Jamaica. From this group, the education officers responsible for the schools selected, form this subsample.

The subsample, made of teachers, is the largest group and represent approximately 25% of the teacher population of the schools selected.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsamples</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>%of Total Sample</th>
<th>Subsample Totals</th>
<th>%of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Ofs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prin. Hg.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prin. Sec.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. Hg.</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. Sec.</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key for subsample abbreviations.

Ed. Ofs. - Education Officers
Prin. Hg. - Principal High
Prin. Sec. - Principal Secondary
Tech. Hg. - Teacher High
Tech. Sec. - Teacher Secondary
In order to give more information about the composition of the sample, the researcher also solicited data in terms of respondent’s years of teaching experience, the number of years in their present position and their educational qualifications. It is perceived that this additional information will help to create a clearer picture of the type of education work force with which the researcher is dealing as well as be used for further analysis of the data to be presented in Chapter VI. This researcher contends that these factors could influence the perceptions of these individuals also on the variables being investigated.

Instrumentation

Two questions were used to collect data for this research. The first questionnaire was designed to gather information on the content on the Teacher Performance Evaluation instrument developed by this researcher and the information collected used to establish the content validity of that evaluation instrument, and the second questionnaire was designed to collect information on the perception of respondents on the administrative procedures which should be employed in the teacher performance evaluation process and how the information collected should be used. (See Appendices for copies of instruments). The questionnaires also collected biographic data on the respondents, as well as solicited any comments which respondents wished to make about any aspect of the research on the instruments they were given.

Each member of the sample, that is, teachers, principals and education officers received individual questionnaires. Specific instructions pertaining to the completion of the questionnaires were set out on the questionnaires to ensure their proper
completion. Respondents were not required to identify themselves by name however, they were required to identify themselves in terms of the research groups into which they would fall, namely, teachers, principals and education officers.

Before the questionnaires were administered, they were reviewed by experts in the field of Research and Educational Administration, who were also familiar with the Jamaican situation, to assess the items in terms of their ability to measure the concepts for which they were designed.

Details of the instrument which has been developed by this researcher to evaluate the performance of teachers in Jamaican Secondary schools were presented and discussed in Chapter III.

**Administrative Procedure**

At the end of the 1989-90 Fall semester, permission was sought and obtained from the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Education, to conduct this research in the Jamaican Educational System. Following this, administrators in randomly selected rural and urban secondary schools were approached for permission to include their schools in the sample to be studied. This permission was obtained, and the administration of questionnaires only awaited approval of this research proposal.

Data collection took place during the Summer of the 1989-90 school year. Data were collected using the two instruments previously discussed. It took each respondent approximately forty minutes to complete the questionnaires, and only questionnaires that were completed were used in this exercise. This resulted in a number of questionnaires being disqualified for use in this research; however, the researcher was able to collect a total of five hundred and sixteen completed
questionnaires from a total of one thousand questionnaires which were originally distributed. Although the margin of error would have been lessened with a larger sample, the number collected was seen adequate since it represented approximately twenty five percent of the population. Scientific researchers such as Elzey (1986), Borg and Gall (1979), and Tuckman (1974), all agree that a sample size of ten percent or more is adequate for researches such as this. In fact, Elzey states that, depending on the nature of the research, an even smaller sample size can be adequate.

The questionnaires were completed independently and returned to the researcher within two months of administration. Following this, the data were coded and collated in a manner to facilitate suitable analytical procedures designed to provide information to answer the research questions previously posed, as well as to prove or disprove hypotheses stated.

Method of Analysis

As stated earlier, this study was two-fold in nature. First, it sought to validate a newly developed instrument in terms of its content as a measure of teacher performance in the secondary level school system in Jamaica, and secondly, it was designed to investigate and compare the perception of selected individuals in the secondary level school system on the administrative procedure and use of information in the teacher performance evaluation process.

Due to the two-fold nature of this research, data were analyzed to meet the objectives of the study. The "t" test and analysis of variance were used to determine differences in perceptions for the different sub-samples being investigated. The Tukey's or Scheffe's statistical techniques were used to determine significant outcomes. Other
simple statistics, such as means, standard deviation, frequency counts, cross tabulations and percentages, were also used where they help to provide more explicit information.

Data pertaining to the content of the newly developed evaluation instrument were used to establish the content validity of the instrument through the use of Cronbach's statistical techniques for determining internal consistency by way of correlations. As was reported in Chapter IV, this technique yielded a reliability coefficient of 0.86.

Limitations

It was previously mentioned in this chapter that education researchers such as Tuckman (1974), and Borg and Gall (1979), agree that the smaller a research sample is, the greater is the margin of error. Although limitations are not directly related to margins of error, they do tend to relate to factors which affect or relate to margins of error. Such factors are sample size and selection as well as research design among others.

The following are the limitations which are presented by this research and which will affect its use and interpretation.

1. The sample is small, and although representative of the population from which it was taken, presents the possibility for a greater margin of error than that of a larger sample. Consequently, the findings of this research cannot be generalized, and are applicable to this sample alone. Inferences may be made, but no generalizations can be made.

2. The sample is not stratified in terms of geographic location, and therefore, there is the possibility that there are intervening variables
which are the result of this factor, and for which there was no control.

3. The perceptions of the sample on teacher performance evaluation are limited to a single instrument which has been provided by the researcher. This instrument is not necessarily all encompassing and the research does not offer alternative measures for consideration. The responses given are, therefore, influenced by the contents of this single instrument.

4. This research focuses on the evaluation of teachers in the secondary level school system in Jamaica only and does not consider evaluation at any other level or in any other situation.

5. This research is designed to investigate only three aspects of teacher performance evaluation, and does not exhaust all the factors of teacher performance evaluation which could affect the evaluation process or be considered for investigation.
CHAPTER VI
Presentation and Analysis of Data

Introduction

The purpose of this investigation was to validate a newly developed measure of teacher performance evaluation and to compare the perceptions of education officers, principals and teachers on their perceptions of the content, administrative procedures and use of information in the teacher evaluation process. Details pertaining to the validation of the teacher performance instrument were presented in Chapter IV. This chapter will examine data on the perceptions of the respondents on the dependent variables previously stated.

Data Presentation

In this chapter, data gathered from the questionnaires and subjected to statistical analyses using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) are presented and analyzed. The data are reviewed in terms of:

a) The sample overall

b) The individual subsamples comprised of education officers, principals and teachers, as well as divisions of principals high, and principals secondary and for the teachers, divisions of teacher high and teacher secondary.

It should be noted that "high" and "secondary" denote the type of school in which the individuals work.
Data Analysis

The data are analyzed as follows:

1. Frequency distributions for respondents were obtained to show a description of the respondents in terms of their job classification, years of teaching experience, time in present position and highest level of educational qualification.

2. The Subprogram One Way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) was used to determine if there were any significant differences among the responses of education officers, principals and teachers on the dependent variables content, administrative procedures and use of evaluation information, in terms of job classification, years of teaching experience and school type. The lowest level of statistical significance which was chosen was .05.

3. The Student’s "t" or "t" Test, as it is commonly known, was the subprogram used to determine if there were significant differences on responses between specified subsamples such as principals high and principals secondary or teachers high and teachers secondary on the dependent variables—content, administrative procedures and use of evaluation information.

4. The subprogram Crosstabs was used with items 2,3,4,20,21,22,23 and 25 with each subsample, namely: education officers, principals and teachers.

In order to improve clarity and statistical understanding in the presentation of this chapter, the presentation and analysis of data is divided into four sections with
data assembled on tables, followed by written analytical statements. The sections are:

1. Sample Description Data
2. Analysis in Terms of Hypotheses
3. Crosstabulations on Selected Items by Subsamples

Key to subsample abbreviations:

- Ed. Offs. = education officers
- Prin. Hg. = Principal High (school)
- Prin. Sec. = Principal Secondary (school)
- Teach. Hg. = Teacher High (school)
- Teach. Sec. = Teacher Secondary (school)

Sample Description Data

Table 2

Distribution of Respondents in Terms of Subsamples and Years Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsamples</th>
<th>1-2+</th>
<th>3-5+</th>
<th>6-10+</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>over</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Offs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prin. Hg.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prin. Sec.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Hg.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Sec.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 above, shows that all education officers and principals have had more
than 15 years teaching experience, but the teaching experience among the teachers range from 1 to over 15 years. It must also be noted that, despite this wide distribution of teaching experience among the teachers, only 10.5% of the teachers have less than 3 years teaching experience. Also noteworthy is the fact that 39% of the teachers in the secondary schools have in excess of 15 years teaching experience while 29% of the high school teachers have more than 15 years teaching experience. Overall, this sample has a fair number of years teaching experience; therefore, respondents should be quite familiar with the operations of schools and the expectations of the educational system.

Table 3

Distribution of Respondents in Terms of Subsamples and Years in Present Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsamples</th>
<th>1-2+</th>
<th>3-5+</th>
<th>6-10+</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>over</th>
<th>Row Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Offs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prin. Hg.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prin. Sec.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Hg.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Sec.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>26.22</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 3 indicates that with the exception of one, the education officers have been in their present positions between 11 and 15+ years, while 9 out of 30 principals have been in their present positions for more than 11 years. In the case
of the teachers, however, more than 50% have been in their present positions for less than 6 years.

Table 4
Distribution of Respondents in Terms of Subsamples and Educational Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsamples</th>
<th>Educational Qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Offs</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prin. Hg.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prin. Sec.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Hg.</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Sec.</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data on Table 4 shows that only 10.5% of the respondents have not been certified to teach: none of these being principals or education officers. Also noteworthy is the fact that 52.2% have either received university or specialist education. In the case of the principals, 90% of them have university education at either the graduate or post graduate level. Fifty percent of the teachers, on the other hand, are only college trained and therefore, have not had any university training.
Key for terms used

Col. - College
Grd. - Graduate
Pst. - Post
Spec. - Special
Pre-trnd. - Pre-trained

Analysis in Terms of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

Ho: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of secondary level school teachers, principals and educational officers regarding the content of a teacher performance evaluation instrument.

An analysis of variance was conducted to compare the scores of Content of the three major subsamples, education officers, principals and teachers. The results are displayed on the Table 5 which follows.

Table 5

One-Way Analysis of Variance Mounted for Content Across Subsamples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>533.021</td>
<td>266.510</td>
<td>6.590</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>20745.698</td>
<td>40.440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>21278.720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 shows that there is significant difference in the perceptions of the subsamples, namely education officers, principals and teachers on the variable content at the .001 level. This result indicates that the difference could not be contributed to chance as the probability of this result occurring by chance would be 1 in 1000.

In order to ascertain between which specific groups the difference was to be found, the data was further tested using the Scheffe's statistical procedure. Table 6 sets out the results of the Scheffe's test.

**Table 6**

*Scheffe’s Test of Significance Between Groups of Content*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsample</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Ed. Officers</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Off.</td>
<td>72,833</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>74,967</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>78,515</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .050 level and above.

The Scheffe’s test indicated that the significant difference existed between the perceptions of the teachers and the principals. The mean scores of the teachers is highest, followed by the principals and the education officers; however, the number of respondents in each group varies from 6 in the case of the education officers to 30 for the principals and 480 for the teachers. The results in Table 6 demonstrate a significant difference at the .001 level. Because of these results among the subsamples, hypothesis 1 was rejected.
Hypothesis 2

Ho: There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary level school teachers, principals and education officers of the administrative procedures which should be used in the teacher evaluation process.

The analysis of variance statistical procedure was again employed to compare the scores of respondents on this variable. The results are set out below in Table 7.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.727</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>.2687</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>1648.250</td>
<td>3.213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>1649.975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsamples - Ed. Officers N = 6
Principals N = 30
Teachers N = 480

In this case, the calculated value, was lower than the Table value of 3.47, hence there were no significant differences, at least at the .050 level, between the three subsamples on administrative procedures which should be used in the teacher evaluation process. Hypothesis 2 was, therefore, accepted.

Hypothesis 3

Ho: There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary level school
teachers, principals and education officers of the use of information gathered through teacher evaluation.

Again the Analysis of Variance statistical technique to identify differences between and within groups was used to compare the scores of respondents on one of the dependent variables, in this case, Use of evaluation information. The results are displayed in Table 8.

Table 8

One-Way Analysis of Variance Mounted
for Use Across Subsamples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.065</td>
<td>3.032</td>
<td>1.948</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>798.700</td>
<td>1.557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>804.765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsamples - Ed. Officers N = 6
Principals N = 30
Teachers N = 480

The calculated probability value of .144 was lower than the Table Value of 3.47, which indicated that no two groups were significantly different, at least at the .050 level, in their perceptions of the Use of information gathered from the teacher evaluation process. Hypothesis was also accepted.

Hypothesis 4

Ho: There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary level school
teachers of the content, administrative procedures, and use of teacher evaluation information based on school type.

In order to ascertain the statistical significant, if any, between the mean scores of respondents on these variables, the Student "t" statistical test of significance was calculated. School type was used as the moderator variable and is represented by "high" and "secondary" in the Table where it is used to describe the teachers. The results of this test are displayed on Table 9.

Table 9

**Application of the Student's "t" to Mean Scores**

**Teacher High/Teacher Secondary on the Dependent Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Subsample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Prob. Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT</td>
<td>Teach. Hg.</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>77.896</td>
<td>6.389</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teach. Sec.</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>79.042</td>
<td>6.526</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIN.</td>
<td>Teach. Hg.</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>12.400</td>
<td>1.664</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teach. Sec.</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>12.081</td>
<td>1.908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCEDURE</td>
<td>Teach. Hg.</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>5.090</td>
<td>1.262</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teach. Sec.</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>4.922</td>
<td>1.267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results indicate that in the cases of the variables content and administrative procedure, there was a significant difference between the perceptions of teachers in high schools and teachers in secondary schools. In the case of Content, the mean score for secondary school teachers was higher than that of the high school teachers. For administrative procedures, the mean score for the high school teachers was higher than that for the secondary school teachers. Although there was only a difference of .329 between the two means, this was enough to indicate a statistically
significant difference at the .05 level. The spread of scores from the mean, indicated by the standard deviation, was very close, with only a difference of .136 between them for content and .244 between them for administrative procedures, both in favor of the secondary school teachers. Hypothesis 4 was, therefore, rejected since there was significance indicated in the results.

Hypothesis 5

Ho: There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary level school teachers of the content, administrative procedures and use of evaluation information based on qualifications.

For this hypothesis, scores had to be compared for the secondary school teachers in terms of their qualifications. For this comparison, the analysis of variance was employed over the Student "t", since there was the likelihood of more than two groups emerging for comparison, and a "t" is not able to execute multiple comparisons of this nature, Table 10 gives out the results.
Table 10

One-Way Analysis of Variance Mounted for Content,
Administrative Procedures and Use Across Teachers
Subsample in Terms of Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>240.320</td>
<td>48.064</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>19883.577</td>
<td>41.950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>20123.900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58.605</td>
<td>11.721</td>
<td>3.700</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>1501.643</td>
<td>3.168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>479</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.441</td>
<td>11.088</td>
<td>7.376</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>712.560</td>
<td>1.503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>768.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results indicate a significant difference for the teachers subsample in terms of qualifications on two of the three dependent variables, administrative procedures and use of information, in the teacher evaluation process. The data in its present form, however, does not allow the researcher to identify between which groups these differences lie. It is, therefore, necessary to use the Scheffe's statistical procedure to identify this information. Table 11 displays these results with respect to administrative procedures. To facilitate clear presentation, and easy identification of the groups, the following key applies:
Note also that group data are presented in order of mean scores from the lowest to the highest, and not in terms of ordered group numbers.

### Table 11

**Scheffe's Test of Significance Between Teachers Subsample Across Administrative Procedures by Qualifications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 1 3 4 6 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.260</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>- - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.260</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>* - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.327</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>* - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.375</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>- - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.857</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>* - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>- - - - - -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .050 level and above.

The Scheffe's test indicated that there were more than one pair of groups having significant differences on their perception of administrative procedures according to teachers qualifications. The groups which indicated significant differences were groups 1 and 2, comprised of college trained teachers and pre-trained graduates respectively; groups 3 and 2, comprised of trained graduates and pre-trained graduates respectively;
and groups 6 and 2 comprised of specialists and pre-trained graduates respectively. In all three cases, group 2, the pre-trained graduates, was the common factor.

With regard to use, Table 12 sets out data computed using the Scheffe’s test of significance.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.625</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.720</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.163</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.381</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.609</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.111</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .050 level and above.

The results indicated that the significant differences existed between the perceptions of groups 1 with those of groups 2, 3 and 5. Group 1 is comprised of college trained teachers, group 3 of graduate trained teachers, group 2 of pre-trained graduate teachers and group 5 of trained post graduate teachers.

It should also be noted that the lowest mean score for the individual’s groups was that of group 4, the group with the smallest number of respondents, 8, while the largest mean score was that of the next smallest group which had only 9 respondents.
Hypothesis 6

Ho: There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary level school teachers of the content, administrative procedures and use of evaluation information based on Teaching Experience.

In order to test for this hypothesis, multigroup comparisons were carried out to determine differences in perception. The analysis of variance was therefore used again as it accommodates this type of analysis. The results are displayed on Table 13.

Table 13

One-Way Analysis of Variance Mounted for Content, Administrative Procedures and Use Across Teachers Subsample in Terms of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>146.677</td>
<td>36.670</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>19977.221</td>
<td>42.057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>20123.900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59.173</td>
<td>14.793</td>
<td>4.681</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>1501.074</td>
<td>3.160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>1560.248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.698</td>
<td>3.924</td>
<td>2.478</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>752.302</td>
<td>1.583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>768.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results given on Table 13 indicate that only on administrative procedures
and use were there any significant differences between groups, at least, at the .050 level and above. In this case of administrative procedures, the level of significance was at the .001 level while for use, the significance was at the .043 level. It should be noted, however, that in the case of use, the Scheffe’s test would not compute for a .043 level as it is designed to compute significance at certain set levels. This result indicates, however that the probability of this outcome occurring by chance is 43 in 1000. For the purposes of identifying between which specific groups the difference lies for the .001 level of significance in the case of administrative procedures, however, the Scheffe’s test was used. These results are set out in Table 14. To facility easy presentation and easy identification of the groups in this analysis, the following key applies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>GROUPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.296</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.154</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.280</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.333</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.481</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .001 level.
The significant differences have been identified to lie in the perceptions of groups 1 and groups 4, 2 and 5. Group 1 in this case, is comprised of teachers with between 1 and 2+ years of teaching experience; group 4 is comprised of teachers with between 11 and 15 years of teaching experience, and group 2 is comprised of teachers with between 3 and 5+ years of teaching experience. It should also be noted that there is a narrow difference between the lowest and the highest mean scores for the five groups. Since significant differences did occur in results when hypothesis 6 was tested, this hypothesis, then, was rejected.

Hypothesis 7

Ho: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of secondary level school principals of the content, administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation information based on School Type.

In order to ascertain the statistical significance, if any, between the mean scores of respondents on these variables, the Student "t" statistical procedure was used. School type, the moderator variable, is represented by "high" and "secondary" in relation to the principals, on the Table which follows, and on which the results appear.

The subsample identification key is:

Principal High = Prin. Hg.
Principal Secondary = Prin. Sec.
Table 15

Application of the Student’s "t" to the Mean Scores for Principal High/Principal Secondary on the Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Subsample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Prob. Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT</td>
<td>Prin. Hg</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>74.285</td>
<td>4.428</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prin. Sec.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75.562</td>
<td>4.412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIN. PROCEDURES</td>
<td>Prin. Hg.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prin. Sec.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>1.506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE</td>
<td>Prin. Hg.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.428</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prin. Sec.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.437</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results indicate that, on none of the three dependent variables, were there any significant differences to be found for principals perceptions in terms of school type. In the case of content, however, there was some noted variance between the mean scores although this was not great enough for there to be a significant outcome. For administrative procedures, the mean scores were the same while for use, the variance was minute. The widest spread of scores from the mean, indicated by the standard deviation also occurred in the case of content. Hypothesis 7 was, thus, accepted.

Hypothesis 8

Ho: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of secondary level school principals of the content, administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation information based on qualifications.
To test this hypothesis, scores were compared for the secondary level school principals in terms of their qualification. In order to make this comparison, the analysis of variance subprogram was used over the Student's "t" since multigroup comparisons had to be made, and the Student "t" is not designed for that. Table 16 sets out the results.

Table 16

One-Way Analysis of Variance Mounted for Content, Administrative Procedures and Use Across Principals Subsample in Terms of Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.105</td>
<td>10.035</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>528.862</td>
<td>20.340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>558.967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATIVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCEDURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.852</td>
<td>1.284</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56.147</td>
<td>2.160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.385</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23.981</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25.366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results on Table 16, above, indicate that, on the three dependent variables,
there were no significant differences of the perceptions of the principals when analyzed in terms of their qualifications. As there were no significant outcomes, it was not necessary to apply the Scheffe’s test of significance; therefore, hypothesis 8 was accepted.

**Hypothesis 9**

Ho: There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary level school principals of the content, administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation information based on years of teaching experience.

As testing this hypothesis would also entail multiple group comparisons, the analysis of variance statistical procedure was again employed. The results are set out on Table 17 which follows.
Table 17
One-Way Analysis of Variance Mounted for Content, Administrative Procedures and Use Across Principals Subsample in Terms of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.005</td>
<td>6.002</td>
<td>.2963</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>546.961</td>
<td>20.257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>558.966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCEDURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.487</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58.512</td>
<td>2.167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>1.282</td>
<td>.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.166</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25.366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the principal subsample, in terms of teaching experience, there were no significant differences in perception on the three dependent variables. Hypothesis 9 was also accepted.

Hypothesis 10

Ho: There is no significant difference in the perception of high school principals and teachers on content, administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation
To test this hypothesis, the Student's "t" subprogram was used since there were only two group means to be compared. The results are displayed on Table 18.

Table 18

Application of the Student's "t" to the Mean Scores for Principals High/Teachers High on the Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Subsample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Prob. Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT</td>
<td>Prin. Hg</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>74.285</td>
<td>4.428</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teach. Hg.</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>77.895</td>
<td>6.389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIN.</td>
<td>Prin. Hg.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCEDURES</td>
<td>Teach. Hg.</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>12.398</td>
<td>1.664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE</td>
<td>Prin. Hg.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.428</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teach Hg.</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>5.090</td>
<td>1.262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data above indicate significant findings on the variable content alone. The level of significance was at the .011 which indicates that the probability of this result occurring by chance are 11 in 1000. This result indicates that there is a significant difference in the perception of high school principals and teachers on the content of teacher performance evaluation. The mean scores for the other two variables show very little variance. Hypothesis 10 was rejected since there was a significant difference in perceptions in the content area.

Hypothesis 11
Ho: There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary school
principals and teachers of the administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation information.

The Student's "t" was again used to compare the mean scores of respondents on the dependent variables under investigation. The results are displayed on Table 19.

**Table 19**

*Application of the Student's "t" to the Mean Scores for Principal Secondary/Teachers Secondary on the Dependent Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Subsample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT</td>
<td>Prin. Sec.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75.562</td>
<td>4.412</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teach. Sec.</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>79.042</td>
<td>6.526</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIN. PROCEDURES</td>
<td>Prin. Sec.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>1.506</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teach. Sec.</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>12.081</td>
<td>1.908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE</td>
<td>Prin. Sec.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.437</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teach. Sec.</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>4.922</td>
<td>1.267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data on the table above, indicate two significant findings. These are for the variables content and use. In the case of content, there are significant differences between the perceptions of secondary school principals and teachers on the content of teacher performance evaluation at the .008 level. This shows that the probability of these results occurring by chance is 8 in 1000. For use, the level of significance was .042, indicating that the probability of these results occurring by chance is 42 in 1000. Again, the greatest variance occurred where there was the greatest significance of
results, namely, in the case of content, followed by use. In the case of administrative procedures, the variance in the mean scores was minute. The dispersion of scores around the mean was also widest in the case of content, followed by use. There was very little difference in the dispersion of scores between the groups for administrative procedures. Since there was significance, however, in content and use, hypothesis 11 was rejected.

Crosstabulations on Selected Items by Subsamples

Additional Analyses

In addition to soliciting information on the dependent variable being studied, the researcher thought it would be useful to gather information which could provide additional information on certain aspects of teacher performance evaluation which are also of prime importance. In addition to the 11 previously stated research questions which were posed in Chapter I to guide the research, 15 other research questions were formulated. The first 11 questions were answered in terms of the 11 hypotheses discussed in the preceding section while the additional 15 research questions will be analyzed in the section which follows.

Research Question 12

Who should evaluate the performance of teachers in the classroom?

Item 20

In response to this item, respondents were given seven possible answers as indicated in the table on the succeeding page. The responses were crosstabulated with each of the seven options in terms of the subsamples being investigated, education officers, principals and teachers. Respondents were free to select more than one
evaluator. The results are set out on Table 20.

Table 20

Crosstabulations on Evaluator Preferred by Subsamples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator Preferred</th>
<th>Ed. Offs.</th>
<th>Subsamples</th>
<th>Teach.</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of Depts.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prins.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Officers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Himself/</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COLUMNS TOTAL 6 30 480 516 100.0

The data on Table 20 indicate that 4 out of 7 possible evaluators were selected by all six education officers to be teacher performance evaluators. The four were heads of departments, principals, education officers and the teacher himself or herself. Four of the six education officers selected students to be evaluators while two selected peer teachers.

For principals the popular evaluators selected, in order of frequency from highest to lowest were, heads of departments, principals and assistant principals, students, the teacher himself or herself, education officer and finally peer teachers.

In the case of teachers, the most frequently selected evaluator was the principal, followed by the teacher himself or herself, then assistant principals, students, peers teachers and finally education officers.

For the overall sample, it is interesting to note the percentage of the sample
which selected each evaluator. Heads of departments was the most commonly selected evaluator, having been selected by 86.6% of the respondents while the least popular was education officers, having been selected by 36.0% of the respondents.

Research Question 13

What method should be used to evaluate a teacher's performance?

Item 21

For this question, respondents were given four popular methods used in evaluating teachers. They were allowed to select more than one response. The crosstabulation subprogram was used to compute responses according to the subsamples being investigated. These results are displayed on Table 21.

Table 21

Crosstabulations on Preferred Evaluation Measures by Subsamples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Measure</th>
<th>Ed. Offs.</th>
<th>Subsamples</th>
<th>Teach.</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Achievement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Rating Scale</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data displayed on Table 21 indicate that all six education officers selected observation and self rating scales to be the two methods which should be used to evaluate a teacher's performance. Four education officers selected interviews and student achievements to be used to measure teacher performance.

In the case of the principals, self rating scales proved to be the most popular
selection, having been chosen by 29 out of 30 principals while interviews were the least popular having been chosen by only 19 principals.

For teachers, the most popular measure selected was observation, having received the support of some 473 teachers out of a possible 480. The second choice by teachers was interviews, followed by self rating scales and student achievement.

In terms of the total sample, the most popular evaluation measure was observation, with 97.7% of the total sample selecting this method of evaluation. This was followed by interviews, self rating scales and student achievement. Less than 50% of the total sample indicated that student achievement should be used as a measure of teacher performance.

Research Question 14

How long should the actual evaluation process last?

Item 21

For this item, respondents were required to select only one response. Crosstabulations were again computed for the subsample on each response option given. The results are set out on Table 22.
The data displayed on Table 22 show that, for the teachers and education officers subsamples, the popular length of time selected for actual teacher evaluation, was a class period. For principals, 25-35 minutes was the most popular length of time selected. This, however, did not change the fact that 63% of the total sample selected a class period. The last popular period of time was 20-25 minutes for the total population as well as for teachers, while 15-20 minutes was the least popular for principals. It should be noted that all education officers selected the class period as the time for the actual teacher performance evaluation.

Research Question 15

Which evaluation response form would best facilitate easy rating of performance evaluation?

Item 23

For this item respondents were given three possible choices from which they were to select only one. Using the Crosstabulation subprogram, the following results
were obtained.

Table 23

Crosstabulations on Rating Methods by Subsamples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Methods</th>
<th>Ed. Offs.</th>
<th>Prin.</th>
<th>Teach.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coded Sheets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>31.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Coded &amp; Narrative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>60.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data on Table 23 show that both coded and narrative methods have been selected by the subsamples as methods which would best facilitate easy rating of teachers during evaluations. The second most popular selection was coded response sheets which were selected by individuals in all subsamples, however, narrative reports were not selected by either education officers or principals and were the least popular among the teachers.

Research Question 16

Which response form would give the most accurate information on the performance evaluation?

Item 24

Responses were given five options from which to choose one. The fifth option required that the respondent make suggestions for alternative forms to collect evaluation data. There were very few individuals who gave alternative suggestions, and these will
be presented following the data presentation on Table 24.

Table 24

Crosstabulations on Evaluation Report Form for Accuracy by Subsample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Form</th>
<th>Ed. Offs</th>
<th>Subsamples</th>
<th>Teach.</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coded Sheets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Coded &amp; Narrative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Coded or Narrative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>480</strong></td>
<td><strong>516</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data displayed indicate that the coded and narrative reports used together, were selected to be the forms which would give the most accurate information on the performance evaluation exercise. Sixty-seven percent of the total sample selected this method as did the majority of respondents in each subsample. Five respondents, all of whom were teachers indicated that neither the coded or narrative reports would give accurate information on the teachers performance evaluation, however, only four teachers indicated that another form would give more accurate information. Unfortunately, the respondents did not indicate what other form this would be.

**Research Question 17**

What should be done with the teacher performance evaluation report?

**Item 25**

This item gave four suggestions on what could be done with evaluation reports.
and respondents were allowed to select as many responses as they chose. The results computed for the subsamples across the four responses are set out in Table 25.

### Table 25

**Crosstabulations on Method of Retention of Evaluation Forms by Subsamples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Retention</th>
<th>Subsamples</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed. Offs.</td>
<td>Subsamples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's Local File</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given to Teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's Ministry File</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Retained</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before commenting on the data given here, it is important to note that respondents could have selected more than one method of retention of evaluating reports. The data displayed on Table 25 indicate that there were 624 responses in excess of the total sample size which suggests that most respondents selected more than one method of retention of evaluation reports. Most respondents, representing 96.5% of the total sample, indicated that evaluation reports should be given to the teacher and 85.3% indicated that the reports should be retained on the teacher's local file. One-hundred seventy-five respondents or 34% of the sample indicated that the reports should be retained on the teachers file in the Ministry while 27 or 5.2% indicated that the reports should not be retained.
Research Question 16

For what purposes should the evaluation report be used?

Item 26

This item also allowed respondents to select more than one response. There was a total of 6 choices given to respondents with a seventh option to give suggestions. All 516 responded only to the 6 choices given and refrained from giving suggestions. The results of crosstabulation procedures are displayed on Table 26.

Table 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Ed. Offs</th>
<th>Subsamples</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prin.</td>
<td>Teach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Appmt.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Dev.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Increases</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference/Recommendation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data show that, again, a large number of the sample made multiple selections of responses to this item. In the case of the education officers, only for the use of evaluation information for staff development did all 6 education officers agree. For the other 5 responses, five education officers responded to all. The principals too made multiple selections. The most popular selections by the principals were staff development, promotions, reference/recommendation, permanent appointment and firing (termination). The least popular selection was salary increase.
For the teachers subsample, the most popular uses of evaluation information selected in order of frequency of responses were promotions, references/recommendations, permanent appointment, staff development, firing and finally salary increases. Unlike the case of the education officer and principals, the use of evaluation reports for staff development was not among the popular selections by the teachers. This was also the reflective of the order in which selections were made by the total sample.

Research Question 19

Who should be evaluated?

Item 27

This item required respondents to make a single selection from four possible selections, each addressing different classifications of teachers in secondary schools. The results of the crosstabulation procedure for each response by subsamples are set in Table 27.

Table 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Ed. Offs.</th>
<th>Subsamples</th>
<th>Teach.</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob./Temp.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Teacher's Except H.O.D.'s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Teachers Except Senior Teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data indicate that, for all three subsamples, it was perceived that all teachers should be evaluated. This response accounted for 94.2% of the responses for the total population. All education officers and principals agreed that all teachers should be evaluated; however, there was some dissent among the teachers with 3.3% electing to have only teachers who are on probation or who are temporarily employed evaluated and 2.5% electing to have all teachers except senior teachers evaluated. No one indicated that all teachers except heads of department should be evaluated.
CHAPTER VII

Interpretation of Findings

Implications and Recommendations

Overview

"The Chapter of summarization and conclusions looks backward, and also forward through consideration of applications, recommendations, and needed research. The final chapter should be an illustration of the adage that the whole is greater than the sum of the parts."

(Good, 1972, p. 434)

If Good's statement, recorded above, is given some consideration in the construction of this final chapter, it would seem that there are two primary tasks to be addressed, that of:

1) Recording "backward-looking" aspects; in other words, presenting an overview of the research, and
2) "Looking forward" through the interpretation of the data, arriving at logical conclusions, and then drawing implications from these in respect to teacher performance evaluation at the secondary level of education in Jamaica.

The aim of this research was twofold in nature; one, to validate a newly developed teacher performance evaluation instrument and two, to investigate and compare the perceptions of secondary level school education officers, principals and...
teachers on what should constitute the content of a teacher performance evaluation instrument, what administrative procedures should be used in the evaluation process and how the information gathered should be used.

The first chapter dealt with the identification of the problem of educational evaluation in general, and specifically teacher performance evaluation. It also attempted to place this problem within the Jamaican educational context, and establish its relevance to improving the society. Selected terms to be used in the research were discussed and clarified and the purpose for engaging in this research exercise was established. A number of questions, intended to guide the research, were also posed.

Before attempting to formulate a plan of action for the investigation, it was necessary to first review literature and researches relevant to the area of study. This review was carried in out in Chapter II. Here the research sought to, first, establish the concept of evaluation, the focal point of this research. This was followed by taking an insight into the pros and cons of methods of evaluation which are commonly used today. Some of the methods reviewed were observation, interviews and rating scales. Teacher performance evaluation as a growing concern and the need for such a process was then examined, followed by a review of some measures of teacher evaluation which have been developed for use in the United States. Among these measures were the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument as well as the Georgia Teacher Responsibilities and Duties Instrument. A total of six instruments were reviewed. The reader should be reminded that there are presently no formal teacher performance evaluation instruments in the Jamaican School System, hence, it was necessary to review those developed and used in another country.

Following the review of the literature, the research was better able to place the
research in a theoretical framework in which the variables to be investigated, as well as the interrelationships between these variables, were defined and discussed. There were three dependent variables, three independent variables and three moderator variables. These variables were presented figuratively to show their interrelationships as well as to give a graphic picture of the design of the research. In this section also, eleven hypotheses, for which the research would have to use statistically sound procedures to disprove or accept, were formulated and presented.

Chapter IV was devoted to explaining the development of an instrument to measure the performance of secondary level teachers in the Jamaican educational system. The nine steps for developing an instrument suggested by Borg and Gall (1979), were used in this exercise. The instrument, measuring 11 dimensions and having a total of seventy one items, and methods to establish its validity were presented and described in detail.

In Chapter V, the research design of the investigation was given, and the reader was enlightened regarding the research methods and procedures which would be utilized to ensure an empirically sound investigation. The population, and methods of selecting a sample from that population, were outlined. The sample was taken from across the island and warranted the use of the stratified random sampling technique to ensure that all factors critical to the research were to be found in the sample, as well as to ensure that the sample was truly representative of the population from which it was taken.

The instruments and administrative procedures to be used in the data collection exercise and the method of analysis to be applied to the data outlined were discussed in Chapter V. This research utilized simple statistical techniques to be found in the SPSS program and included ANOVA, Student's "t", Scheffe's test of significance and
crosstabulations. It was also established that there were a number of limitations which this research presented, and of which the reader should be aware.

This was followed by Chapter VI, in which the data were presented and analyzed in terms of the sample overall, as well as the subsamples and individual partitions being considered. It is now necessary to interpret these findings from the perspective of the hypotheses and research questions presented in the text.

Interpretation of the Findings

Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary level school teachers, principals and education officers regarding the content of a teacher performance evaluation instrument.

The one-way analysis of variance was used to compare groups. The results (Table 5) indicated a significant difference among the three subsamples at the .001 level. This, therefore, forced the researcher to reject the null hypothesis and accept the finding that among these groups there are significant differences in perception of the content which should be measured in a teacher performance evaluation exercises.

The Scheffe's test of significance (Table 6) identified the differences as being between principals and teachers. This is not surprising as the literature indicated that one of the areas of controversy was that of disagreement between principals and teachers on what should be evaluated. According to Lazovick (1983), and McAfee (2975), there is growing realization of the conflicts surrounding teacher evaluation which are, sometimes, the result of the disagreement between teachers and their supervisors, who are oftentimes, the principals.
The mean scores displayed on Table 6, showed the teachers to have the highest mean, followed by principals and education officers. This is an interesting result as it indicates that the teachers responses were more in keeping with the ideal, in terms of the literature, than any other group. One would have expected that the senior administrative personnel, including both the principals and education officers with their superior level of education and more working experience, might have responded more in-keeping with what is considered to be desirable in terms of the characteristics and behaviors on which a teacher should be evaluated. It could be that these administrators have become so preoccupied with administrative duties that they have lost touch with exactly what takes place in the classroom.

Another factor which could have contributed to the significant difference which resulted on this variable is that there were dimensions which measured factors which did not relate specifically to instruction, but without which, the teachers job of instructing would be most difficult. These dimensions measured factors such as teachers providing financial, psychological and welfare assistance to students (although they are not required to do so), without any form of recognition or compensation. In interviews conducted with the education officers, the respondents stated that they did not think that teachers should be evaluated on factors such as these. This perception could have influenced the outcome in this analysis.

This fact that the data did not indicate a significant difference between education officers and principals is not surprising since both of these individuals are administrators within the school system and many education officers were, at one time, school principals. They would therefore, share similar views on matters of this nature. That there is no significance between the perceptions of education officers and teachers
might be surprising, in view of the previous statement. However, the number of education officers is so small compared to that of the teachers, that it would be difficult to compare the responses statistically and have meaningful results. Because of the results from analysis, this hypothesis was rejected.

**Hypothesis 2**

There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary level school teachers, principals and education officers of the administrative procedures which should be used in the teacher evaluation process.

The analysis of variance mounted for administrative procedures across the subsamples showed no significant differences (Table 7). This finding suggests that all three subsamples share similar views on how the teacher evaluation process should be conducted. The questions which addressed this section asked respondents to indicate the steps which should be used in carrying out the evaluation exercise, and who should be involved at different stages in this process. The consensus by these three subsamples indicate that they are in agreement with how the evaluation process should be administered.

Once again, because of the small education officer subsample, there is very little that a statistical procedure of this nature could reveal. This is unavoidable, however, because of the wide ratio of education officers to schools in the Jamaican School System. The results of this analysis, therefore, required that the null hypothesis be accepted.

**Hypothesis 3**

There is no significant differences in the perception of secondary level school teachers, principals and education officers of the use of information gathered
through teacher evaluation.

The one-way analysis of variance mounted for use across the subsamples produced a non-significant outcome. Table 8 indicates, by a probability rating of .144, that between and within the responses of the three subsamples, there were no significant differences on their perceptions of how information which is gathered through the evaluation process should be used. The items which were developed to gather information in relation to this hypothesis, required respondents to make multiple selections on the use of evaluation information. This could have contributed to the fact that there were no significant differences. If respondents have the option of choosing a number of responses to a particular item, the chances are greater that there will be a significant amount of commonality in selections.

Note also that the subsample sizes remain constant and previous comments relating to the effects of subsample sizes on statistical computations would be applicable in this case also. Again the null hypothesis was accepted since there were no significant differences resulting.

Hypothesis 4

There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary level school teachers of the content, administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation information asked on school type.

In order to test this hypothesis, the Student's "t" statistical procedure was used to compare mean scores for the high school teachers and the secondary school teachers on the dependent variables content, administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation information. The data revealed two significant findings (Table 9). For the variables content and administrative procedures, there were significant differences in
perception for the teachers in high school against the teachers in secondary school at the .05 level.

In the case of content, this suggests that these two sets of teachers perceive a significant difference in terms of the characteristics of behaviors on which they should be evaluated. This could be the result of the fact that there is a difference in how these two types of secondary level schools are perceived. The 1985 Peoples National Party Education Manifesto speaks to the fact that the society at large perceives that there is a significant difference between these schools the high school being considered more prestigious than the secondary school. It is, therefore, not surprising that the teachers themselves would have different perceptions on matters which affect both the school and themselves.

The Manifesto also addressed the lack of resources in the secondary schools when compared to the high schools. The teachers might feel that conditions are not similar; hence, they should not be evaluated on the same factors.

Another possible reason for the significant difference in the results pertaining to content could be the result of the teaching experience of the subsamples. From the mean scores displayed on Table 9, it can be seen that the secondary school teachers had a higher mean score indicating greater positive responses. Table 2 which gives the years teaching experience of the subsamples indicate that the secondary school teachers have more teaching experience than do their counterparts in the high school. From this experience, therefore, they could have become more familiar with what is done and expected in the classroom and, therefore, what should be evaluated.

In the case of the significant differences reported for administrative procedures, this could be the result of their academic exposure. The common adage is
that "knowledge is wisdom," and it might be so in this case since a review of the mean scores on this dimension were higher in the case of the high school teachers than they were for the secondary school teachers, thus indicating greater conformance with expectations expressed in the literature.

Another reason for this finding might related to the educational background of the teachers in both these institutions. Although the size of the secondary teachers subsample was larger than that of the high school teachers, this does not account for the fact that a far greater proportion of the teachers have not studied beyond the teacher college level (Table 4). In addition, it seems fair to state that the higher the level of education, the greater is the exposure of the individual to knowledge. This assumption is based on the higher mean score for high school teachers (Table 9), thus indicating greater conformity with the ideals expressed in the questionnaire. This difference in perception could therefore be the result of the fact that, because of the higher level of educational exposure of the high school teachers, they might be more familiar with literature related to the evaluation process.

Another possible explanation is the fact that the principals in the high school themselves have a higher level of educational qualifications than do their counterparts in the secondary schools (Table 4). This could mean that they try to apply their increased knowledge to the situations in which they work, part of which could be to try, in their own ways, to have some type of informal evaluation system, hence their teachers might have the benefit of this additional exposure and thus be more informed than their counterparts.

The fact that there was no significant difference in the case of the variable use, indicates that on this particular variable, the two subsamples shared similar perceptions.
The mean scores of the subsamples shared similar perceptions. The mean scores of the subsamples of this variable (Table 9), were almost the same, thereby showing very little discrimination in the responses. The null hypothesis had to be rejected since only in the case of one of the three variables, there was no significant difference reported.

**Hypothesis 5**

There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary level school teachers of the content, administrative procedures and use of evaluation information based on qualifications.

For this hypothesis, the one-way analysis of variance was used to compare scores. It revealed that on two of the variables, namely, administrative procedures and use, there were significant differences in perception by teachers based on qualifications (Table 10). For content, there were no significant differences between or within the groups. The mean scores showed little discrimination indicating that the responses on the variable content were very similar for this subsample.

Significant differences for administrative procedures were shown at the .002 level of significance (Table 10). This indicates that the teachers, based on their qualifications, differed significantly on the administrative procedures they perceive should be used in the teacher evaluation process. As was stated in the discussion of hypothesis 4, the level of education which an individual has can influence their perception of issues. In this case, the Scheffe's test of significance identified the significant differences as being between the pre-trained graduates and college trained teachers, the pre-trained graduates form the only group that does not have teacher training. Their mean score is also the lowest for all six groups in this analysis. It is not surprising, therefore, that their perceptions, because of their limited qualifications
in education, would be significantly different from the other groups with training in education. Their perception was least favorable in terms of the ideals presented in the questionnaire.

For the variable use, the Scheffe’s test of significance indicated significant differences, based on respondents qualifications, between the college trained teachers and trained graduates, pre-trained graduates and specialists (Table 12). The college trained teachers have the lowest academic qualifications among this group; therefore, it is not surprising that their perception of how information gathered through evaluation should be used. At that level of training, individuals are not as exposed to the far-reaching effects of evaluation; therefore, they might not necessarily see some of the benefits to be gained from extensive use of evaluation information. It should be noted, however, that although the college-trained teachers had significantly different perceptions from the other previously stated, it was the pre-trained post graduates who had the lowest means, showing that their responses were least favorable. The trained post graduates had the highest mean which indicated that this group perceived the use of information to be most in-keeping with what is desired in terms of the literature. This group is the most academically qualified, and therefore have had the widest exposure to the concept and use of performance evaluation. The researcher was forced to reject the hypothesis since the results on two of the variables were contrary to the hypothesis stated.

**Hypothesis 6**

There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary level school teachers in the content, administrative procedures and use of evaluation information based on teaching experience.
The one-way analysis of variance was also used to compare responses in testing this hypothesis. The computations revealed two significant results: administrative procedures at the .001 level and use at the .043 level (Table 13). The fact that there were no significant differences among the subsamples on content indicated that teaching experience was not a factor in the perception of content across the teacher’s subsample. The contrary holds true for administrative procedures, however, since the perception of teachers on this variable was colored by the number of years teaching experience that they had. It is understandable that individuals tend to better understand situations the longer they remain in them; therefore, teachers too are better able to form similar opinions about how things are and should be done in the educational system by virtue of being there for a number of years. The Scheffe’s test of significance to determine where the difference were, indicated that teachers with the lowest number of years teaching experience 1-2+ years, differed significantly, on this variable from teachers with 11-15 years, 3-5+ years and teachers with over 15 years teaching experience. The mean scores from lowest to highest did not coincide with the chronological order of the groups in terms of years of teaching experience, but it did identify the teachers with the least number of teaching experience to have the lowest mean and those with the largest number of years teaching experience to have the highest mean score. These results indicate that teaching experience is a factor in the perception of teachers on the administrative procedures which should be used in the teacher evaluation process.

Although the researcher has presented the view that there was a significant difference in the case of the variable use, the level of significance was not within the parameters required for the Scheffe’s test to identify between which groups the significance existed. As a result of that, the interpretation of this finding is limited.
The finding does indicate that on the variable use, teaching experience is also a factor in the perception of how evaluation information should be used. It suggests that the length of time that an individual has been teaching could cause him to make certain judgements regarding how this information should be used, since he or she is more familiar with the system. More teachers, therefore, will tend to perceive things in the same way. In this case also, the researcher was forced to reject the hypothesis, because for two out of three variables, significant differences were reported.

Hypothesis 7

There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary level school principals of the content, administrative procedures and use of evaluation information based on school type.

Since there were only two groups involved in this analysis, the Student's "t" was to compare responses. As indicated on Table 15, there were no significant differences to be found in the perceptions of principals, in terms of school type, on the three dependent variables. In fact, in the case of administrative procedures, the mean scores were identical, thus yielding a probability coefficient of 1.000, which shows that there was no variance in the responses. For the variables content and use, the differences in the mean scores were minute. It should also be noted that the standard deviation also indicated that the scores were all clustered around the means, confirming that there was little or no variation in the responses given.

These results are not surprising, in that there is little difference in the principals of these two types of schools as shown in terms of their teaching experience (Table 2), years in their present positions (Table 3) and qualifications (Table 4). For qualifications, the difference only lies in terms of whether or not the principals have
done post graduate studies, but, with the exception of one, they have all completed a university program in addition to being teacher trained. The stark similarities between the groups could therefore have contributed to this outcome. The principals were of one mind regarding the characteristics or behavior on which a teacher should be evaluated, the way in which the evaluation should be conducted and how the information which is gathered through the evaluation process should be used. In light of the fact that there were no significant differences reported the hypothesis was accepted.

**Hypothesis 8**

There is no significant difference in the perceptions of secondary level school principals of the content, administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation information based on qualifications.

Since this was a multigroup analysis, the analysis of variance subprogram was used to compare the scores for the principals subsample on the three dependent variables in terms of their qualifications. The results (Table 16), indicate, by probability ratings of .690 for content, .624 for administrative procedures and .685 for use, that between and within the responses of the subsamples, there were no significant differences in perceptions in terms of qualifications. As was stated in the case of the previous hypothesis, and displayed on Table 16, there is very little difference in the level of education for this group, if the group is categorized as having university education or not having this level of education. Qualification, therefore, would not be a factor in this group's perceptions of the variables.

By not showing any significant differences for all three variables, this result also supports the findings for hypothesis 7 (Table 15), which indicated that, for all three
dependent variables, there were no significant differences for the principals subsamples. Again this infers unity of thought as to what principals perceive teachers should be evaluated on, how the evaluation process should be conducted and how information, gathered through the process, should be used. The findings were in-keeping with the hypothesis, therefore the hypothesis was accepted.

**Hypothesis 9**

There is no significant difference in the perception of secondary level school principals of the content, administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation information based on years of teaching experience.

The analysis of variance subprogram was used to compare scores in respect of this hypothesis. The reactions from this procedure showed no significant differences in the perceptions of principals on the dependent variables based on teaching experience (Table 17). As for the two previous hypothesis, this result supported the initial results for the principals on all three variables. Those results showed so little variance that it is used to further analyze the information, there are no significant differences to be found.

The reader must be reminded that principals were randomly selected from across the island, and for them to have shown a little variation in their responses without being coached, shows how similar they are in their perceptions of what should take place with regard to teacher evaluation. The fact that there is a principals association through which contact and interacting among principals is maintained, could help to account for a common perception on this issue. In light of this finding, the researcher was again forced to accept the hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 10**
There is no significant difference in the perception of high school principals and teachers on content, administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation information.

For this hypothesis, the comparison of scores for only two groups would be necessary, therefore, the Student's "t" statistical procedure was used. It produced one significant difference at the .011 level, and this was on the variable content (Table 18). The computation of mean scores indicated that the teachers had a higher mean score than the principals suggesting that their perceptions of the characteristics and behaviors on which a teacher should be evaluated are more in-keeping with what is expressed in the literature as being desirable.

The findings here are also in keeping with that in hypothesis 1 which showed significant differences between teachers, principals and administrators with the teachers having the highest mean score (Table 6), showing that the teachers expressed more positive perceptions on this variable.

For the variables administrative procedures and use, there were no significant differences as indicated in the probability coefficients of .328 and .253 respectively (Table 18). This suggests that there is very little variance in the perceptions of these two subgroups as to the way in which the evaluation process should be used. It should be noted, however, that although there were no significant differences for these two variables, in the case of administrative procedures, the teachers had a higher mean score than did the principals, and for the variable use, the principals had a slightly higher mean score than did the teachers. This suggests that, for administrative procedures, the teachers response were more in-keeping with the ideals expressed in the literature, while for use, the principals perception were a little more in-keeping with
the literature. In the case of the variable use, the differences in mean scores for the two subsamples is so minute, that it shows very little difference in perceptions between the two groups. Because there was a significant result in this analysis, the hypothesis was rejected.

**Hypothesis 11**

There is no significant differences in the perception of secondary school principals and teachers of the content, administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation information.

For the purpose of comparing respondents scores in respect to this hypothesis, the Student's "t" was used. It yielded significant differences on two of the variables for the subsamples. In the case of the variable content, .008 was the level of probability, while in the case of use, the level of probability was .042. The non-significance of the differences in the mean scores of 12.000 for principals and 12.081 was shown in the probability level of .839 (Table 19).

For the variable content, the mean score for the teachers is higher than that for the principals. This shows that the teachers perceptions are more in-keeping with the ideal. This finding is similar to that found in the case of high school principals and teachers (Table 18). The significant difference between teachers, regardless of the school in which they work, and administration, represented in this research by principals and education officers, has shown that for the variable content, the teachers have a more satisfactory perception. They are more correct, in terms of the literature, about the characteristics and behaviors on which they should be evaluated.

In the cases of the variable use, the mean score for principals is higher than that for the teachers. Again, this has been the trend throughout the findings, and supports
the findings for the high school principals and teachers subsamples. In this case, the principals’ perceptions are more in line with those expressed in the literature as being desirable.

**Research Question 12**

Who should evaluate the performance of teachers in the classroom?

Item 20, which sought data in respect to this question, invited multiple responses from the respondents. Crosstabulations were used to secure the information and the results showed that the heads of departments were the most popular evaluator selected, commanding eighty six percent of the responses from the total sample. They were also the most popular selection for each of the subsamples. The education officers were equally convinced that principals, education officers and the teacher himself or herself should be evaluators, but this sentiment was not expressed in total by either the principals or the teachers.

For the principals, the next three most popular evaluators following the heads of department were principals, assistant principals and students, while for the teachers, principals, the teacher himself or herself and assistant principals were the next most popular. In terms of the sample overall, the next most popular evaluator selected was similar to that of the teachers subsample. This is understandable, since teachers form ninety three percent of the sample (Table 1). With the exception of peer teachers, who received the second lowest in selection and education officers who received the lowest, all the other suggested evaluators received in excess of fifty percent of the overall sample scores to be evaluators.

It is not surprising that neither principals nor teachers perceived that education officers should be evaluators of teacher performance since these officers are far
removed from the situations and may be considered to be more concerned with school administration than with instruction. In addition, education officers have usually stopped teaching for a number of years; therefore, neither teachers nor principals might consider them to be up-to-date or as creative as they, the teachers and principals, are when it comes to instruction.

That peers were not a popular selection for any group is not surprising in that all three subsamples may consider that peers do not possess the skills necessary to evaluate, since they themselves are being evaluated. For teachers to reject their peer as evaluators is in-keeping with research findings. According to French-Lazovik (1981), one of the problems associated with peer evaluation is jealousy. There are some teachers who would rather not be judged by their peers on their level of competence as they deem their peers to be on the same level. They feel more satisfied being judged by superior personnel, whom they perceive to be more qualified to pass judgement.

For principals and education officers, having peer teachers evaluate teachers also, would almost be like suggesting that these teachers were of similar status and possess a comparable level of expertise. Much emphasis and importance are placed on the status of individuals within the system and steps are always being taken to ensure that no one forgets that.

Research Question 13

What method should be used to evaluate a teacher's performance?

For this item also, respondents were given the opportunity to select more than one response and crosstabulations were used to identify responses according to the subsamples. For the education officers and principals the two most popular methods
of evaluation selected were observation and self rating scales, while for the teachers, observations and interviews were the two most popular selections. Observation, however, was by far the most popular choice across subsamples since it was chosen by 97.7 percent of the total sample (Table 21).

The overwhelming support for observation is not unexpected as the literature indicates that this is the most popular method used to measure teacher performance (Good, 1980; Edelfelt, 1988; Larson, 1984). It is felt that the best way to judge the performance of a teacher in the classroom, is to watch him at work in the classroom. There the evaluator is able to get a first hand idea of what is actually being taught, the interaction between teacher and students and the progression of the lesson through its different phases. Observation seems to offer the fairest and most acceptable way through which to measure the performance of a teacher. It should be noticed that the use of student achievement as an evaluation measure was not very popular, and in fact, received the least number of scores for the sample overall. In Jamaica, where there are so many factors external to the school which affect the students ability to learn, it is no wonder that student achievement would not have been selected to be used as a measure of teacher performance. In addition, the record of student achievement is below expectations, and is still deteriorating daily; therefore, no educator would like to be assessed based on such unsatisfactory achievement results.

It should be noticed, however, that although the use of student achievement as a measure of teacher performance was least popular among the principals and teachers, it was selected by four out of six of the education officers as a desirable method to measure teacher performance. Interviews with Lewis (1990), Taylor (1990) and Barrett (1990), who are all education officers, revealed that they were supportive of student
achievement being used as a measure of teacher performance because they believe if
the teacher has taught well, then the student will learn, and this learning is reflected
in their academic achievement. The teachers on the other hand expressed the view that
students were not really interested in learning since they neither came prepared to learn
nor were they at times mentally or physically able to attend to their lessons (Smith,
1990), Bryan 1990, Clark, 1990 and Robb, 1990). They indicated that the socio-
economic plight of students often interfered with the students ability to learn; therefore,
teachers ought not to be held responsible for their learning.

Research Question 14

How long should the actual evaluation last?

The item designed to gather data to answer this question required the selection
of a response by each candidate. The crosstabulation subprogram yielded results which
showed that the most popular period of time selected by respondents for the actual
evaluation was a class period. Almost two thirds of the total sample made this
selections. The least popular period of time selected was 20 - 25 minutes, which
received only 9.3 percent of the scores (Table 22).

In the Jamaican situation, a class period varies between 30 and forty minutes.
Teachers would rather be evaluated for the entire period so that their evaluator can
assess the progress of the class from the beginning to the end. It leaves nothing to
chance and the teacher feels more satisfied that the evaluator will be making a
judgement on the entire class rather than on portions of the class. He or she would
not have missed any important part of the class, the omission of which might cause
unsatisfactory evaluations to be made (Smith, 1990).

Principals and education officers also prefer seeing the entire class. As Jones
(1990) suggested in an interview, both the beginning and the end of the class are important and are part of the evaluation; therefore, it is important be there for the entire class.

Generally speaking, it would seem that this is considered fair to all concerned as nothing will go unseen; hence, there will be less opportunity for evaluators to be accused of having made judgements on what the teacher considered to be the worst parts of the class and they had failed to see the interesting and good parts of the class. 

**Research Question 15**

Which evaluation response form would best facilitate easy rating of performance evaluation?

In response to the item designed to gather data to answer this research question, respondents were forced to select one response out of a possible three. The crosstabulation subprogram used to identify responses in terms of subsamples showed that 60.65 percent of the total sample indicated that both coded and narrative response facilitated easy rating of performance evaluation. The second selection was coded sheets followed by narrative reports (Table 23).

This result is in keeping with those found by other researchers such as Carroll (1981), Braskamp (1980), and James (1987). A combination of instruments is often seen to offer the evaluator the opportunity to rate or assess a wider range of behaviors without being restricted to any single one. This, therefore, offers variety which is better able to accommodate responses or comments pertaining to the evaluation. A coded form, for example does not allow the evaluator to expand on any rating neither is it able to cover all the behaviors and characteristics of the teacher. As Soar et al (1984) claim, the teacher does not operate like a worker who is purely a technician.
He or she takes to the classroom factors which are not necessarily prescribed for use in the classroom, but the use of which will improve the teaching/learning process. They claim that there are a number of factors operating in a classroom which will require greater flexibility when assessing the teachers' performance in the classroom. Consequently, it would seem fair to conclude that the use of both types of forms would better facilitate easy rating of performance evaluation.

**Research Question 16**

Which response form would give the most accurate information on the performance evaluation?

For this research question also, respondents were asked to select one response. If none of the alternatives presented were adequate, respondents were asked to make suggestions for an alternative report form. Evaluation forms which accommodated both coded and narrative responses were selected by 67.1 percent of the total sample to be able to give the most accurate information on performance evaluation (Table 24). Only .8 percent of the total sample, which was representative of the teachers alone, indicated that there should be an alternative form; however, they failed to say what that form should be.

This result is in-keeping with those found by other researchers such as Carroll (1981), Braskamp (1980) and James (1987). A combination of instruments is often seen to be more effective as this is able to accommodate a more meaningful assessment and the evaluator is able to expand on coded ratings through narrative reports. By using both of response forms, therefore, the evaluator is able to expand on coded ratings through narrative reports. By using both types of response forms, therefore, the evaluator is able to more easily accommodate evaluations of a wider variety of
behavior than using one restrictive form on which he or she may try to rate behaviors which are not accurately represented. The use of both coded and narrative forms ensures that the evaluator assesses all factors required to be assessed and in addition allows for free expression by the evaluator on factors which he or she may consider needs additional clarification or comment. In addition, narrative reports allow the evaluator to make suggestions or to indicate behaviors which are more appropriate used in one situation than in another.

Research Question 17

What should be done with the teacher performance evaluation report?

In responding to this question, respondents were allowed to make multiple selections. The crosstabulations showed that 96.5 percent of the total sample elected to give the evaluation report to the teacher. 85.2 percent suggested that the report be placed on the teachers local file; 34.0 percent suggested that it be put on the teacher’s file in the Ministry of Education while 5.2 percent suggested that they should not be retained (Table 25).

It is interesting to note that all six education officers indicated that the report should be placed on the teacher’s local file and four indicated that it should be given to the teacher. Principals’ placing the report on the teacher’s local file and giving a report to the teacher was suggested by 28 respondents. For the teachers, the most popular indication was that of giving the report to the teacher followed by placing a copy on the local file.

It is not surprising that giving the teacher a copy of the report was the popular selection as teachers are not presently aware of their performance, and this would offer them the opportunity to know how well they are doing. By being made aware of their
performance, they are being given the opportunity to identify what has been perceived to be their strengths and weaknesses and to take appropriate action. In this way, the supervisor is better able to use the evaluation process for developmental purposes, one of the primary purposes of the teacher Evaluation process (Floden and Freiman, 1981).

That a copy of the report be retained in the teacher’s local file indicates that both teachers, principals and education officers accept the importance for a record of the evaluation to be kept in the institution. This is important to maintain a paper trail and thereby establish continuity. It also ensures that there is another copy of the report to which reference can be made in the event that this is needed.

Four individuals, all of whom are teachers, indicated that the evaluation reports should not be retained. The purpose of the evaluation is questioned because of the attitudes of the four teachers. One wonders, therefore, what would have been the purpose of the evaluation. This researcher can only suggest that the possibility exists that these teachers do not fully understand the purpose of evaluations, or feel that they would be better off without a record of their performance anywhere.

Research Question 18

For what purposes should the evaluation report be used?

In responding to this item, individuals were allowed to select more than one purpose for which the evaluation report could be used. Six uses suggested in the literature review were given. The crosstabulations revealed that 72.5 percent of the total sample indicated that the reports should be used for promotions; 69.7 percent that they be used for reference/recommendation purposes and 61.2 percent indicated that they should be used for permanent appointments. For staff development and firing (termination), 38.9 percent and 34.1 percent respectively suggested that the evaluation
information be used in this way while 21.1 percent indicated that it should be used for salary increases.

It is important to note that only education officers and principals gave priority to evaluation reports being used for staff development. This is what the literature indicates should be one of the primary purposes of teacher evaluation, especially if it is being used for formative purposes (Rieck, 1989; Knapp, 1982; Barber, 1984). The teachers did not share this view, however, as only 39 percent of these respondents indicated that the reports should be used in this way. This difference in perception could be the result of the way in which these individuals view the purpose of performance evaluation as well as the way that the individuals relate to the process.

Education officers and principals would be the administrators in the performance evaluation process, and would be involved in the process of evaluating while the teachers are being evaluated and might see more negative outcomes than do their prospective evaluators. They also see themselves as professionals who have already been duly trained and do not necessarily welcome suggestions that they might need remedial or developmental training. Teachers in Jamaica would also prefer to attend development programs, the successful completion of which would result in an increase in salary rather than be attending a program which is supposedly geared at developing instructional skills.

Education officers and principals, on the other hand, would welcome the opportunity to let teachers know that they have not reached the pinnacle of their training, and that there is always room for improvement, and would, in fact, welcome the opportunity to instruct teachers in developmental programs. It should be noted that in the Jamaican situation, there are few developmental courses provided for teachers,
and most of them are conducted in the capital city, Kingston. It therefore means that there are a number of teachers who would not be able to take advantage of these opportunities for reasons related either to cost of transportation or board and lodging.

That the least popular use selected is salary increases is not surprising. It is this researcher's opinion that the average Jamaican teacher would rather not have his or her increases tied to his or her performance since there is still the view that evaluations can be very subjective, and that teachers could be victimized through this process. It would therefore, not seem wise to have a teacher's remuneration tied to the opinion of another individual, who is perceived to have the power to determine that teacher's financial status. It should be noted that although the use of evaluations for salary increases was the least popular selection among the principals, it received the same level of importance as four other uses, gaining the selection of five out of six education officers.

Research Question 19
Who should be evaluated?

Respondents were asked to select one response for this item, but these responses allowed for the inclusion or exclusion of different categories of teachers within the system. For education officers, principals and teachers, the overwhelming consensus was that all teachers should be evaluated. Ninety-four point two percent of the total sample, including all education officers and all principals, indicated that evaluation should be done for teachers who were either temporary or seeking permanent appointments, and 13 or 2.5 percent indicated that all teachers except senior teachers should be evaluated.

This result is indicative of the realization of the respondents that all teachers
Summary of Findings

For easy recognition as well as to quickly recapitulate the findings in respect evaluation in the school, acceptance by the respondents of the importance of and, perhaps a need for, teacher evaluation process. It is this researcher's view that this finding results indicate an assessment the extent to which the job is being satisfactorily carried out is through the should be evaluated. They all perform a job and the only way one can monitor or

1. A significant difference at the .01 level was found in the perception of secondary level school teachers, principals and education officers of the use of a teacher performance evaluation instrument.

2. No significant difference was found in the perception of secondary level school teachers, principals and education officers of the administration procedures which should be used in the teacher evaluation process.

3. No significant differences were found in the perception of secondary level school teachers, principals and education officers of the variables concerning and administrative procedures, but not on the variable use.

4. Significant differences at the .05 level were found for teachers on the variable content of the teacher performance evaluation instrument.

5. Significant differences at the .02 and .001 levels, respectively were found in the case of the variables administrative procedures and use.
content. The significant differences were identified to be between the pre-trained graduates and college trained teachers, trained graduates and specialists in the case of administrative procedures and between college trained teachers and trained graduates, pre-trained graduates and trained post graduates for the variable use.

6. Significant differences at the .001 and .043 levels, respectively were found for the teachers subsample on the variable administrative procedures and use when the data were examined in terms of teaching experience. However, no significant differences were found for the variable content. In the case of administrative procedures, the significant differences occurred between teachers with 1 - 2+ years of teaching experience and teachers with 11 - 15 years teaching experience, 3 - 5+ years teaching experience and teachers with over 15 years teaching experience.

7. No significant differences were found for the principals’ subsample on the variables content, administrative procedures and use when the data were examined in terms of school type.

8. No significant differences were found for the principals’ subsample on the variables content, administrative procedures and use when the data were examined in terms of qualifications.

9. No significant differences were found for the principals subsample on the variables content, administrative procedures and use when the data were examined in terms of teaching experience.

10. No significant differences were found between the principals and
teachers' subsamples for the variables administrative procedures and use of teacher evaluation information. A significant difference at the .011 level was found in the case of the variable content.

11. Significant differences were found between the principals and teachers' subsamples for the variables content and use at the .008 and .042 levels, respectively, however, no significant differences were found in the case of the variable administrative procedures.

12. The three subsamples indicated that heads of departments, followed by principals, were the most preferred to conduct teacher evaluations. Peer teachers and education officers were the least preferred in the overall sample and among teachers and principals.

13. Observation was the most popular method selected to be used in teacher evaluation.

14. For the total sample, a class period was seen to be the length of time in which the actual evaluation should be executed.

15. The coded and narrative type evaluation response form was seen to be able to best facilitate easy ratings of performance evaluations.

16. The coded and narrative type response form was seen to be able to give the most accurate information on the performance evaluation.

17. The two most popular suggestions as to what should be done with the evaluation reports was that they should be given to the teachers and retained on the local school files.

18. The most popular purposes for which evaluation reports should be used were (1) for promotions; (2) for reference/recommendation and (3) for
permanent appointment. The least popular suggestion was its use for salary increases.

19. There was overwhelming agreement from the total sample that all teachers should be evaluated.

Implications

The findings of this research hold important implications for the development and implementation of a teacher performance appraisal system in Jamaica. The significant differences found on the content of the instrument send a word of warning to the would-be developers or planners of such a program. These differences imply that all of the stake holders did not perceive the content, which should be measured in performance evaluation, to be the same. There was a difference between what the administrators perceived should be measured and what the teachers perceived should be measured, with the teachers perception being more in keeping with the literature.

Examination of the responses to this variable, indicate that the principals and administrators were not of the opinion that the dimensions which measure extra curricular activities and student welfare support should be assessed in a performance appraisal. This implies that administrators need to be sensitized to and educated about how critical and important these functions are to the teaching/learning situation. Jamaica is a poor third world country that lacks adequate resources, and if the majority of students are to learn, the teachers will have to do whatever lies in their power to provide the best opportunity for those children to learn. Since the teachers cannot reduce the poverty of the country, they should be recognized for their efforts to improve the situation by performing these welfare functions. Without the acceptance
of these factors by administrators, the evaluation program would not have their support and they could, therefore, easily sabotage the system. Acceptance of the evaluation program by all the stake holders in necessary for its effective implementation.

Although the teachers, as one group, were more homogeneous in terms of their perception of content, it is important to note that when their data were analyzed in terms of school type, significant differences in perception emerged. This implies that the teachers in the secondary school type, significant differences in perception emerged. This implies that the teachers in the secondary schools saw peculiarities in their situation which might not be present in the high school, and vice versa, and that these should be taken into consideration when developing an evaluation instrument. This could be a true reflection of the situation, in that high schools for the most part, offer a more academic program and are better equipped than their secondary counterparts. If both schools are to be considered comparable secondary institutions, efforts should be made to ensure some measure of equity in the resources which are in the schools. It might not be necessary to offer the same content, but there should be adequate resources to ensure effective instruction in each content area. If there are differences in content and resources, chances are that the teachers would like an instrument to recognize those differences and address them.

This result also implies that there is a need for the Ministry of Education to re-examine the curricular offerings in each type of school and the allocation of resources in respect those offerings. It could be that if a concept similar to the magnet school program were introduced, scarce resources could be placed in specific locations for specific curricular offerings rather than being spread thinly across a number of different schools which are not adequately equipped to effectively offer those program. If this
situation was corrected, a common evaluation instrument could be used as there would be greater equity in the distribution of resources.

Since there was a significant difference in perception between administrators and teachers on content, it was not surprising that this difference was also found between principals and teachers in each school type. This finding supports the initial outcome previously discussed and underscores the need to educate the users of a teacher evaluation system about the content of such a system in the Jamaican society, and in-keeping with ideals found in the research and literature.

There seemed to be very little diversity in the way the total sample perceived the administrative procedures which should be used in an evaluation exercise. The respondents indicated support for a system which would orient its users to its use and expectations and prepare them for the evaluation exercise in terms of the eight steps of the clinical supervision model proposed by Cogan (1973), and which was used in developing items to measure this variable. For the teacher subsamples, however, there were significant differences found for this variable when the data were examined in terms of school type. The perceptions of the high school teachers were more in-keeping with the literature than were those of the secondary school teachers. A look at the responses of these two groups indicated that the high school teachers were more in favor of having evaluations more than once per year and being told the rating which they had received on the evaluation. One possible reason for this result is the fact that high school teachers, who are usually more qualified, do not fear being assessed more than once per year, neither do they fear being told the ratings which they have been given. They are more confident in their ability to instruct because of their higher level of qualification, and expect to do well on an evaluation, therefore, they would be more
eager to hear their ratings than would their secondary level counterparts. In addition, high school teachers may have a more positive self image because, at the out-set, the secondary schools were not created to be on par with the high schools, and therefore, it was felt, by many teachers, that they held a more pretigious job working in the high schools. The difference in perception was also evident in the number of university graduates which secondary schools employed as against high schools, the high schools employing far more graduates. The sample statistics shown in Table 4, indicate that, overall, there are more university graduates working in the high schools than in the secondary schools. The number of trained post-graduate in the secondary schools is one, whereas, the number is eight in the case of the high schools. As a result of the perceived differences in status, it is possible that the secondary school teachers might not have considered themselves to be on par with their counterparts in the high schools (Davis, 1985). This situation could have added to the level of confidence experienced by the high school teachers while it could have increased the feeling of inferiority which exists among secondary school teachers. This finding would suggest that the secondary school teachers need to be educated about factors, such as those previously identified, and their relevance to the administrative procedures to be used in an evaluation exercise. In addition, efforts have to be made to increase the caliber of teachers in the secondary schools to, at least, that of high school teachers, as well as to improve curricular offering and resources to raise the standards of these schools, and thereby, help to eliminate the stigma of inferiority which is attached to these schools. If these two types of school prove themselves to be equal in most, if not all things, then chances are that this inferiority complex will gradually disappear.

It should also be noted, that there was very strong support from the stake
holders for the evaluation report to be given to the teachers as well as a copy retained on file in the institution. This implies that the stakeholders agree that the teachers need to know how they have been performing, the ratings they have been given and the comments which have been made in respect of their performance. No longer should such information be kept secret because, it is only by knowing how they are performing, that appropriate action can voluntarily be taken by the teachers. On the other hand, it is also likely that the teachers will be more amenable to action taken by the administrator, if they are aware of the reasons for the action, and understand its relevance and importance to their performance. In addition, the findings also indicate that it is accepted among the stakeholders that the administration needs to have a record of the teachers' performance, but so too do the teachers.

Agreement was also found among the subsamples on how the information which is gathered in the evaluation process should be used in general, but differing views existed between the administrative personnel and the teachers about specific uses of this information. The findings indicated that stakeholders would accept an evaluation system which would use evaluation information for promotion, giving references or recommendations and for permanent or temporary appointments. Administrators, however, would seem to more readily accept a system which uses the evaluation information for staff development, than would the teachers. This implies that there could be a difference in understanding between the administrators and the teachers as to what staff development entails, or that teachers do not fully understand what is meant by staff development. It would be sad to think that the teachers might be of the opinion that they do not need staff development, but this too, is a possible implication. Teachers in the Jamaican situation, usually think of development in terms
of increased certification, status and salaries, and if staff development did not imply opportunities for advancement in terms of these factors, it would not be easily accepted. The possibility exists, however, that, with education and utility, they might better understand and accept staff development as being important to becoming master teachers. The literature strongly supports the use of evaluation information for staff development as one of the single most important uses of this exercise, and it would seem to be important that the teachers be made to understand its importance through education. Since all subsamples welcomed an orientation programs as part of preparing for an evaluation program, it would seem to be appropriate to use such programs to educate users on the importance and relevance of factors such as this.

Significant differences on the variable, use, also emerged between secondary school teachers and principals. The mean score of these principals indicate that their responses were more in-keeping with the literature than were those of the teachers. A review of the data itself, indicated that not many of these teachers indicated that the evaluation report should be used for staff development, whereas, the principals did. This might be the result of the level of education and the experience of these teachers as they relate to the use of evaluation information. As suggested in other similar situations, educating the stake holders will be the best way of ensuring a common understanding of the whole evaluation process, its content and use.

The important part which qualifications and years of teaching experience play in the perception of this sample should not go unnoticed. For the subsample comprised of education officers, there was very little difference in terms of either qualifications or years of teaching experience, hence the results were not affected by these variables. In the case of the principals, there was a little diversity in terms of both these
moderator variables, but this was so insignificant that it did not result in a difference in perception within the group. It could be that, because of the status which the position of principal enjoys in the Jamaican society, neither qualifications nor years of teaching experience affected their perception of the factors measured in this research.

For the teachers, however, which was the largest and most diversified group in terms of qualifications and teaching experience, significant differences resulted when the data were examined in terms of the moderator variables. In population, teachers will always far out number administrators, hence greater diversity in terms of qualifications and years of teaching experience can always be expected among this group. It will therefore be more difficult to cater to all the differences which they bring to the situation. The differences which resulted from these diversities, must, however, be examined as they might have important implications for teacher evaluation and the educational system.

For the variable use, no significant differences emerged for the total sample, the education officers subsample, or the principals subsample. For the teachers, however, a significant difference emerged when the data were examined in terms of qualifications and years of teaching experience, although no such difference was found when the data were examined in terms of school type. This difference was identified to be between the untrained graduates and the trained graduates and postgraduates. Among these three groups, the untrained graduates also had the lowest mean score. That this difference occurred between teachers who had graduated from university and were teaching without a teaching certificate and teachers who had received both a university degree and special teacher training would imply that the teacher who has been formally prepared to teach is more aware of how evaluation information should be used than the
untrained teacher. The fact is also, that trained teachers might have received information on this factor during their training and are therefore better equipped to make judgements in-keeping with the literature than untrained teachers. It would therefore seem that not only will the untrained teacher require education in this matter, but it might be in the interest of education in general to require that all teachers be formally prepared to teach before being allowed to teach. Although these results do not suggest that these teachers might be causing any problems in terms of teaching, chances are that this could be so. This research was not designed to investigate that problem, however, it might be useful for such a research to be carried out.

Significant differences on the variable use, which resulted after the teachers data had been examined in terms of years teaching experience, identified teachers with less than 3 years teaching experience differing from teachers with more than 3 years teaching experience. The inexperience of these fairly new teachers might have contributed to the fact that they had the lowest mean and were in least agreement with the ideals expressed in the literature. This implies that the number of years on the job can influence an individual's perception. It is true that wisdom grows with experience, and certainly this would seem to be the case here. Education, again, would seem to be the most effective method of dealing with the fears of this group. One could suggest time, but then the system would not be able to wait for teachers to gain the experience to be able to understand different ways in which evaluation should be used. In fact, young teachers are always entering the profession, therefore, it is best to educate them to these facts rather than to wait for them to find out through experience.

It is also important to note the findings which emerged as a result of crosstabulations, and to see the implications which these might hold. One interesting
finding was that related to the selection of would-be evaluators. Here the local school administrators were seen to be the most preferred while peer teachers and education officers were the least preferred. This finding is not unexpected in that education officers are seen to be too remote from the situations, and teachers would rather not have their peer stand in judgement of their skill, since they fear ridicule and embarrassment should they not be effective. In the case of the apparent rejection of education officers and peers as evaluators, this could imply that these individuals would not be welcome by teachers should they be selected as evaluators. Since all six education officers indicated that they should be evaluators, this group might be somewhat disappointed, therefore the developers of the evaluation system must be careful in making a decision concerning this. The part that education officers will play in this aspect of the program must be clearly understood and accepted by the stakeholders. Also, it would not seem wise to try to use peer teachers at the outset of the program, unless a devise like an evaluation committee is set up and accepted by the stakeholders, and peers are selected using criteria determined by the stakeholders.

The overwhelming selection of observation as the method of evaluation is not surprising and is very much in-keeping with the literature. It would therefore be expected that this would be the major method used to evaluate teachers. It might be supported by interviews, as this was the second most popular choice; however, the final decision on this matter would be that of the stakeholders. That the sample is opposed to the use of student achievement as a measure of teacher performance is not surprising as there are too many external factors to the school which could confound the teachers efforts and limit the success which he or she could realize as a teacher. It would, therefore, seem unfair to have the teachers performance tied to this factor in any major
way, and the stake holders might not be prepared to accept this.

The selection of a class period being used for the actual evaluation was very popular, and seems to be a reasonable expectation. It would seem that, as a total sample, this was seen to be the best time since the evaluator would have the benefit of seeing the class progress from the beginning to the end. This would allow for a more comprehensive evaluation since the evaluator had had the chance to observe all aspects of the lessons, and the teacher would have the opportunity to impress the evaluator on a larger number of factors. A teacher evaluation system would therefore have to bear this factor in mind when working with the stake holders on the development of a suitable instrument.

The findings for the total sample as well as for the subsamples, indicated that a combination of narrative and coded evaluation reports were the most accurate and the easiest to score. This finding is very much in-keeping with the literature and should be one of the factors for consideration in the development of an evaluation program.

One of the most interesting findings to have resulted from this research is that there was overwhelming agreement on the fact that all teachers, regardless of their classification, should be evaluated, or that they were against discrimination in favor of any group. This implies that this sample recognized the importance of evaluation at the workplace. This is a most promising finding as it indicates that there should not be any serious opposition to developing a system which would evaluate all its teachers. In terms of the larger picture, if one considers that teacher evaluation is only a part of a much needed total evaluation program for the school system, it might be that the individuals themselves see and accept the need for some measure of accountability and monitoring, and therefore would welcome efforts to correct a deteriorating educational
Generally speaking, the findings have indicated that the stake holders in the evaluation process, here represented by education officers, principals and teachers, do not all have the same understanding of the evaluation process, but there are enough agreements to indicate that it should not be too difficult to develop a system to evaluate teachers if the stake holders are properly represented in the planning and development of that system. Education seems to be the answer to many of the discrepancies which have been indicated, but with the acceptance of the need for a comprehensive evaluation system by the stake holders, chances are that they will be only too willing to work with such a program for the betterment of all concerned.

Recommendations

The conclusions drawn from this study have presented significant implications for stake holders in the evaluation process, the planners and developers of an evaluation system as well as for the education process in general. Since the development and implementation of a teacher evaluation system would be the concern of the Ministry of Education, the following recommendations are therefore addressed to that body.

The Ministry of Education must:

1. seriously consider the development and implementation of an institutionalized, comprehensive teacher evaluation system;

2. examine its educational goals, administration and concept of teaching, and design an evaluation system to meet the needs of the situation in which it is to be used, rather than transport and transplant a foreign system into the Jamaican situation;
3. seek input from the prospective users of the system to ensure representation of the ideas of the different user groups in the development of a teacher evaluation system, and thereby, ensure its legitimacy, fairness and effectiveness;

4. develop a system that will evaluate all teachers;

5. ensure that there is commitment from top level officials prior to the development of the system, to ensure continuity of the program;

6. ensure that the evaluation system has utility;

7. in conjunction with the Jamaica Teachers’ Association, develop a program to educate the users of the evaluation system about the different aspects of the system: its use, administration and content.

8. ensure that the evaluators be trained in the techniques of evaluation.
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APPENDICIES
CIRCULAR

To: Education Officers
   Principals
   Subject Teachers

From: Permanent Secretary

Re: Study on Educational Administration
    and Supervision (in Secondary and
    High Schools)

This serves to introduce Mrs. Claudette Williams a
Doctoral Student from the Clarke-Atlanta University in the
United States of America who is pursuing a Research on the
abovenamed subject.

Mrs. Williams wishes to conduct interviews in 29 of
our Secondary and High Schools islandwide. This is to solicit
the kind support of Principals and Subject Teachers in
completing the questionnaire as promptly as possible to assist
in carrying through this project in the shortest possible
time.

I am asking you to cooperate fully with the person
designated to coordinate the completion of questionnaires
in each school.

Rae Davis
Permanent Secretary
Dear Educator,

I am a student at the Clark Atlanta University, and am engaged in conducting a research on the perception of teachers, principals and education officers on Teacher Performance Evaluation in Secondary Schools in Jamaica. You are being asked to participate in this exercise to help provide vital information on this topic.

To that end, you are asked to complete ALL items on the attached questionnaires and return them within a seven day period. Your responses will be held in strict confidence used for the purposes of this research only. Please respond as accurately and honestly as you can, and use the response modes indicated for each item.

Your time, cooperation and assistance in this exercise, are of paramount importance and are very greatly appreciated.

Thank you.
APPENDIX C
CONTENT EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Dimension 1: Classroom Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Clean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Orderly arrangement of furniture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Easy access to students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Compatible seating arrangement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Orderly display of charts and teaching aids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments/Suggestions


Dimension 2: Teacher Preparation For Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Comprehensive lesson plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Goals and objectives are clearly stated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Appropriate teaching methods described</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Relevant teaching activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Appropriate teaching aids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Logical sequencing of activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments/Suggestions


### Dimension 3: Classroom Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Appropriate instructional level</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Develops content logically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Builds for transfer of learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Creates opportunities for student involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Utilizes classroom time for maximum learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Provides opportunities for practical application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Visual learning style accommodated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Tactile learning style accommodated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Auditory learning style accommodated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Opportunities for written and oral expression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments/Suggestions

### Dimension 4: Learning Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Relates content to student experiences and interests</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Establishes climate for courtesy and respect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Recognizes learning efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Avoids sarcasm and negative criticism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Challenges students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Establishes and maintains positive rapport with students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments/Suggestions
### Dimension 5: Classroom Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Gives clear behavioral expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Consistently reinforces the roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Responds verbally and non-verbally to undesirable behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Constantly maintains contact with students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Monitors classroom activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments/Suggestions

### Dimension 6: Assessment of Student Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Uses effective questioning techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Gives feedback on performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Provides guided student practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Provides activities for independent practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Solicits responses/demonstrations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Assesses, evaluates and demonstrates student programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments/Suggestions
### Dimension 7: Extra Curricula Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Participates in school fundraising activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Coaches students for academic/athletic competition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Prepares students for entry into Festival competitions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Actively involved with school clubs/organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments/Suggestions

### Dimension 8: Community Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Involves parents/community personnel in school activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Develops programs to encourage parent/community involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Encourages and builds harmonious relationships between school and community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Works cooperatively with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Works cooperatively with administration and support staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Conducts parent/teacher conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments/Suggestions
Dimension 9: Personal Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Is sensitive to the needs of students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Is sensitive to the feelings of students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Is easy to talk to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Demonstrates positive and cooperative attitudes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Exhibits enthusiasm for work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Encourages students to succeed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Is fair and consistent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Is willing to take suggestions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Is adaptable and resourceful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Dresses appropriately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Is prompt and organized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments/Suggestions

Dimension 10: Additional Duties and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Keeps accurate, legible records.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Attends to routine duties/responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Assumes share of school responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Is punctual for work and staff meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Complies with conditions stated in employment contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Maintains satisfactory attendance records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Participates in school/parent meetings other than those required by administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments/Suggestions

---

**Dimension 11: Student Welfare Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Counsels students in matters relating to their academic and emotional wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Counsels parents on matters relating to their family wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Willingly gives extra tuition to students at no cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Secures financial assistance for needy students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Protects students from abusive situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Secures social welfare assistance for students who are abused physically or emotionally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments/Suggestions
Please circle your response to the following questions.

Item 12

a) Considering that one of the aims of an evaluation instrument is ease in scoring, would you suggest a change to the method of scoring on the Evaluation Instrument attached?

Yes  No

b) If yes, which ONE of the following response modes would you think more appropriate?

i) NI (Needs Improvement
   S (Satisfactory)
   E (Excellent)

ii) Poor
    Good
    Excellent

iii) Below Average
     Average
     Above Average

c) If none of the above is appropriate, what response mode would you suggest?
Please indicate below.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Item 13

a) Are there any other dimensions of teacher performance which you think should be assessed?

Yes  No

b) If yes, please indicate __________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX D
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN JAMAICA

Teacher's Name: ____________________________

Grade: ______ Subject: ______________ School: _______________________

Date: ________ Time: ________ Length of Observation: _______________

Evaluator's Name: __________________________ Position: ______________________

Directions

Circle the Response which best described the teacher's performance for the characteristic being evaluated.

Dimension 1: Classroom Environment

A. Clean NI S
   B. Orderly arrangement of furniture NI S
   C. Easy access to students NI S
   D. Compatible seating arrangement NI S
   E. Orderly display of charts and teaching aids NI S

Comments: ___________________________________________________________

Dimension 2: Teacher Preparation For Instruction

A. Comprehensive lesson plan. NI S
   B. Goals and objectives are clearly stated NI S
   C. Appropriate teaching methods NI S
   D. Relevant student activities NI S
E. Appropriate teaching aids  NI  S

F. Logical sequencing of activities  NI  S

Comments: ________________________________________________________________

Dimension 3: Classroom Instruction

A. Appropriate instructional level  NI  S
B. Develops content logically  NI  S
C. Builds for transfer of learning  NI  S
D. Creates opportunities for student involvement  NI  S
E. Utilizes classroom time for maximum learning  NI  S
F. Provides opportunities for practical application  NI  S
G. Visual learning style accommodated  NI  S
H. Tactile learning style accommodated  NI  S
I. Auditory learning style accommodated  NI  S
J. Opportunities for written and oral expression  NI  S

Comments: ________________________________________________________________

Dimension 4: Learning Environment

A. Relates content to student experiences and interests  NI  S
B. Establishes climate for courtesy and respect  NI  S
C. Recognizes learning efforts  NI  S
D. Avoids sarcasm and negative criticism  NI  S
E. Challenges students  NI  S
F. Establishes and maintains positive rapport with students

Comments:

Dimension 5: Classroom Management

A. Gives clear behavioral expectations
B. Consistently reinforces the roles
C. Responds verbally and non-verbally to undesirable behavior
D. Constantly maintains contact with students
E. Monitors classroom activities

Comments:

Dimension 6: Assessment of Student Progress

A. Uses effective questioning techniques
B. Gives feedback on performance
C. Provides guided student practice
D. Provides activities for independent practice
E. Solicits responses/demonstrations
F. Assesses, evaluates and demonstrates student programs

Comments:
Dimension 7: Extra Curricula Activities

A. Participates in school fundraising activities
B. Coaches students for academic/athletic competition
C. Prepares students for entry into Festival competitions
D. Actively involved with school clubs/organizations

Comments: 

Dimension 8: Community Relations

A. Involves parents/community personnel in school activities
B. Develops programs to encourage parent/community involvement
C. Encourages and builds harmonious relationships between school and community
D. Works cooperatively with colleagues
E. Works cooperatively with administration and support staff
F. Conducts parent/teacher conferences

Comments: 

Dimension 9: Personal Characteristics

A. Is sensitive to the needs of students
B. Is sensitive to the feelings of students
C. Is easy to talk to
D. Demonstrates positive and cooperative attitudes
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Exhibits enthusiasm for work</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Encourages students to succeed</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Is fair and consistent</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Is willing to take suggestions</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>Is adaptable and resourceful</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>Dresses appropriately</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>Is prompt and organized</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: ____________________________________________

Dimension 10: Additional Duties and Responsibilities

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Keeps accurate, legible records.</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Attends to routine duties/responsibilities</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Assumes share of school responsibilities</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Is punctual for work and staff meetings</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Complies with conditions stated in employment contract</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Maintains satisfactory attendance records</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Participates in school/parent meetings other than those required by administration</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: ____________________________________________


**Dimension 11: Student Welfare Support**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Counsels students in matters relating to their academic and emotional wellbeing</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Counsels parents on matters relating to their family wellbeing</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Willingly gives extra tuition to students at no cost</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Secures financial assistance for needy students</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Protects students from abusive situations</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Secures social welfare assistance for students who are abused physically or emotionally</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

Questionnaire 2

The following items are designed to collect information on your perception of administrative procedures which should be used in a teacher performance evaluation system and for what purposes the evaluation should be used. The first section asks for demographic information and is followed by items addressing administrative procedures and the purposes of evaluation.

Please check ( ) the response which best reflects your answer.

1. In which of the following schools are you employed?
   a) New Secondary
   b) Traditional High or Grammar

2. For how many years have you taught?
   a) 1-2+ years
   b) 3-5+ years
   c) 6-10+ years
   d) 11-15 years
   e) over 15 years

3. For how many years have you been in your present position?
   a) 1-2+ years
   b) 3-5_ years
   c) 6-10+ years
   d) 11-15 years
   e) over 15 years

4. Which of the following best describes your educational qualifications?
   a) Colleged Trained
   b) Pre-trained Graduate
   c) Trained Graduate
   d) Pre-trained Postgraduate
   e) Trained Postgraduate
   f) Specialist
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Should teachers be required to take part in an orientation program to inform them about the evaluation of teachers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Should principals be required to take part in an orientation program to inform them about the evaluation of teachers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Should education officers be required to take part in an orientation program to inform them about the evaluation of teachers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Should principals and teachers attend the same performance evaluation orientation program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Should teachers know the factors on which they will be evaluated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Should teachers be told the time at which they will be evaluated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Should teachers and their evaluators plan for the evaluation together?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Should the evaluator interrupt the teacher during the evaluation observation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Should the evaluator interrupt the student during the class being evaluated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Should the teacher know the method of scoring which will be used by the evaluator in the evaluation observation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Should teacher performance evaluation take place more than once per year?
Response

16. Should the teacher have a choice of evaluation instrument which should be used to evaluate him or her?

17. Should the teacher receive immediate feedback from his or her evaluator on his/her performance?

18. Should the teacher be able to object to any aspect of his/her performance evaluation?

19. Should the teacher be told the rating that he/she has received for his/her evaluation?

Please check ( ) the appropriate response

20. Which of the following should evaluate a teacher’s performance? (you may check more than one response)
   a) Students
   b) Peer Teachers
   c) Heads of Departments
   d) Principals
   e) Assistant Principals
   f) Education Officers
   g) The teacher himself or herself

21. Which of the following methods should be used to evaluate a teacher’s performance? (you may check more than one response)
   a) Observation
   b) Interviews
   c) Student Achievement
   d) Self Rating Scales
22. How long should the actual evaluation process last? (please check ONE response)
   a) 15-20 minutes
   b) 20-25 minutes
   c) 25-35 minutes
   d) A class period

23. Which of the following would facilitate easier rating in a performance evaluation exercise?
   a) Coded response sheets
   b) Narrative reports
   c) Both coded responses and narrative response

24. Which of the following would give the most accurate information on the performance evaluation exercise?
   a) Coded rating sheets
   b) Narrative reports
   c) Both coded and narrative reports
   d) Neither coded or narrative reports
   e) Other, Please specify ________________

25. What should be done with the teacher’s performance evaluation report? (you may check more than one response)
   a) A copy should be placed on the teacher’s local file
   b) A copy should be given to the teacher
   c) A copy should be placed on the teacher’s file in the Ministry of Education
   d) The report should not be retained

26. For which of the following purposes should the evaluation report be used? (you may check more than one response)
   a) Promotions
   b) Permanent appointment
   c) Firing
   d) Staff development
   e) Salary increases
   f) Reference/recommendation
g) Other, please specify ________________________________

27. Which of the following teachers should be evaluated for performance? (please check ONE response)
   a) All teachers
   b) Probationary/temporary teachers only
   c) All teachers except department heads
   d) All teachers except senior teachers

28. Which of the following positions do you presently hold? (please check ONE response)
   a) Classroom teacher
   b) Principal
   c) Vice Principal
   d) Education Officer
SEGMENT ONE

ORIENTATION TO THE GEORGIA TEACHER EVALUATION PROGRAM
Agenda and Guide for Notes

I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

A. OBJECTIVES FOR THE ORIENTATION SESSION

1. Explain the three purposes of the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program

2. Describe the procedures for field-test implementation

3. Identify the resources that were used to develop the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program

4. Identify the dimensions of effective teaching in the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument

5. Describe the procedure for using the Georgia Teacher Duties and Responsibilities Instrument

B. THREE PURPOSES OF THE GEORGIA TEACHER EVALUATION PROGRAM

1.

2.

3.
C. RESOURCES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE GEORGIA TEACHER EVALUATION PROGRAM

D. TWO GEORGIA TEACHER EVALUATION PROGRAM INSTRUMENTS

II. PROCEDURES FOR FIELD-TEST IMPLEMENTATION

A. RESPONSIBILITY FOR EVALUATION

B. STATEWIDE EVALUATION PROGRAMS

C. TIMELINE FOR 1988-89 FIELD-TEST

D. GEORGIA TEACHER EVALUATION PROCESS
   1. Orientation
   2. Pre-Evaluation Conference
   3. Observations
   4. Scoring and Written Comments
   5. Post-Observation Comments
   6. Annual Evaluation Summary Reports and Conferences
   7. Professional Development Plans

E. CONFIDENTIALITY

F. APPEALS

G. RECORDKEEPING
III. GEORGIA TEACHER OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

A. FORMAT AND ORGANIZATION
   1. Teaching Tasks
   2. Dimensions
   3. Research/Rationale and Bibliography
   4. Sample Effective Practices

B. GEORGIA TEACHER OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT CONTENT
   1. Task I: Provides Instruction
      a. Dimension A: Instructional Level
      b. Dimension B: Content Development
      c. Dimension C: Building for Transfer
   2. Task II: Assesses and Encourages Student Progress
      a. Dimension A: Promoting Engagement
      b. Dimension B: Monitoring Progress
      c. Dimension C: Responding to Student Performance
      d. Dimension D: Supporting Students
   3. Task III: Manages the Learning Environment
      a. Dimension A: Use of Time
      b. Dimension B: Physical Setting
      c. Dimension C: Appropriate Behavior

C. IDENTIFICATION OF DIMENSIONS (VIDEOTAPES)
GEORGIA TEACHER EVALUATION PROGRAM
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

TEACHER: ______________________ SYSTEM: ______________ SCHOOL: ______________

Check one of the following:

☐ Enhancement ☐ Satisfactory/Limited Needs ☐ Needs Improvement/Deficiencies ☐ Unsatisfactory/Deficiencies

Specific objectives for improvement from the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument or the Georgia Teacher Duties and Responsibilities Instrument:

Activities/Procedures/Timeline:
(Other each activity as to desired or required)

How progress will be measured:

Comments:

Evaluator's Signature: ______________________ SS#: ______________ Date: ______________
Teacher's Signature: ______________________ SS#: ______________ Date: ______________

Teacher's signature acknowledges receipt of form and necessarily concurrence with the plan. If the teacher does not agree to the plan, written comments must be attached. If comments are attached, initial here ______.
## GTOI OBSERVATION RECORD: STANDARD FORM

### TEACHING TASK I: PROVIDES INSTRUCTION

**Comments:**

- A. Instructional Level
- B. Content Development
  - 1. Teacher-Focused
  - 2. Student-Focused
- C. Building for Transfer

### TEACHING TASK II: ASSESS AND ENCOURAGES STUDENT PROGRESS

**Comments:**

- A. Promoting Engagement
- B. Monitoring Progress
- C. Responding to Student Performance
- D. Supporting Students

### TEACHING TASK III: MANAGES THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

**Comments:**

- A. Use of Time
- B. Physical Setting
- C. Appropriate Behavior

---

**SIGNATURES**

Observer: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Teacher: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Teacher's Copy
GOVERNMENT EVALUATION FIELD TEST: ANNUAL EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT

TEACHER'S NAME:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER SSN</th>
<th>OBSERVER SSN</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>EVALUATION SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOVERNMENT TEACHER OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT - SUMMARY INFORMATION

TEACHING TASK I: PROVIDES INSTRUCTION

Strengths:

Deficiencies or Needs:

A. Instructional Level
B. Content Development
   1. Teacher-Focused
   2. Student-Focused
C. Building for Transfer

TEACHING TASK II: ASSESSES AND ENCOURAGES STUDENT PROGRESS

Strengths:

Deficiencies or Needs:

A. Promoting Engagement
B. Monitoring Progress
C. Responding to Student Performance
D. Supporting Students

TEACHING TASK III: MANAGES THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Strengths:

Deficiencies or Needs:

A. Use of Time
B. Physical Setting
C. Appropriate Behavior

GOVERNMENT TEACHER DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES INSTRUMENT - SUMMARY INFORMATION

Strengths:

Deficiencies or Needs:

(SIGNATURES)

PRINCIPAL: ___________________________ DATE: ________________

OBSERVER: ___________________________ DATE: ________________

TEACHER: ___________________________ DATE: ________________

TEACHER'S COPY
# GT01 Observation Record: Extended Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER'S NAME</th>
<th>OBSERVER'S NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>TOTAL MINUTES</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teaching Task I: Provides Instruction

**Comments:**

A. Instructional Level:
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3

B. Content Development:
   1. Teacher-Focused
   2. Student-Focused
   3. Building for Transfer

C. Building for Transfer:
   1. Initial Focus
   2. Content Emphasis or Linking
   3. Summation

### Teaching Task II: Assesses and Encourages Student Progress

**Comments:**

A. Promoting Engagement
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3

B. Monitoring Progress
   - 1
   - 2

C. Responding to Student Performance:
   1. Responding to Adequate Performance
   2. Responding to Inadequate Performance

D. Supporting Students
   - 1
   - 2

### Teaching Task III: Manages the Learning Environment

**Comments:**

A. Use of Time:
   1. Non-instructional Tasks
   2. Instructional Time

B. Physical Setting
   - 1
   - 2

C. Appropriate Behavior:
   1. Monitoring Behavior
   2. Intervening

---

(Signatures) Observer: __________________________ Date: _____________

Teacher: __________________________ Date: _____________

Teacher's Copy
APPENDIX G

CRITERIA USED IN EVALUATING TEACHERS
EXAMPLE NUMBER 16
LAVEGA SCHOOL DISTRICT (WACO, TX)
FALL 1987 ENROLLMENT: 5,795

OUTLINE OF TEXAS APPRAISAL INSTRUMENT

DOMAIN I. INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

Criterion 1. Provides opportunities for students to participate actively and successfully.

Indicator a. appropriately varies activities
b. interacts with students in group formats as appropriate
c. solicits student participation
d. extends students' responses/contributions
e. provides ample time for students to respond to teacher questions/solicitations and consider content as it is presented
f. implements instruction at an appropriate level of difficulty

Criterion 2. Evaluates and provides feedback on student progress during instruction

Indicator a. communicates learning
b. monitors students' performances as they engage in learning activities
c. solicits responses or demonstrations from specific students for assessment purposes
d. reinforces correct responses/performances
e. provides corrective feedback/clarifies, or none needed
f. reteaches, or none needed

DOMAIN II. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION

Criterion 3. Organizes materials and students

Indicator a. secures student attention, or students are attending
b. uses administrative procedures and routines which facilitate instruction
c. gives clear administrative directions for classroom procedures or routines, or none needed.
d. maintains seating arrangements/grouping appropriate for the activity and the environment
e. has materials, aids, and facilities ready for use
APPENDIX H

CRITERIA USED IN EVALUATING TEACHERS
EXAMPLE NUMBER 18
SAN BERNARDINO CITY USD (SAN BERNARDINO, CA)
FALL 1987 ENROLLMENT: 33,339

The following indicators of teacher performance are only samples to be used as a guide in rating teacher performance, either as "meets or exceeds acceptable performance", "Improvement needed", or "Unsatisfactory". They are not absolute indicators that fit all situations. Good judgment must be used in rating the performance of a teacher. These sample performance indicators are an aid, and should never be considered as substitutes for the evaluator's judgement.

I. STUDENT PROGRESS

Meets or Exceeds Acceptable Performance
The percentage of students passing the proficiency tests is at or above the school or district average (Grades 2 to 5); Students' CTBS scores generally reflect at least a year of academic growth or are at or above grade level; profile cards are kept current and reflect expected standards of student progress; report card data indicates expected student achievement.

Improvement Needed
The percentage of students passing the proficiency tests falls below the school or district average (Grades 2 to 5 only); Student's CTBS scores generally reflect less than a year of academic growth or are below grade level; profile cards are not consistently maintained and a number of students have not met the 70% promotion standard; report card data indicates that a number of students are not achieving.

Unsatisfactory
A significant number of students failed to pass the proficiency tests; Students' CTBS scores reflect less than a year of academic growth or are significantly below grade level; profile cards indicate that most students have not met the 70% promotion standard or do not support the actual skills mastered by the students' (as reflected in other measurements); report card data reflects a general lack of achievement by most students.

II. INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNIQUES AND STRATEGIES

Meets or Exceeds Acceptable Performance

A. Teaches to Objectives:
Always has a well-defined objective for every learning activity with a specific content and perceivable behavior, consistently teaches to be objective and communicates lesson objectives to students.

B. Provides directed teaching at the appropriate level of difficulty:
Effectively determines students' needs and plans appropriate learning units; consistently monitors student progress and adjusts the level of difficulty when necessary; consistently utilizes small group instruction, when appropriate, to instruct students with similar academic needs; effectively provides instruction according to a well developed lesson plan which emphasizes teacher student interaction and incorporates basic elements of the lesson design.
C. Maintains and monitors time on task:
Consistently engages students in productive learning throughout the instructional day.

D. Uses a variety of teaching strategies and techniques to facilitate learning, i.e., reinforcement, motivation, lesson design, and questioning skills:
Effectively and consistently applies the basic principles of learning to daily instruction; consistently uses an appropriate schedule of reinforcement to positively affect students' behavior and academic progress; consistently employs the motivational variables of level of concern, feeling tone, success, knowledge of results, intrinsic and/or extrinsic rewards, and/or interest to arrange or manipulate the learning conditions in the classroom; effectively and appropriately utilizes the basic elements of the lesson design model in daily instruction; consistently asks questions which extend students' thinking to the higher levels of the cognitive domain (i.e., application, analysis, synthesis, evaluation).

Improvement Needed

A. Teaches to Objectives:
Occasionally has a learning objective; does not always teach to the objective or communicate the objective to students.

B. Provides directed teaching at the appropriate level of difficulty;
Occasionally determines students' needs before planning learning, units; some students are inappropriately placed in instructional groups; utilizes large group instruction despite a wide range of student abilities; infrequently uses lesson plans.

C. Maintains and monitors time on task:
Frequent inappropriate use of instructional time negatively impacts students' academic progress.

D. Uses a variety of teaching strategies and techniques to facilitate learning, i.e., reinforcement, motivation, lesson design, and questioning skills:
Occasionally applies the basic principles of learning to daily instruction; seldomly uses reinforcement or motivation theory; occasionally utilizes some of the basic elements of the lesson design model and only in a partially effective manner; asks few questions of students (does not actively seek to involve students in lessons).

Unsatisfactory

A. Teaches to Objectives:
Instructional program lacks clear focus; Teaching lacks continuity and direction; Lesson objectives are seldom evident.

B. Provides directed teaching at the appropriate level of difficulty:
Lessons frequently are inappropriate to the instructional range of the students; Teaching consists of talking "at" students with little or no interaction or checking for understanding.

C. Maintains and monitors time on task:
A considerable number of instructional minutes are wasted due to poor preparation, planning, and/or classroom.
D. Uses a variety of teaching strategies and techniques to facilitate learning, i.e., reinforcement, motivation lesson design, and questioning skills:

Basic principles of learning are generally lacking in daily instruction; teacher behaviors often negatively affect students' behavior and/or academic progress; lessons lack structure and little student learning occurs; students are rarely asked questions or encouraged to participate during lessons.

III. ADHERENCE TO CURRICULAR OBJECTIVES

Meets or Exceeds Acceptable Performance

A. Follows some of study and/or continuums:

Instructional units and lesson objectives and plans consistently reflect careful examination and compliance with courses of study and continuums as adopted by the board of education.

B. Uses district-approved textbooks:

Board of education adopted textbooks and other instructional materials are consistently used and provide the basis for the instructional program.

C. Supports curricular objectives with lesson plans:

Written lesson plans consistently reflect continuum objectives and course of study goals and objectives as adopted by the board of education.

D. Maintains a balanced instructional schedule:

Consistently adheres to the weekly instructional time allotments for each subject area as adopted by the board of education.

Improvement Needed

A. Follows course study and/or continuums:

Instructional program infrequently complies with board adopted continuums and courses of study. Students fail to meet district curriculum standards due to a lack of instruction.

B. Uses district-approved textbooks:

Board adopted textbooks and/or instructional materials are infrequently used and rarely provide the basis for the instructional program; district materials seem to only supplement the classroom instructional program.
C. Supports curricular objectives with lesson plans:

Written lesson plans and/or lesson observations infrequently reflect continuum objectives or course of study goals or objectives; students frequently receive instruction which is unrelated to district adopted curriculum standards for the grade level.

D. Maintains a balanced instructional schedule:

Instructional program frequently does not meet minimum weekly time allotments for a particular subject area. Students do not complete a course of study due to a lack of emphasis in some skill areas.

Unsatisfactory

A. Follows course of study and/or continuums:

Consistently does not follow board adopted continuum and/or course of study. Students do not make satisfactory progress towards meeting district curriculum standards due to a lack of instruction in subject areas.

B. Uses district-approved textbooks:

Consistently fails to use adopted textbooks and instructional materials as the basis for lesson planning and implementation.

C. Supports curricular objectives with lesson plans:

Written lesson plans and/or lesson observations normally do not reflect continuum objectives or course of study goals or objectives; students progress suffers as a result of poor teacher planning and preparation.

D. Maintains a balanced instructional schedule:

Consistently does not follow district weekly instructional time allotments policy in most subject areas. Student progress is significantly impeded as a result of a flagrant misuse of instructional minutes.

IV. SUITABLE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Meets or Exceeds Acceptable Performance

A. Maintains appropriate classroom appearance:

Classroom displays and bulletin boards reflect the curriculum as well as the season, and show student work; furniture arrangement creates a productive and safe learning environment; instructional materials and supplies are neatly stored or displayed and easily accessible.

B. Maintains appropriate discipline and control:

A firm, fair discipline plan is consistently applied; classroom rules are developed and logical positive and negative consequences are consistently given to modify and reinforce behavior, communication with the principal and parents.

C. Supports curricular objectives with room environment:

Bulletin boards, displays, instructional materials, and/or learning centers evidence the teaching of the district adopted continuum objectives and courses of study.
APPENDIX I

OBSERVATION FORMS USED IN TEACHER EVALUATION
EXAMPLE NUMBER 28
VESTAL CENTRAL SCHOOLS (VESTAL, NY)
FALL 1987 ENROLLMENT: 4,432

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

NAME: _________________________________ DATE: _________________________________
GRADE SUBJECT or LEARNING AREA: _________________________________
CLASSIFICATION: □ Probationary □ Tenured □ Substitute □ Other___
SCHOOL: __________________________________ TIME: _________________________________
OBSERVER/TITLE: __________________________________

GOALS

The goals of the Classroom Observation Instrument are to assist teachers in improving their
performance and to aid the Administration in the evaluation of staff.

DEFINITIONS

"Meeting District's Expectations" - The observer determined that the teacher's performance was at
a level expected of an experienced, well-trained teacher in the Vestal Central School District.

"Needs Improvement" - The observer determined that a discrepancy existed between the expected
level of performance of an experienced, well-trained teacher in the Vestal Central School District
and that which was demonstrated by the teacher.

DIRECTIONS

Each substatement is to be checked as "Meeting District's Expectations" or "Needs Improvement".
The observer will provide written comments appropriate to the observation. An item marked
"Needs Improvement" will be explained, including a statement of corrective action.
Preparation and Planning

1. Teacher specifies or identifies appropriate learning objectives:
   - Lesson planning reflects appropriate subject matter content
   - Lesson planning provides for varied student abilities

2. Teacher specifies appropriate learning activities to accomplish stated learning objectives:
   - Lesson planning identifies appropriate techniques, procedures, and materials

3. Teacher assembles materials to accomplish stated learning objectives:
   - Materials are set up and ready for use

Techniques of Instruction

4. Teacher's presentation facilitates students' comprehension of the lesson:
   - Teacher clearly defines the objectives of the lesson

5. Teacher is adaptable and resourceful:
   - Uses appropriate methods and materials which lead toward mastery of stated objectives
   - Capitalizes on classroom events and situations which enhance instruction

6. Teacher effectively interacts with students throughout the lesson:
   - Reacts in a positive manner to students' requests, questions and efforts
   - Encourages student discussion and exchange of ideas

7. Teacher evaluates student performance:
   - Utilizes evaluation procedures that determine students' attainment of lesson objectives
   - Provides for feedback of results

Classroom Management

8. Teacher establishes effective procedures and regulations to enhance learning:
   - Budgets class time effectively
   - Uses good judgment in disciplining students

9. Teacher maintains a safe and secure environment:
   - Adheres to health, safety and fire regulations of the school
   - Is aware of possible hazards and takes action to prevent injury

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets District's Expectations</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Written Evaluation Forms Used in Teacher Evaluation

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Individualized Instruction
- No coverage of curriculum
- Curriculum: Instructional
- Instruction: Students
- Students: Curriculum
- Curriculum: Instruction
- Instruction: Students

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### I. Teaching Effectiveness
- Knowledge of subject area
- Implementation of curriculum
- Organization of curriculum content
- Preparation for instructional period
- Organization of curriculum content

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Implementation of Curriculum
- Important
- Subject
- Subject matter
- Knowledge

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. Organization of Curriculum Content
- Does not follow
- Follow
- Follow
- Follow
- Follow

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4. Preparation for Instructional Period
- Adequate
- Adequate
- Adequate
- Adequate
- Adequate

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5. Teaching Skills
- Average
- Average
- Average
- Average
- Average

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fall 1987 Enrollment: 4,326

GLOUCESTER COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS (GLOUCESTER, VA)

EXAMPLE NUMBER 32

APENDIX J
7. Humanization/favorable psychological environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gives students negative feedback; does not recognize student needs</td>
<td>Humanization/psychological environment is satisfactory</td>
<td>Extra effort is made to treat each student in accordance with his/her needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Student-Teacher relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussions ramble - sometimes without purpose; little student participation</td>
<td>Student-teacher interaction adequate</td>
<td>Questions challenging; discussions are interesting; high degree of student participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Classroom management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students constantly talking purposelessly; confusion in classroom hampers instruction</td>
<td>Students generally follow instructions; distractions seldom interfere with instructional environment</td>
<td>All students working and attentive; involved in activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Daily teaching objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Given too hurriedly; vague and sometimes unreasonable or undefined</td>
<td>Usually adequate and understood</td>
<td>Students clearly understand objectives and know what is desired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Originality of approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional pattern seldom changes; new ideas seldom tried</td>
<td>Some evidence of new approaches</td>
<td>Demonstrates unusual creative ability: demonstrates an awareness of new subject field developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Closure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional period ends abruptly; no plans for continuity</td>
<td>Some carryover from one day to next</td>
<td>Students clearly understand what is expected and have a goal for future classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Evaluation techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation techniques and procedures not always used purposefully or promptly</td>
<td>Evaluation techniques and procedures used as prescribed for instructional purposes</td>
<td>Evaluation results used to potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Classroom appearance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom is untidy and unorganized</td>
<td>Classroom is neat and used purposefully</td>
<td>Classroom areas are used very effectively to increase interest and motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K

GEORGIA TEACHER DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES INSTRUMENT

I. Teacher Duties and Responsibilities

A. Follows professional practices consistent with school and system policies in working with students, students' records, parents, and colleagues

1. Interacts in a professional manner with students and parents
2. Is available to students and parents for conferences according to system policies
3. Facilitates home-school communication by such means as holding conferences, telephoning, and sending written communications
4. Maintains confidentiality of students and students' records
5. Works cooperatively with school administrators, special support personnel, colleagues, and parents
6. Models correct use of language, oral and written*
7. Demonstrates accurate and up-to-date knowledge of content*
8. Assigns reasonable tasks and homework to students*

B. Complies with school, system, and state administrative regulations and board of education policies

1. Conducts assigned classes at the times scheduled*
2. Enforces regulations concerning student conduct and discipline*
3. Is punctual
4. Maintains lesson plans as required by school policy*
5. Provides adequate information, plans, and materials for substitute teacher
6. Implements designated curriculum*
7. Maintains accurate, complete, and appropriate records and files reports promptly
8. Attends and participates in faculty meetings and other assigned meetings and activities according to school policy
9. Complies with conditions as stated in contract

*Classroom observations with the GTOI can provide an opportunity to observe performance of these items.
C. Acts in a professional manner and assumes responsibility for the total school program, its safety and good order

1. Takes precautions to protect records, equipment, materials, and facilities
2. Assumes responsibility for supervising students in out-of-class settings

II. Duties and Responsibilities, Prescribed by Local System (Optional)

A. 

B. 

C. 

III. Professional Development Plan

Completes all prescribed activities outlined in the Professional Development Plan
APPENDIX L
INTERVIEW OUTLINE

The following are items which were used to guide the interview process with individuals in the subsamples investigated in this research.

1. Describe the state of education in this country over the past five years.

2. What, would you say, are the factors which have contributed to the present state?

3. How would you describe the academic achievement of high school students in G.C.E. and C.X.C. examinations, and what has contributed to its present level?

4. What is your general impression of the secondary/high school performance in the classroom?

5. Do you think that the performance of the students in major examinations bear any relationship to the way that teachers perform their job?

6. In what way have (a) principals and (b) education officers contributed to the current situation in education?

7. What can (a) teachers, (b) principals and (c) education officers do to improve the present situation?

8. What do you think of the change of New Secondary schools to secondary/high schools, and the fact that they are now seen to be on the same level?
9. Do you think that students in both types of schools have similar curricular offerings and are taught at the same level?

10. What are your views about implementing a teacher evaluation program in the secondary school system?

11. In what ways, if any, could such an evaluation system affect education in Jamaica?

N.B. Individuals were not asked questions which would be duplicating, to a great extent, items on the questionnaires. They were asked, however, to speak freely as the information given would be held in strict confidence.