

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book. These are also available as one exposure on a standard 35mm slide or as a 17" x 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 8925227

**Effectiveness of five selected strategies for using teacher
self-evaluation as an administrative tool in the improvement
of instruction in selected elementary schools in Nebraska as
perceived by elementary teachers and principals**

Beaty, Carol A., Ed.D.

The University of Nebraska - Lincoln, 1989

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

EFFECTIVENESS OF FIVE SELECTED STRATEGIES FOR USING
TEACHER SELF-EVALUATION AS AN ADMINISTRATIVE
TOOL IN THE IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTION IN
SELECTED ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN NEBRASKA
AS PERCEIVED BY ELEMENTARY
TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

by

Carol A. Beaty

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of
The Graduate College in the University of Nebraska
in Partical Fulfillment of Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Education

Major: Interdepartmental Area of
Administration, Curriculum, and Instruction

Under the Supervision of
Professor Robert J. Stalcup

Lincoln, Nebraska

May 1989

TITLE

EFFECTIVENESS OF FIVE SELECTED STRATEGIES FOR USING TEACHER SELF-EVALUATION
AS AN ADMINISTRATIVE TOOL IN THE IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTION IN
SELECTED ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN NEBRASKA AS PERCEIVED
BY ELEMENTARY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

BY

Carol A. Beaty

APPROVED

DATE

Robert J. Stalcup

April 21, 1989

F. William Sesow

April 21, 1989

Donald Herling

April 21, 1989

David Moshman

April 21, 1989

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE

GRADUATE COLLEGE

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

Effectiveness of Five Selected Strategies for Using
Teacher Self-Evaluation as an Administrative Tool
in the Improvement of Instruction in Selected
Elementary Schools in Nebraska as Perceived
by Elementary Teachers and Principals

Carol A. Beaty, Ed.D.

University of Nebraska, 1989

Advisor: Dr. Robert J. Stalcup

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of five selected strategies for using teacher self-evaluation as an administrative tool to improve instruction in the elementary school as perceived by elementary teachers and principals. The study examined the use of teacher self-evaluation to improve instruction in Nebraska Class III school districts. It also examined the perceptions of 103 elementary school principals and 309 elementary school teachers regarding the effectiveness of five self-evaluation strategies in the improvement of instruction. A survey instrument made up of Likert-type items was used in the study.

The findings of the study indicate that self-evaluation is being used in Nebraska to improve instruction. All five self-evaluation strategies were considered "somewhat effective" in the improvement of instruction by principals and teachers. Self-evaluation

which includes the setting of goals for improvement by teachers and monitoring of progress toward those goals is considered as more effective in improving all areas of teaching than other self-evaluation strategies. Findings also indicate that teachers and principals who have experience with a self-evaluation strategy perceive it as more effective than teachers and principals who do not have such experience.

Recommendations were made to administrators regarding the use of self-evaluation to improve instruction. All five strategies (goal setting, growth contracting, self-observation, self-rating, self-ranking) were recommended for use in elementary schools. Administrators should be directly involved in the self-evaluation process. Self-evaluation strategies should be used along with other evaluation strategies. Administrators should be cognizant of the importance of teacher motivation in the achievement of instructional improvement.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation and gratitude to the many individuals who encouraged and assisted me in the completion of this study. Those individuals include:

Dr. Robert J. Stalcup, chairperson of my doctoral committee, who assisted me with his interest, his time, and his expertise as I completed this study.

Dr. Donald Uerling, Dr. F. William Sesow, and Dr. David Moshman, who as members of my supervisory committee offered suggestions and contributions as I worked toward completion of the manuscript.

Bunny Polezal, NEAR Center statistician, who assisted with the selection of statistical methods used and the interpretation of the results.

The 286 elementary teachers and principals who took the time and effort to complete and return the survey sent to them.

The staff at Hamlow Elementary School in Waverly, Nebraska who assisted in the study by piloting the first survey instrument and offering support and encouragement during the entire period of my doctoral studies.

My friend Sharon Schulenberg, who encouraged me always with her confidence in me.

My friend Gayle Angus, who devoted hours to folding, stuffing, sealing, and stamping surveys and who followed the progress of the study with interest and support.

My children, Jeffry and Jennifer, who are themselves embarking on University studies and followed my educational pursuits with interest and support.

C.A.B.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Context of the Problem	1
Purpose of the Study	4
Research Questions	4
Summary of Procedures	5
Definitions.	6
Assumptions.	8
Delimitations and Limitations.	9
Significance of the Study.	9
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	11
Introduction	11
Need for Instructional Improvement	12
Administrator Role in Improvement of Instruction	13
Limitations of Teacher Evaluation in the Improvement of Instruction.	21
Use of Multiple Data Sources	31
Teacher Involvement in Teacher Evaluation	38
Teacher Self-Evaluation for Instructional Improvement	43
Summary	62

3. PROCEDURES64
Introduction64
Setting for the Study.64
Research Methodology65
Instrumentation.65
Population and Sample.69
Data Collection.70
Statistical Analyses72
Summary74
4. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA.75
Introduction75
Teacher Self-Evaluation in Class III School Districts77
Distribution of Respondents.82
Perceived Effectiveness of Five Self-Evaluation Strategies on the Improvement of Instruction84
Perceived Effectiveness of Five Self-Evaluation Strategies on the Improvement of Six Teaching Situations91
Relationship Between Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Effectiveness of Self-Evaluation Strategies	106
Comparison of Ratings of Respondents With and Without Experience Using the Self-Evaluation Strategies	109
Comments of Respondents	116

5. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS. 120

 Summary. 120

 Discussion 124

 Conclusions. 130

 Recommendations. 131

 Recommendations for Research 132

 Recommendations for Practice 134

REFERENCES 137

APPENDIXES

A. Teacher Evaluation Survey 145

B. Definitions of Self-evaluation
 Strategies 150

C. Letter to Superintendents. 152

D. Letter to Principals 154

E. Letter to Teachers 156

F. Letter Accompanying Second
 Mailing of Survey 158

G. Letter Accompanying Third
 Mailing of Survey 160

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Reliability Test for the Pilot Study.....	66
2. Study Reliability.....	69
3. Use of Teacher Self-Evaluation in Nebraska Class III School Districts	78
4. Number of Responses per Mailing	83
5. Number of Usable Responses	84
6. Means and Standard Deviations of Self- Evaluation Strategies for All Respondents	86
7. Means and Standard Deviations of Self- Evaluation Strategies for Principals and Teachers	87
8. Split Plot ANOVA Summary	88
9. Tukey Analysis for Self-Evaluation Strategies	89
10. Teaching Situation Mean Scores by Strategy for All Respondents	92
11. Split Plot ANOVA Summary for Planning	94
12. Tukey Analysis for Planning	95
13. Split Plot ANOVA Summary for Instruction ..	96
14. Tukey Analysis for Instruction	97
15. Split Plot ANOVA Summary for Classroom Management	98
16. Tukey Analysis for Classroom Management ...	99
17. Split Plot ANOVA Summary for Clinical Assistance	100

18.	Tukey Analysis for Clinicial Assistance	101
19.	Split Plot ANOVA Summary for Progress Monitoring	102
20.	Tukey Analysis for Progress Monitoring	103
21.	Split Plot ANOVA Summary for Care Giving ..	104
22.	Tukey Analysis for Care Giving	105
23.	Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients for Principals and Teachers	107
24.	Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients for Principals and Teachers by Teaching Situations for Self- Evaluation Strategies	108
25.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Self-Evaluation Strategies for Respondents With and Without Experience Using that Strategy	109
26.	Use of Self-Evaluation Strategies by Fifty-nine Districts Reporting Use of Self-Evaluation	111
27.	Results of a T-Test Analysis of the Difference between Ratings of Effectiveness of the Goal Setting Strategiey given by those With Experience and those Without Experience with that Strategiey.....	114
28.	Results of a T-Test Analysis of the Difference between Ratings of Effectiveness of the Growth Contracting Strategiey given by those With Experience and those Without Experience with that Strategiey.....	114
29.	Results of a T-Test Analysis of the Difference between Ratings of Effectiveness of the Self-Rating Strategiey given by those With Experience and those Without Experience with that Strategiey.....	115
30.	Results of a T-Test Analysis of the Difference between Ratings of Effectiveness of the Self-Ranking Strategiey given by those With Experience and those Without Experience with that Strategiey	115

31. Results of a T-Test Analysis of the Difference
between Ratings of Effectiveness of the
Self-Observation Strategy given by those
With Experience and those Without
Experience with that Strategy..... 116

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Context of the Problem

National, state, and local attention is currently focused on education. Reports and studies including A Nation at Risk (1983), Action for Excellence (1983), A Place Called School (Goodlad, 1984) and Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education (1986) have illustrated a need to raise standards for students and improve teaching in the public schools. It has been recognized that the most important aspects of education are classroom instruction and the teachers who deliver it. There is a clear need to focus on instruction in order to improve the public schools.

One approach to the improvement of instruction in the public schools has been through teacher evaluation. Frequently, the primary purpose of teacher evaluation has been described as the improvement of instruction (Bolton, 1973; Darling-Hammond, Wise & Pease, 1983; Stiggins & Bridgeford, 1985). However, traditional teacher evaluation has been relatively ineffective in the improvement of instruction (Soar, Medley & Coker, 1983).

Effective teaching is difficult to define and varies according to different teaching situations (Darling-Hammond et al., 1983; Glickman, 1987; Stodolsky, 1984). Furthermore, traditional evaluation systems have not necessarily been successful in measuring effective teaching (Darling-Hammond et al., 1983; Soar et al., 1983; Stodolsky, 1984).

The task of improving instruction is difficult because it may require changing the behavior of another person. Confidence, motivation, and cooperation of the teacher must be engaged before improvement can take place (Darling-Hammond et al., 1983). Additionally, teachers require strategies and guidance in making instructional changes. Although considerable administrator time is spent in evaluating teachers, it has been referred to as 'a waste of time' by teachers (Hawley, 1982; Kilgore, Caffey & Nordell, 1985).

Evidence exists that teacher evaluation can be effective in improving instruction. Factors contributing to that effectiveness include an emphasis on cooperative procedures and collegiality in the teacher evaluation process and a shared understanding between teachers and administrators regarding the criteria and processes of the evaluation (Darling-Hammond et al., 1983). There are indications that involving the teacher more directly in

the evaluation process will improve the effectiveness of evaluation in improving instruction (Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin & Bernstein, 1984). Ways to achieve cooperation and involvement of teachers in the improvement of instruction need further investigation.

Teacher self-evaluation may be useful in evaluation that is directed toward improvement (Duke, 1987). Teachers have expressed interest in more opportunities for self-evaluation (Stiggins & Bridgeford, 1985). Teacher self-evaluation, done in cooperation with an evaluator, may be a way to deal effectively with differences in strengths, styles, skills, and competencies among teachers (Haefele, 1980).

Investigating the potential of self-evaluation as a means of improving teacher evaluation effectiveness, thus leading to the improvement of instruction, would supplement the growing body of knowledge pertaining to both teacher evaluation and instructional improvement. It would further have practical significance to administrators struggling to effect instructional changes through teacher evaluation. A study of teacher self-evaluation could identify strategies that administrators could utilize in the improvement of instruction. It could further offer a means of involving teachers more directly in the evaluation process, a

practice that has been strongly recommended in the literature.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of five selected strategies for using teacher self-evaluation as an administrative tool to improve instruction in the elementary school as perceived by elementary teachers and principals.

To achieve this purpose, this study attempted to answer the following research questions.

Research Questions

1. To what extent is teacher self-evaluation used in elementary schools in Nebraska Class III school districts to improve instruction?

2. Is goal setting, as perceived by elementary teachers and principals, an effective teacher self-evaluation strategy in improving instruction?

3. Is growth contracting, as perceived by elementary teachers and principals, an effective teacher self-evaluation strategy in improving instruction?

4. Is self-rating, as perceived by elementary teachers and principals, an effective teacher self-evaluation strategy in improving instruction?

5. Is self-ranking, as perceived by elementary

teachers and principals, an effective teacher self-evaluation strategy in improving instruction?

6. Is self-observation, as perceived by elementary teachers and principals, an effective teacher self-evaluation strategy in improving instruction?

Summary of Procedures

The procedures followed in this study are described below with further detail in Chapter 3.

1. A review of literature was conducted in the areas of need for instructional improvement in public schools, the role of the administrator in the improvement of instruction, the limitations of teacher evaluation in the improvement of instruction, the use of multiple data sources in teacher evaluation, teacher involvement in the evaluation process, and research on teacher self-evaluation.

2. Based on the review of literature, definitions were formulated for five teacher self-evaluation strategies.

3. A survey instrument was developed based on a view of teaching excellence identified in the review of literature.

4. Instrument reliability was tested through a pilot survey.

5. The population was identified following

examination of teacher evaluation policies and procedures submitted to the Nebraska Department of Education as required by Title 92, Nebraska Administrative Code, Rule 34 (1985). All Class III school districts using teacher self-evaluation were selected.

6. The survey was distributed to all elementary principals and randomly selected teachers of identified schools.

7. Descriptive statistics, split plot analysis of variance, Pearson's product moment correlation, and t-tests for independent means were utilized to analyze the data.

8. Based on the analysis of data, conclusions were drawn and recommendations made.

Definitions

(1) Evaluation strategy - A specific method used by administrators to measure and monitor teacher performance.

(2) Teacher self-evaluation - A process in which teachers measure and monitor their own teaching performance.

(3) Improvement of instruction - The continuous process of upgrading the quality of teaching (Duke, 1987).

(4) Goal setting - An evaluation strategy in which the teacher selects personal instructional improvement goals and regularly monitors progress toward selected goals. Goal setting is considered a self-evaluation strategy when the teacher has the primary responsibility to select goals and monitor progress and the administrator facilitates the process.

(5) Growth contracting - An evaluation strategy in which the teacher develops a contract which specifies job targets/objectives, methods of attainment, time lines, and progress measurement techniques. Growth contracting is considered a self-evaluation strategy when the teacher has the primary responsibility for developing and monitoring the contract and the administrator facilitates the process.

(6) Self-rating - An evaluation strategy in which the teacher compares his or her performance on specified criteria with a predetermined standard.

(7) Self-ranking - An evaluation strategy in which the teacher analyzes his or her own teaching strengths and weaknesses and ranks them.

(8) Self-observation - An evaluation strategy in which the teacher observes himself or herself through the use of video or audio tapes or other observation instruments. Examples of such instruments include

Teacher Self Appraisal Observation System and Flanders Interaction Analysis.

(9) Class III school districts - Nebraska school districts which embrace territory having a population of 1,000 to 100,000 and maintain both elementary and secondary grades under the direction of a single board of education.

Assumptions

(1) Nebraska Department of Education files are a valid source for determining use of teacher self-evaluation in Nebraska schools.

(2) Teacher self-evaluation, as described in school district evaluation policies and procedures on file with the Nebraska Department of Education, is being used in Class III schools for the improvement of instruction.

(3) The improvement of instruction is observable and can be measured.

(4) A mailed survey is a valid research design for the purpose of identifying self-evaluation strategies that are effective in improving instruction.

(5) The individuals responding to the survey were willing and able to respond accurately regarding teacher self-evaluation and the improvement of instruction.

Delimitations and Limitations

(1) The population surveyed was limited to elementary schools in Nebraska Class III school districts currently indicating use of teacher self-evaluation in evaluation policies and procedures submitted to the Nebraska Department of Education.

(2) The survey was a measure of a particular perception of a selected population at a designated point in time and will not constitute a permanent record of the populations' perceptions.

(3) The results of the study may be affected by inherent limitations of mailed survey research.

Significance of the Study

The most often reported goal of teacher evaluation is the improvement of instruction. This study was designed to look specifically at teacher self-evaluation strategies and the effect they may have on the improvement of instruction. This study has practical significance to school districts and administrators who are attempting to expand their evaluation strategies to meet the goal of instructional improvement more effectively. This study was designed to gather information from teachers and administrators who are currently using self-evaluation in Nebraska. The perspectives of professionals who have experience with

procedures or methods can be valuable to others who may want to consider such procedures or methods.

The research literature makes frequent reference to the involvement of teachers in the evaluation process. This study of self-evaluation strategies and their effects on instructional improvement may verify this means of involving teachers more directly in the evaluation and instructional improvement process. The conclusions drawn from this study of teacher self-evaluation strategies will supplement the growing body of knowledge pertinent to teacher evaluation and instructional improvement.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this research was to determine the effectiveness of five selected strategies for using teacher self-evaluation as an administrative tool in improving instruction in selected elementary schools in Nebraska as perceived by elementary teachers and principals.

This review of literature contains six sections that investigate the major facets pertaining to this study. The first section discusses the need for instructional improvement in public schools. The second section reports research regarding the role of the administrator in the improvement of instruction. The third section reports research regarding the limitations of teacher evaluation in the improvement of instruction. The fourth and fifth sections discuss two factors frequently mentioned in the literature as important to effective teacher evaluation when the purpose of such evaluation is the improvement of instruction: a) use of multiple data sources in teacher evaluation and b) teacher involvement

in the evaluation process. The final section reports previous research on teacher self-evaluation, including discussion of specific self-evaluation strategies as they relate to instructional improvement.

Need for Instructional Improvement

Commissions and reports issued in the early 1980's focused on the need for public schools in the United States to improve. Recommendations from these commissions and reports included both higher standards for student performance and higher expectations for teachers. Duke (1987) summarized the recommendations from five reports or studies (Adler, 1982; Boyer, 1983; Education Commission of the States, 1983; Goodlad, 1984; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). All of these reports made recommendations relating to the improvement of instruction. These recommendations included improving teaching skills, expanding the variety of teaching styles, and increasing active participation in learning by students.

The public's concern about public education is shifting from accountability for finance and management to concern about the quality of classroom teaching (Darling-Hammond, Wise & Pease, 1983). The belief that the key to educational improvement is in the improvement

of classroom instruction is growing. In the 1979 Gallup Poll, the most frequent response to the question on what public schools could do to earn an "A" grade was improving teacher quality (Gallup, 1979). The report of the Commission on Reading (1985) included the following statement: "an indisputable conclusion of research is that the quality of teaching makes a considerable difference in children's learning" (p. 85). The skill and effectiveness of teachers was considered by far the most significant variable in determining what children learned.

In a discussion of teacher evaluation and its relation to school improvement, McLaughlin (1984) indicated that the results of national reports and studies about the status of American education are creating momentum at state and local levels to "do something" about the quality of education. Local, state, and national educational agendas include the improvement of schools. Emphasis on teacher quality and the improvement of classroom instruction is paramount. McLaughlin maintained that teacher evaluation can be a powerful strategy to achieve school improvement goals.

Administrator Role in Improvement of Instruction

The 1970's and 1980's marked multiple research

attempts to determine the factors contributing to effective schools. Some researchers have attempted to link specific teacher behaviors to student achievement. Others have looked at schools that experience success in student achievement and have tried to identify traits of a school that made it more effective than others. This has led to specific investigations of the effect of the building principal on the school and his/her relationship to the success of the school.

Weber (1971) was one of the first researchers to investigate successful schools and try to identify characteristic features of the school contributing to the success of students in achieving. Weber completed a case study of four inner city elementary schools from New York City, Kansas City, and Los Angeles. Common factors of the four successful schools included strong leadership, high expectations, orderly climate, and stress on reading. Wellisch and others (1978) reported the efforts of evaluating the impact of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA). The researchers examined leader behavior in nine elementary schools that had made significant achievement gains and contrasted them with thirteen less effective elementary schools. The authors concluded that strength of administrator leadership was a major factor in the schools' ability to improve student achievement.

Principals in the effective schools were more likely to have strong views about instruction and to effectively communicate their viewpoints to teachers through discussion and reviews of teacher performance.

Edmonds (1979) summarized the results of several efforts to identify and analyze urban schools that are instructionally effective for poor and minority students. He concluded that school leadership does make a difference. Leaders in effective schools promoted an atmosphere that is orderly yet not rigid. Leaders frequently monitored student progress. They stressed that staff be instructionally effective for all pupils. They set clear goals and learning objectives. They developed and communicated a plan for dealing with achievement problems.

In an effort to analyze school leadership, Brookover and Lezotte (1979) investigated six elementary schools with improving student test scores and two elementary schools with declining test scores. The leadership of the improving schools differed from that of the declining schools. Principals of improving schools were more likely to be instructional leaders and they assumed responsibility for evaluating the achievement of instructional objectives.

Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) conducted intensive,

open-ended interviews with eight exceptional principals. No single pattern of behavior characterized these instructional leaders, but some common characteristics were identified. Those characteristics observed in exceptional principals included 1) a goal-oriented perspective, 2) self-confidence and openness to others, 3) tolerance for ambiguity, 4) a tendency to test limits, 5) sensitivity to the dynamics of power, 6) an analytic perspective, and 7) the ability to be in charge of their jobs.

Gersten and Carnine (1981) identified six administrative and supervisory support functions essential to instructional improvement. Those functions included 1) implementing programs of known effectiveness, 2) monitoring student performance, 3) monitoring teacher performance, 4) providing technical assistance to teachers, 5) demonstrating visible commitment to programs for instructional improvement, and 6) providing emotional support and incentives for teachers. Gersten and Carmine suggested that these functions may be carried out by principals or by others in instructional leadership roles.

Shoemaker and Fraser (1981) reviewed several well-known studies of effective schools that illustrated that schools and principals have a significant impact on

student achievement. The authors identified four themes from the review of that research that have implications for the development of effective principals. Those four themes included the following: assertive, achievement-oriented leadership; orderly, purposeful, peaceful school climate; high expectations for staff and pupils; and well-designed instructional objectives and evaluation system.

Sweeney (1982) reviewed multiple studies of school effectiveness and identified six leadership behaviors that have been consistently associated with effective schools. Effective principals 1) emphasize achievement, 2) set instructional strategies, 3) provide an orderly atmosphere, 4) frequently evaluate student progress, 5) coordinate instructional programs, and 6) support teachers.

Jackson, Logson and Taylor (1983) studied eight District of Columbia low-income schools in an effort to identify leadership behaviors that distinguish effective low-income urban schools from less effective schools. Principals in the effective schools were more assertive in setting the instructional program. They monitored carefully to see that the curriculum met the achievement goals of the school. Teachers in the effective schools felt they were being held responsible for the achievement

of their students and reported an imperative to solve instructional problems.

McCurdy (1983) described "leadership" as a key trait in cases where school success is attributed to the principal. McCurdy stated that when defining leadership "researchers almost uniformly mean a conscious effort to improve the quality of teaching, instruction, and the school" (p. 9).

Little and Bird (1984) studied seventeen school administrators through interviews and observations and identified four patterns of leadership. One pattern centered on maintaining smooth operations and an orderly environment. Another centered on the improvement of teaching. A third pattern focused on staff development and a fourth centered on the cultivation of productive relationships among staff. Little and Bird concluded, as did Blumberg and Greenfield, that a single pattern of behavior did not characterize successful instructional leaders.

De Bevoise (1984) interpreted instructional leadership as the actions taken by a principal to promote growth in student learning. These actions included goal setting, defining purpose, providing resources, supervising and evaluating teachers, coordinating staff development, and enabling collegial relationships with

and among teachers. De Bevoise drew conclusions from the research done by others on instructional leadership. Common functions of instructional leadership included communicating a vision of the school's purpose and standards, monitoring student and teacher performance, recognizing and rewarding good work, and providing effective staff development programs. De Bevoise described these functions as ideal and not necessarily reflective of what most principals do or feel they can do.

Rutherford (1985) studied leadership skills of elementary and secondary principals over a five year span at the University of Texas at Austin. Clear distinctions between more-effective and less-effective principals emerged from the data that were collected through observations of principals and interviews with principals, teachers, and central office staff members. The distinctions between more-effective and less-effective principals related to five essential qualities of effective principals. Those qualities included 1) clear visions for their schools, 2) translation of visions into goals and objectives for teachers and students, 3) establishment of supportive school climate, 4) continuous monitoring of progress toward goals and objectives, and 5) intervention in a

supportive and/or corrective manner. Rutherford concluded that effective school leaders will demonstrate the five essential qualities of leadership, but that they will be demonstrated through different day-by-day behaviors.

Duke (1987) concluded that instructional leadership is "a relatively complex phenomenon involving a mixture of activities directly or indirectly related to instructional improvement" (p. 80). Duke described seven situations that instructional leaders must address. Among those seven were teacher supervision and development and teacher evaluation. According to Duke, the most critical situation that the instructional leader must deal with is the supervision and development of teachers. Instructional leaders must directly monitor instruction and collect data that will be useful in setting instructional improvement targets.

Summary. The research on school principals strongly supports the conclusion that principals make a difference as to what happens to the instructional program of a school. Instructional leadership has been identified by many researchers as an essential function of effective principals. Instructional leadership, in turn, consists of specific functions performed by

principals through a rather wide variety of behaviors. Those functions receiving general agreement from the researchers included setting instructional goals for the school, and monitoring, supervising and enabling teachers to meet those goals.

Limitations of Teacher Evaluation
in the Improvement of Instruction

The need for the improvement of instruction and the key role of the building administrator in achieving quality instruction was discussed in the previous sections of this review. Frequent reference in the literature was made to supervision and evaluation of teachers as a way to insure and/or improve the quality of instruction in a school. This section of the review of literature discusses the limitations of current teacher evaluation practices in the improvement of instruction.

Many school districts in the United States maintain that the primary purpose of teacher evaluation is the improvement of instruction. Yet McGreal (1983) pointed out that many of these same districts establish evaluation procedures that promote high-supervisor, low-teacher involvement, encourage infrequent or unfocused observations, and make comparisons between teachers on rating scales based on some type of

standardized criteria. All of these procedures have been found to hinder the improvement of teacher performance.

McGreal described a common law model for teacher evaluation used by more than 65 percent of school districts in the United States. Characteristics of this common law model include high-supervisor, low teacher involvement, observation as the single evaluation method, standardized criteria, comparative judgments between teachers, and an emphasis on summative evaluation. McGreal stated that "the common law system clearly seems to violate a number of assumptions about how to best promote instructional improvement" (p. 12). The common law model tends to promote the use of evaluative data gathered for administrative purposes. Common law models involve minimal contact time between supervisors and teachers. There is a heavy emphasis on standardized criteria that address relatively general areas of competence and characteristics or traits that have little or no research backing that links them to student learning. Common law models force administrators to make comparisons and judgments between teachers. All of these factors tend to erode the effectiveness of the model on the improvement of instruction.

In a case study of teacher evaluation policies and practices in four school districts, Stiggins and

Bridgeford (1985) endeavored to understand the problems and potentials of current teacher evaluation and to identify ways to promote teacher development. The research literature discussed by Stiggins and Bridgeford identified concerns of administrators with current teacher evaluation practices. Those concerns included inadequate definitions of effective teaching, lack of trust in the evaluation process by teachers, inadequate link between evaluation and instructional improvement, lack of specific evaluation techniques and skills, and inadequate time for evaluation. Concerns of teachers were also enumerated. Those concerns included inappropriate methods of assessment, unspecified performance criteria, infrequent and superficial classroom observation, lack of relationship of evaluation to instruction, subjective and personal nature of evaluation, and poorly communicated results which are not useful in improving performance.

The administrators in Stiggins and Bridgeford's case study cited four major barriers that limit the development of a more formative evaluation system. Those barriers included 1) teachers' lack of trust in the evaluation process, 2) insufficient time for evaluation, 3) the adversarial context of evaluation, and 4) principals' skills as evaluators. These concerns were

strikingly similar to those reported by administrators in other research reported by the authors.

Teacher evaluation has been criticized for attempting too much with one system. School districts typically have one evaluation system that attempts to address accountability and instructional improvement. Stiggins (1986) maintained that one system may be unable to accomplish both purposes. Evaluations typically provide information for use in personnel management decisions, including hiring, firing, promotion, tenure, salary, and merit. These evaluations are based on minimum competencies. If teachers do not meet the competencies, they must improve or leave the system. If teachers do meet the competencies, there is no impact from the evaluation. In reality, nearly all teachers meet minimum competencies and this type of evaluation system directly affects few teachers. As a result, this type of evaluation has little or no effect on instruction in the classroom.

Considerable research has been done in recent years to more adequately define effective teaching. Much of that research has attempted to link specific teaching behaviors to student achievement. This research is commonly referred to as teacher effectiveness research or process-product research. Numerous reviews on teaching

research are available (Rosenshine & Furst, 1971; Rosenshine, 1971; Dunkin & Biddle, 1974; Good, Biddle & Brophy, 1975; Medley, 1977; Peterson & Walberg, 1979; Stevens & Rosenshine, 1981; Good & Brophy, 1984). Effectiveness research appears to have a strong and growing research base. Most findings tend to parallel accepted practice that make those results readily acceptable to practicing educators and school systems (McGreal, 1983). The effectiveness studies are receiving increasing attention from school districts as the basis of teacher evaluation systems.

Many researchers and educators have expressed concern with using the teacher effectiveness research directly in the process of teacher evaluation. The extensive Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study, conducted for California's Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing, concluded that linking precise and specific teacher behavior to precise and specific learning of pupils is not possible at this time (Bush, 1979). This study did find that patterns of teaching performance appear to contribute to learning even though specific teaching behaviors cannot be identified as essential to effective teaching.

Centra and Potter (1980) investigated teaching variables identified by Rosenshine and Furst (1971) as

consistently related to student achievement. These variables included clarity, variability, enthusiasm, task-oriented behaviors, student opportunity, use of student ideas, criticism, types of questions, probing, and instructional difficulty level. Centra and Potter concluded that, although these variables are not unimportant, they cannot be considered "basic teaching tasks". Centra and Potter further pointed out that student achievement is affected by multiple factors other than teacher behavior and that the effects of teacher behavior on student achievement are likely to be small.

In a comprehensive review of literature on teacher evaluation, Darling-Hammond et al. (1983) expressed concern about the process-product research that has correlated teacher behaviors with student outcomes. The process-product view of teacher effectiveness assumes that what the teacher does will have a direct effect on what the student learns. Darling-Hammond et al. do not take issue with the process-product research per se. It is when that research is translated into rules for teacher behavior that in turn become the foundation of teacher evaluation models that they become concerned. The authors reminded the reader of the considerable number of variables among students, classrooms, and schools.

Darling-Hammond et al. pointed out that effective teaching behaviors vary for students of different socioeconomic, mental, and psychological characteristics and for different grade levels and subject areas. These findings make it difficult to develop rules for teaching behaviors that can be applied generally. The authors further pointed out that the effectiveness of teacher behaviors also varies according to the goals of instruction. Teacher behaviors that may result in increased achievement on standardized tests are dissimilar to those that increase complex cognitive learning, problem solving ability, and creativity. In such an analysis, educational goals become extremely important when determining effective teaching behaviors.

McLaughlin (1984) critiqued a checklist type of evaluation based on process-product models that assume specific teacher behaviors lead to particular learner outcomes. McLaughlin considered such checklists as irrelevant and inappropriate evaluation tools. She specified four concerns. First, learner outcomes are cumulative and it is difficult to isolate the effect of any one teacher on student performance. Second, teacher behaviors interact with other factors such as socioeconomic status, school climate, pupil abilities, and previous instructional treatment to affect student

performance. Third, teachers vary in what is effective for them and in the problems they face in their classrooms. Finally, teachers' effectiveness varies depending on goals defined for the student or the class. The checklist approach to evaluation disregards these variables and the complexity they bring to the individual classroom. As a result, such evaluations are inappropriate and contribute little to school improvement.

Glickman (1987) summarized research in instructional practices by saying "successful teaching is context and classroom specific. Teaching behaviors and the sequence of instruction will vary, depending on the learning goal and on the prior competence of students" (p. 122).

Evaluation of teachers is most often accomplished by a single direct classroom observation and a rating system that compares teachers on predetermined criteria (McGreal, 1983). This type of evaluation has received sharp criticism from researchers including Soar, Medley, and Coker (1983) who discussed three inherent problems with the use of rating scales to evaluate teachers. Rating scales lack the minimum properties necessary to accurately measure the performance of teachers; rating scales lack validity; and rating scales are highly susceptible to the halo effect. Teachers' ratings are

often abstracted from behaviors and highly dependent on the personal standard of effective teaching of the rater. Additionally, Soar, Medley, and Coker reported that the literature they reviewed consistently found no relationship between observer's ratings of teachers and students' achievement. The halo effect (a rater's tendency to let his or her overall impression of the teacher's competence influence specific ratings in different areas) tends to obscure what is actually being rated. Independent characteristics are frequently rated similarly. As a result of the halo effect, ratings become useless for diagnosis and improvement of instruction. In conclusion, the authors indicated that rating scales reflect the beliefs of the raters about effective teaching and individual teachers. Ratings tell how favorably a given teacher impresses a rater. Ratings do not, however, reflect actual competence of teachers.

Observations of teachers in classrooms are the most frequent evaluation technique used in schools. The validity of observations is premised on an assumption that teaching behaviors are stable and consistent and that a classroom observation is a representative sample of how a given teacher teaches. Stodolsky (1984) provided evidence that teacher behavior is neither stable nor consistent across settings. Elementary teachers in

Chicago were observed teaching different subjects to the same children. Subject matter strongly influenced instructional variance. Features of instructional format, pacing, and cognitive level varied for the same teacher with the same children in teaching different subjects. Stodolsky's results indicated that teachers do not demonstrate consistent patterns of behavior but rather a broad repertoire that varies according to situations. These results shed doubt on the validity of single or infrequent classroom observations in the evaluation of teachers, which is a common practice in schools.

The validity of principals' judgments of the effectiveness of teachers is usually taken for granted. However, studies of the validity of principals' judgments have shown no appreciable agreement between principals' judgments of teachers' effectiveness and the amount students learn (Medley and Coker, 1987). Medley and Coker studied 46 elementary principals and their evaluative data on 322 teachers. Achievement data were collected for the students of each teacher. Results of this study supported the earlier findings that principals' judgments have little to do with teachers' effectiveness in promoting student achievement.

Summary. The purpose of teacher evaluation reported in the literature is almost always the improvement of instruction. At the same time, the procedures and methods used to evaluate teachers have not always led to the improvement of instruction. Concerns have arisen over high-supervisor, low-teacher involvement, infrequent or unfocused observations, comparisons between teachers, the subjective nature of evaluation, and poor communication of evaluation results. The research reported in this review has been critical of using the teaching effectiveness research as the basis for evaluation because of variables and complexities in different teaching settings. The use of observation and principal's ratings of teachers were found to have inherent limitations.

Use of Multiple Data Sources

The use of multiple data sources during teacher evaluation is receiving regular attention in the literature on teacher evaluation. This attention springs in part from the limitations of specific methods of teacher evaluation identified frequently by researchers and discussed in an earlier section of this review.

Popham (1975) maintained that educational evaluations should not be based on single measures.

Teaching is so complex that a single measuring device cannot portray an accurate picture. Many measuring devices are less than perfectly valid. Popham described serious deficiencies in traditional teacher competence indices such as rating scales, observation reports, and pupil performance on standardized tests. He further maintained that the probability of getting an accurate description of teaching performance is increased by using more than one instrument.

Gephart, Ingle, and Saretsky (1976) investigated attitudes toward different approaches to evaluation. They concluded that each method investigated had weaknesses and that reliance on any one of them would be inadequate. They reported on the lack of consensus toward any one approach to evaluation and the apparent willingness to utilize combinations rather than relying on a single technique.

Levin (1979), after reviewing research results on six approaches to teacher evaluation, indicated that reliance on a single evaluation technique is unwise because it reduces the possibility of fair evaluation. He supported evaluation procedures that rely less on ratings of principals and supervisors and more on other methods.

Norris (1980) indicated that teacher evaluation

requires multi-dimensional evaluation. A variety of instruments should be available for supervisors and teachers to use. Those instruments which could represent the teacher's performance most fairly within the context of the school's curriculum should be selected. Norris suggested that teacher diversity could be dealt with adequately within the context of teacher evaluation if the evaluation process was personalized through instrument selection.

Lewis (1982), writing for the American Association of School Administrators, utilized the responses from over 400 school systems to a survey on evaluating educational personnel to come to some conclusions on evaluation. She stated that "school administrators generally realize that there is no one model of evaluation that is suited for all school systems or even for all teachers within one system" (p. 29). She made particular reference to use of observation as a single method of evaluation and suggested it was not successful in achieving improvement of instruction. Flexibility in evaluation procedures is necessary to satisfy the needs of a school system.

Darling-Hammond et al. (1983) reviewed a large body of research on evaluation processes and tools and concluded that "research has not identified a teacher

evaluation method which is unvaryingly successful" (p. 308). They concluded that due to the low levels of reliability, generalizability, and validity attributed to teacher evaluation methods, unidimensional approaches to assess competence, performance, or effectiveness of teachers will be unsuccessful.

While maintaining the importance of direct classroom observation as the foundation of effective evaluation, McGreal (1983) emphasized the usefulness of other sources of data about teaching. He stated that "there are other data gathering methods that can be helpful, if not essential, to the establishment of an effective instructional improvement effort" (p. 125). McGreal described the use of parent evaluation, peer evaluation, student performance, self-evaluation, student evaluation, and artifact collection as potential sources of information. Of these sources, he considered peer evaluation, student performance, and self-evaluation the most useful in improving instruction.

Use of multiple evaluation procedures will provide a more comprehensive picture of a teacher's performance (Stiggins & Bridgeford, 1985). Student and peer evaluation, assessment of student products, self-evaluation, and objective data from classroom observation including verbatim records and classroom

interaction charts are recommended to supplement the current reliance on subjective observation. Stiggins and Bridgeford's case study of teacher evaluation policies and practices in four school districts was designed to investigate ways teacher evaluation is used to promote teacher growth and improvement. Teachers made recommendations for improvement that included more frequent formal and informal observations, greater use of peer observation, and use of self-evaluation. These recommendations reflect teachers' perceptions that multiple evaluation techniques would be helpful in improving instruction.

Christensen (1986) described evaluation in terms of differences among teachers. In order to modify, improve, or change behavior and teaching techniques, evaluation must take into consideration the orientation and style of the teacher. Based in part on Glickman's work on supervisory style, (Glickman 1981) Christensen recommended that administrators learn to use all orientations of evaluation (directive, collaborative, nondirective) to meet the needs of individual teachers. The suggested evaluation would include self study, peer observation, and administrator observation. Such an evaluation approach should facilitate cooperation of teachers in the process.

Duke and Stiggins (1986) studied the important features of effective evaluation experiences. In-depth case studies were conducted of thirty teachers who had experienced positive growth that was triggered at least in part by an effective evaluation. The authors recommended multiple evaluation procedures, some of which have previously been considered inappropriate. The inappropriateness of some evaluation techniques has been linked particularly to evaluation for accountability when teacher dismissal, promotion, or salary increase are being considered. Student evaluations of teacher performance, peer assessments, and teacher self-evaluation have been suspect because of potential bias. Duke and Stiggins pointed out the potential each has when evaluation is for the purpose of professional development and personal growth of the teacher. Students, peers, and teachers themselves have valuable information that can influence and support teacher growth.

Stiggins (1986) contrasted teacher evaluation for accountability and teacher evaluation for growth. When teacher evaluation is used for accountability, evaluation data are subject to public and judicial review and must be verifiably objective and standardized for all teachers. This limits the type of data and the process

by which it can be collected. When teacher evaluation is for growth purposes, evaluation data are not constrained in this way. Performance criteria can be individualized for particular teachers and sources can be varied. Particularly useful data sources include self-assessment, peer assessment, student evaluations, and student achievement results. These sources can often be the most valuable sources of information on teacher performance.

Duke (1987) maintained that high quality data is important in teacher evaluation. The quality of evaluation is unlikely to be any better than the quality of data collected on teacher performance. Duke indicated that the quality of data is determined by three factors: 1) the variety of sources of relevant information, 2) the frequency of collection of information, and 3) the care in collecting the information. Duke elaborated on a variety of data sources including classroom observation, student judgments, parent opinions, student achievement, and teacher self-evaluation.

Summary. The sources reviewed in this section discussed the use of multiple methods or data sources in the teacher evaluation process. There was general agreement that single methods or data sources lack fairness and validity and are often ineffective in the

improvement of instruction. The chance of an accurate picture of a teacher's performance increases with multiple data sources. Recommended data sources in addition to direct observation of teaching performance include self-evaluation, peer evaluation, student evaluation, and student performance. The usefulness of teacher evaluation in the improvement of instruction increases when multiple data sources are utilized.

Teacher Involvement in Teacher Evaluation

When the purpose of evaluation is the improvement of instruction, the teacher should be involved in the evaluation process. The sources in this section of the review reveal a relationship between teacher involvement and the effectiveness of teacher evaluation in improving instruction.

Brighton (1965) maintained that the involvement of teachers is the most essential factor in the success of a teacher-evaluation system. He believed that teacher involvement increases the likelihood of a good evaluation plan because it represents the best judgment and thinking of all affected. Teacher involvement will also create a sense of identity with the evaluation system. As a result of this sense of identity, teachers will feel a responsibility and obligation to make the system work.

Bolton (1973) reinforced the need to involve teachers and administrators in the planning of evaluation procedures. He indicated that involvement of teachers increases the effectiveness of the process on instruction because teachers will better understand the purposes and procedures of evaluation.

Ovard (1975) concluded that teachers should be involved in developing both the criteria for the evaluation and the instruments used. This conclusion was based on research that indicated that teacher morale improves with teacher involvement in teacher evaluation and that performance criteria developed by teachers are more accepted by them. Pine and Boy (1975) also insisted that teacher resistance to evaluation will be overcome when teachers have a significant voice in designing and implementing evaluation procedures.

In a survey of teachers regarding effective evaluation programs, 100% of the responding teachers stated that they wanted to participate in the development or selection of evaluation instruments so that they would be familiar with the criteria by which they are judged (Young and Heichberger, 1975). Seventy percent of the teachers supported the idea of supervisors and teachers agreeing on instructional objectives and working together in evaluating these objectives.

Haefele (1980) summarized twelve approaches to teacher evaluation and pointed out strengths and weaknesses of each. The only method Haefele found helpful in the improvement of instruction was a model based on the teacher and evaluator arriving at mutually agreed upon instructional goals. The notable features of the model included teachers and administrators working together for the benefit of students, a goal toward instructional improvement, and teacher self-evaluation.

Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein (1984) reported on the 1983 Rand study that examined teacher evaluation practices in 32 school districts identified as having highly developed teacher evaluation systems. Four of these districts were chosen for extensive case study. Despite differences in evaluation procedures, the four school districts followed certain common practices that contributed to their success and may be applicable to the success of teacher evaluation in other districts. Four factors identified were organizational commitment, evaluator competence, teacher-administrator collaboration, and strategic compatibility. One of five conclusions drawn from the study was that teacher involvement and responsibility improve the quality of teacher evaluation. Recommendations to school districts included involving

teachers in the design and oversight of teacher evaluation to ensure its legitimacy, fairness, and effectiveness.

McLaughlin (1984) explained the significance of teacher participation in developing district evaluation practices. She maintained that teacher participation is important in building the trust between administrators and teachers that is necessary for evaluation to effect improvement. The evaluation system is not complete until teachers are committed to do something about the outcomes of evaluation. Teachers must see an evaluation system as equitable and relevant. Teacher participation in the development of a system is a means to that end.

McLaughlin went on to describe teachers' motivation and sense of professional effectiveness as very important to improving schools and maintaining high quality classroom practices. It is primarily an intrinsic reward system. McLaughlin indicated that lack of feedback about performance impedes a teacher's sense of efficacy and thus can effect a lack of growth. Efficacy relies on environmental response that acknowledges good performance. McLaughlin believes that teacher evaluation can provide the review and diagnosis essential to teacher satisfaction, efficacy, and growth.

Teachers in the study conducted by Stiggins and

Bridgeford (1985) to find more effective evaluation strategies spontaneously urged more participation in their own evaluations. Over half (53%) suggested more opportunities for self-evaluation and collegial observation. When asked what changes are needed to make evaluation more effective, teachers and supervisors both suggested that teachers and administrators need to collaborate on goals, criteria, and procedures for evaluation.

Duke (1987) encouraged the use of performance standards for evaluating teachers only when they are clearly stated, based on latest research, developed as a result of teacher involvement, communicated effectively, and reviewed on a regular basis. When these criteria are met, performance standards can be helpful in establishing a vision of teaching on which to base evaluation.

Summary. When evaluation is for the purpose of instructional improvement, it is not complete until the teacher responds to the outcomes of the evaluation. The sources reviewed in this section agree that the involvement of teachers in developing and implementing evaluation procedures increases understanding and identification with the evaluation procedures, increases the acceptance of criteria and procedures, improves

morale regarding evaluation, and has a positive effect on motivation to improve instruction.

Teacher Self-evaluation for Instructional Improvement

The use of self-evaluation as a method of teacher evaluation is the focus of this section of the review of literature. Self-evaluation is receiving increasing attention in the literature, particularly as an alternative data source when multiple data sources are recommended and also as a way to increase the involvement of teachers in the evaluation process.

Brighton and Rose (1965) enumerated the limitations of self-appraisal as an instrument of teacher evaluation. Some teachers tend to overrate themselves. This may occur particularly with marginal or insecure teachers. Other teachers, particularly emotionally secure teachers, tend to underrate themselves. Self-evaluation is inaccurate and unreliable because teachers are unable to be objective in assessing their own performance. Brighton indicated that these limitations may make self-evaluation inappropriate if the purpose of teacher evaluation is to establish accurate ratings of teachers. However, if the purpose of teacher evaluation is to promote better performance on the part of teachers, then the above mentioned criticisms are not salient.

Self-evaluation becomes very appropriate as a teacher evaluation technique. When self-evaluation is utilized, teachers share the responsibility for improving their performance. Teachers regard self-evaluation as an acceptable type of evaluation. The best and most effective motive for change is one that comes from within.

Bolton (1973) described teacher self-evaluation as having the advantage that teachers have the opportunity for improvement without external threat. Self-evaluation has great potential for increasing teacher motivation to improve. Bolton indicated that self-evaluation has the disadvantage that standards used for evaluation may not relate to outside criteria or needs of the school district. When implementing a self-evaluation strategy, Bolton recommended that school districts should train teachers to help them specify their own goals in measurement terms, provide teachers with a framework for analyzing and interpreting their own behavior, and provide teachers with the technical competence needed for operating various new media for recording their own behavior.

Johnston (1973) compared the effects of traditional and self-evaluation on 84 student teachers and found that those involved in self-evaluation had somewhat higher

scores on some teaching indices. He concluded that self-evaluation could produce changes in subsequent behavior.

When considering the question of who should judge teacher competency, Pine and Boy (1975) agreed that the approach should include the teacher as self-evaluator of his/her own competency. Self-evaluation is sometimes critiqued as tending toward egocentrism and personal or professional defensiveness. Pine and Boy asserted that self-evaluation is appropriate but should be used in conjunction with evaluation by others.

In discussing the need for teacher evaluation to be responsive to the needs, resources, goals, and requirements of the local situation, Gephart et al. (1976) stressed that an evaluation plan that works well in one context may not be successful in another. The authors strongly supported self-evaluation, but emphasized that it should be supplemented with evaluation by others.

Self-evaluation of some type appears to be a frequent component of the teacher evaluation system for a school district. Data from 375 school districts regarding their teacher evaluation practices was compiled by the Educational Research Service (Kowalski, 1978). One-third of the school districts in the study required

teachers to evaluate themselves. Other school districts suggested it to teachers as an option and encouraged teachers to share the results with the principal.

Roelle and Wood (1980) suggested six ways to improve teacher evaluation. The recommended focus of evaluation should be on instructional improvement. The suggestions were directed at the principal who was described as the most essential person in the evaluation process. One of the six suggestions was to provide teachers with opportunities for self-evaluation. Roelle and Wood maintained that teachers can be encouraged to improve their performance if they assess their own skills systematically to determine their strengths and weaknesses.

Self-evaluation has been emerging as a technique in teacher evaluation (Darling-Hammond et al. 1983). The potential of self-evaluation is in stimulating self-reflection and motivation toward change and growth. Data gathered from multiple sources including administrator observation, peer observation, student feedback, student achievement, and video or audio tapes can be used by teachers to assess strengths and weaknesses and to make judgments about their teaching.

McGreal (1983) discussed the use of self-evaluation strategies as part of a discussion on use of sources of

data other than classroom observation. McGreal stated, "Increasing the teacher's ability to be self-reflective is a desired outcome of any effective teacher evaluation system" (p. 133). McGreal stressed the role of the supervisor or administrator in making self-evaluation successful and effective in the improvement of instruction. He stated, "Self-evaluation data are most effective when they are shared and discussed with someone else" (p.131). Self-assessment data are shared with the supervisor and can be used in identifying areas of interest or concern on which to build improvement goals.

Duke and Stiggins (1986) considered self-evaluation to be a viable option when evaluating teachers for growth rather than accountability purposes. A teacher's perspective on personal growth is essential to professional development. Teachers must see and acknowledge the need for change in order to grow. Self-evaluation is one means to help teachers see and acknowledge those needs.

Duell and Davison (1987) conducted a study to explore how elementary teachers and principals view teacher evaluation techniques. Two dimensions were studied: accuracy and comfort level. Teachers and principals were asked to rate how accurate each of forty-nine evaluation strategies was in reflecting the

quality of instruction and to rate how comfortable each strategy was when used to evaluate teaching. Five of the 49 strategies were teacher self-evaluation strategies: periodic self-reflection, self-comparison of methods with those described in classes and workshops, self-evaluation checklist, packaged self-evaluation system, and video or audio tapes. According to teachers' views, periodic self-reflection was judged the most accurate of all 49 strategies and self-evaluation checklist was judged as 5th of 49. None of the self-evaluation strategies were judged in the negative half of the accuracy scale. On the comfort scale teachers also rated periodic self-reflection in the top 5 and no self-evaluation strategies in the negative half of the scale. Principals also rated self-evaluation strategies of self-reflection and video and audio tapes in the top 10 of the 49 strategies on the accuracy scale. Duell and Davison concluded that teachers and principals view teacher self-evaluation as accurate and teachers generally considered self-evaluation comfortable.

Duke (1987), like McGreal, saw value in self-evaluation by teachers as an additional source of information about the teacher rather than as an independent model of evaluation. Duke found self-evaluation particularly useful when teacher

evaluation is directed toward improvement. Systematic self-evaluation by teachers can counteract the shortage of supervisors and limitations of time for direct classroom observation.

Hammer (1987) surveyed teachers in five states regarding their attitudes toward teacher evaluation processes. The findings of this study revealed that teachers want to be involved in their own evaluations, yet do not want to evaluate themselves exclusively. Hammer concluded that teachers do not want to have sole responsibility for their own evaluation plans, but they do want input in those plans and in the result of those plans.

Goal-Setting & Monitoring. For this research study, goal setting and monitoring is defined as an evaluation strategy in which the teacher selects personal instructional improvement goals and regularly monitors progress toward selected goals. Goal setting is considered a self-evaluation strategy when the teacher has the primary responsibility to select goals and monitor progress and the administrator facilitates the process.

Heichberger and Young (1975) reported that in a survey of teachers in rural and suburban New York

elementary schools, 77 percent of the teachers favored a goal-oriented supervisory and evaluation program. A majority of respondents believed that the most effective way a supervisor could improve instruction involved working with faculty to solve instructional problems.

Goens and Lange (1976) suggested a three step process that would individualize evaluation for different teachers according to their needs. It is basically a goal setting model. The steps in the process described by Goens and Lange consisted of a pre-evaluation conference in which the teacher and the supervisor identify needs, objectives, and strategies; a period of data gathering and analysis; and a post-conference in which the data are examined, conclusions are developed, and implications are defined through mutual discussion.

Haefele (1980) reviewed twelve approaches to teacher evaluation and could support only one. That approach was based on a teacher, together with the principal or supervisor, establishing mutually agreed upon instructional goals and objectives for the year. Haefele asserted that this approach recognizes that each teacher is different, having various strengths, styles, skills, and competencies. The notable features of this approach include teachers and administrators working together, a goal toward improvement, and teacher self-evaluation.

Blecke (1982) described a teacher evaluation system used in an Illinois high school for six years. The evaluation system had the primary objective to improve instruction. An initiative style was adopted where the individual teacher determined what must be done for improvement to occur. The system was based on individual goal setting by teachers and periodic monitoring of progress toward those goals. Regular conferences with supervisors were held to share goals and progress. Blecke reported strong success of the program indicated by improved trust between administrators and staff, better teaching, improved efforts by teachers, and improved classroom performance by students.

After being involved for over eight years in over 300 school districts McGreal (1983) identified goal setting as the major activity of evaluation as a commonality of evaluation systems that were considered effective by their districts. The goal setting approach recommended by McGreal is based on a belief that the most effective evaluation systems allow the teacher and supervisor maximum flexibility in determining the most appropriate goals for each situation. Goal setting must not always be remedial, in fact goals may often emphasize skills or areas of interest that might be interesting, challenging or useful to other teachers or to the school.

The process described by McGreal includes goal defining by the teacher and a negotiating step in which the teacher and administrator work out the final form of the goals.

Glatthorn (1984) advocated the use of differential supervision. He suggested giving teachers a choice of four types of supervision including clinical supervision, cooperative professional development, self-directed development, and administrative monitoring. The self-directed development choice enables individual teachers to work independently on professional growth concerns. Teachers develop and carry out individualized plans for professional growth with the administrator serving as a resource. Glatthorn described self-directed development as an appropriate model for experienced, competent teachers.

In a case study on teacher evaluation practices conducted by Stiggins & Bridgeford (1985), 54% of teachers sampled spontaneously supported self-evaluation through goal setting and videotaping. Administrators in the study supported increased staff involvement in goal setting as a way to improve the effectiveness of teacher evaluation.

Growth Contracting. Growth contracting in this

study is defined as an evaluation strategy in which the teacher develops a contract that specifies job targets/objectives, methods of attainment, timelines, and progress measurement techniques. Growth-contracting is considered a self-evaluation strategy when the teacher has the primary responsibility for developing and monitoring the contract and the administrator facilitates the the process. Although similar to goal setting, growth contracting is more performance based. It is based on the concept of established work objectives, action plans, and measured outcomes and results.

Redfern (1980) developed a performance objectives approach to teacher evaluation. He described the most useful personnel evaluation programs as putting premiums on identifying what needs improving, planning how to achieve the needed improvements, and determining how the results will be evaluated. The purpose of the evaluation is to make a greater commitment to increasing effectiveness in teaching and learning. Professional growth and development of the person being appraised is emphasized. The steps in Redfern's performance objectives model include 1) defining the responsibilities of the person being appraised, 2) identifying needs based on the responsibility criteria, 3) establishing objectives (job targets) and developing action plans, 4)

carrying out the action plan, 5) monitoring of progress toward performance objectives, 6) assessing results, and 7) discussing results of job performance.

Iwanicki (1981) defined performance contracts as a plan for describing, monitoring, and evaluating the professional development activities of a teacher. The components of a performance contract include a performance objective, a plan of action, special operational requirements, and procedures for evaluation. According to Iwanicki, contract plans are based on the assumption that teachers are competent professionals seeking to strengthen or improve particular aspects of their performance through the professional growth process. Professional growth is a function of the teacher's ability to recognize the need for and to assume the responsibility for growth. Iwanicki stated, "self-evaluation receives considerable emphasis since both the effectiveness and efficiency of the conferencing process depend on the teachers' ability to assess their performance, identify valid areas for improvement, and plan appropriate professional development activities" (p. 213).

Iwanicki maintained that although self-evaluation is the primary strategy in contract plans the leadership role of the evaluator is not diminished. The evaluator

needs to allow the teacher to direct the activities as long as the proposed plan is valid. With some teachers the evaluator will have to assume a more dominant role.

McGreal (1983) discussed some weaknesses in performance objectives approaches to evaluation. He considered the insistence that job targets be based on district job performance criteria to seriously limit the relationship between supervisor and teacher and diminish the effectiveness on the improvement of instruction. Emphasis on specific and traditionally measurable objectives has led to the development of irrelevant, easily countable, easily reached goals that have little impact on instructional improvement.

Donaldson and Posluszny (1985) proposed a model for professional growth and development of teachers based on a review of professional growth and development from teacher training programs, business, and higher education. A professional development plan that is cooperatively developed by the supervisee and supervisor was a common feature of the professional growth programs reviewed. The model suggested by the authors incorporates the development of growth plans for teachers. Teachers select goals based on perceived strengths or weaknesses or through an open choice procedure. The supervisor serves as facilitator in

helping teachers identify options and resources in order to achieve the goals they have developed.

Garvin (1986) described growth contracts as a viable way to assess teacher performance and chart the direction of professional growth. Growth contracts should reflect individual staff member's own perceived needs for growth in light of their strengths and weaknesses. Garvin maintained that individual growth is more likely to occur when growth contracts are self-designed and self-imposed. Ownership of a growth process is important in maintaining motivation.

Self-Rating. In this study self-rating is defined as an evaluation strategy in which the teacher compares his or her performance on specified criteria with a predetermined standard.

The accuracy of teachers' evaluations of themselves has been questioned. McNeil and Popham (1973) critiqued the use of self-ratings by teachers in the evaluation process. They found a tendency for instructors to overrate themselves and negligible relationships of self-ratings with other criteria such as student ratings or measures of student gains.

McAfee (1975) studied 49 teachers and supervisors regarding their ratings of teacher performance on 51

selected items. There was little agreement between teachers and supervisors, and McAfee concluded that either teachers or supervisors or both are incapable of accurately evaluating a teacher's performance, background, or abilities. As a result he suggested that training in self-evaluation for teachers is necessary if that mode of evaluation is to be used. He also recommended training in teacher evaluation for supervisors.

Carroll (1981) reviewed research on self-appraisal and concluded that empirical studies have generally demonstrated that self-ratings show little agreement with ratings of students, colleagues, or administrators. Self-ratings can be useful for comparisons with and interpretations of other data sources.

In describing self-evaluation as promising in leading to the improvement of instruction, McGreal(1983) contrasted differing self-evaluation strategies and cautioned against the use of some. Comparison of self-ratings with ratings of supervisors promotes an atmosphere of conflict between teacher and supervisor. McGreal suggested this type of procedure should be vigorously avoided. He also considered making self-evaluation a requirement as a misuse of the strategy.

Self-Ranking. In this study self-ranking is defined as an evaluation strategy in which the teacher analyzes his or her own teaching strengths and weaknesses and ranks them.

Carroll (1981) considered self-ranking to be less likely to be biased than self-ratings and more useful in teacher evaluation. Relative strengths and weaknesses of a teacher can be ascertained through the use of forced choice instruments. Forced choice instruments require that a teacher assign a rank to a number of attributes, teaching skills, or other performance related data. This approach forces teachers to identify relative strengths and weaknesses, either of which can be used for professional development.

McGreal (1983) also described a strategy called forced choice scaling that can be a successful use of self-evaluation. Teachers rank themselves on a number of teaching variables, indicating strongest to weakest. Data from this type of instrument can be used in setting improvement goals for teachers. Supervisors do not rank teachers, and teachers are not compared to each other in this type of assessment.

Self-Observation. In this study self-observation

is defined as an evaluation strategy in which the teacher observes himself or herself through the use of video or audio tapes or other observation instruments.

Bushman (1974) suggested using observation systems to enable teachers to receive objective feedback conceptualizing their classroom behavior and then to appraise their own teaching behavior. To effect change teachers must find out what is happening in their classrooms. Audio or video recordings are suggested feedback mechanisms, with teachers using specified observation systems such as Flanders Interaction Analysis, Teacher Self-Appraisal Observation System, or Teacher Image Questionnaire. Bushman found this approach successful with teachers. Introducing teachers to observations systems and inviting them to participate can give them impetus to improve their teaching through increased self-knowledge.

Elliott (1978) discussed the use of audio and video tape recordings as a means of teacher self-evaluation. He stated, "recordings capture the data from which one can reconstruct one's actions" (p. 79). Recordings bring to a teacher's attention that of which he/she is unaware, has forgotten, or has repressed. It is an instrument that teachers can use to improve their own performance in the classroom.

Levin (1979) reviewed six modes of teacher evaluation. Regarding the use of observation instruments or systems, he found them useful for giving teachers feedback on aspects of their teaching. The effect of that feedback on a teacher's subsequent behavior was not known. Levin indicated that provision of feedback was not a guarantee that teaching would improve or change.

Moritz and Martin-Reynolds (1980) described a self-directed evaluation program in Ohio that relies solely on videotape analysis. Teachers view and analyze tapes and identify one or two verbal and nonverbal skills that can be improved. These become the focus of the teacher's development in the ensuing months. The teacher meets with an administrator to share the tape and results of the self-analysis. After surveying Ohio teachers over a three-year period, Moritz and Martin-Reynolds reported that teachers felt positive about the program, preferred video-taped self-evaluation to traditional evaluation, and believed that sharing the tape with an administrator was a non-threatening experience.

Vidiotape or audiotape analysis as a means of self-evaluation was also supported by Carroll (1981) who recommended that feedback from tapes be focused by a supervisor or trained colleague. Carroll asserted that focused feedback is critical, and therefore reviewing

tapes in isolation makes the process less helpful to the teacher. Carroll added that recordings can be the source of extensive analysis of one's teaching and is useful for monitoring teaching following practice and/or other improvement strategies.

Glatthorn (1984) reported that feedback to the teacher by means of videotape is most effective when another observer is present during the viewing. In this way a second point of view is available that can help focus the teacher's attention. Glatthorn reported that his experience with schools in pilot studies indicated that teachers who at first seem reluctant to have their classes videotaped find it a very valuable experience if they have the support and advice of a skilled consultant.

Summary. Self-evaluation is considered an appropriate teacher evaluation technique when the purpose of teacher evaluation is the improvement of instruction. Self-evaluation appears to have a positive effect on teacher motivation to improve. The researchers generally agreed that self-evaluation needs to be a component of an overall evaluation system rather than existing on its own. Many researchers stressed the importance of sharing information from various self-evaluation strategies with an administrator to maximize effectiveness. Several

authors mentioned that teachers should receive training in order to use self-evaluation effectively. Goal-setting, growth contracting, and self-observation received support in the literature as viable self-evaluation strategies. Researchers were more critical of self-ratings and self-rankings.

Summary of the Review of Literature

1. The public is concerned about the improvement of instruction in the public schools. The quality of teaching within a classroom is believed to have a significant impact on student learning.

2. The instructional leadership of a school principal has a strong, direct effect on the quality of instruction within a school. Setting instructional goals for the school and monitoring, supervising, and enabling teachers to meet these goals are essential instructional leadership functions of the principal.

3. Traditional methods of teacher evaluation have not been effective in the improvement of instruction. Variables and complexities in different teaching settings, limitations of observation strategies and principal's ratings of teachers, low teacher involvement, infrequent evaluation, and poor communication of results were identified as concerns with traditional teacher

evaluation methods.

4. The use of multiple evaluation methods and data sources has been recommended as a way to overcome some of the limitations of traditional evaluation.

Self-evaluation, along with peer evaluation, student evaluation, and student performance were recommended to supplement direct observation of teaching performance.

5. The involvement of teachers in the teacher evaluation process is recommended to increase understanding of and identification with the evaluation purpose and procedures. Involvement of teachers appears to have a positive effect on the motivation of teachers to improve.

6. Self-evaluation is an appropriate technique for use in a teacher evaluation system that has as its purpose the improvement of instruction. Self-evaluation is most effective when used and shared with an administrator. A variety of self-evaluation strategies may be helpful in the improvement of instruction.

Chapter 3

PROCEDURES

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of five selected strategies for using teacher self-evaluation as an administrative tool to improve instruction in the elementary school as perceived by elementary teachers and principals. The procedures that were used to determine that perceived effectiveness are described in this chapter. A discussion of the setting for the study, the research methodology, the instrumentation, the population and sample, the methods of collecting data, and the types of statistical analyses which were used are included in this chapter.

Setting for the Study

The setting for the study was the state of Nebraska. As reported in the Nebraska Education Directory (1987/88), Nebraska is divided into 344 public school districts, of which 222 are Class III districts (K-12 districts with a district population between 1,000 and

100,000). Nebraska contains only two school districts that serve populations larger than 100,000. Class III districts in Nebraska include a range of school districts representing small rural communities to medium sized urban communities to suburbs of metropolitan areas. Education in Nebraska is heavily supported by property tax, and there is a tradition of local control. Nebraska has experienced vigorous resistance to school reorganization, which in part accounts for the large number of relatively small school districts in the state.

Research Methodology

The research design employed in this study was survey research. The specific form of survey used was a mailed questionnaire. The technique is well-established as a way of collecting information about educational topics in general and about teacher evaluation in particular (Altschuld & Lower, 1984). The advantages of using survey research include low cost and ease of data collection (Berdie & Anderson, 1974).

Instrumentation

The survey instrument used in this study was designed by the researcher and consisted of Likert-type items representing respondents' ratings of the

effectiveness of specific self-evaluation strategies. The instrument was field tested using a sample of 10% of the identified population for the study. Instrument reliability was verified through the pilot study. The results of the coefficient alpha, a computation for internal consistency reliability, are reported in Table 1.

Table 1
Reliability Test for the Pilot Study

	Alpha
Total Instrument	.98
Goal Setting Strategy	.93
Growth Contracting Strategy	.91
Self-Rating Strategy	.98
Self-Ranking Strategy	.99
Self-Observation Strategy	.96

As a result of the high coefficient alpha for the entire instrument (.98) and the individual strategies (.93, .91, .98, .99, .96) in the pilot study, no changes were made in the instrument.

The survey instrument, Teacher Evaluation Survey (see Appendix A), was based in part on a vision of

teaching excellence described by Duke (1987). Duke referred to teaching excellence rather than teaching effectiveness, because excellence connotes unlimited potential for growth rather than mastery of competencies. Duke drew on five visions of teaching in developing his model. These included models based on didactic instruction, coaching, and socratic questioning (Adler, 1982), motivational teaching (Purkey, 1970), clinical teaching (Hunter, 1983), teaching for mastery (Haertlel, Walberg, & Weinstein, 1983), and direct instruction (Barnes, 1981; Denhem & Lieberman, 1980; Good & Brophy, 1984; Kierstead, 1985; Rosenshine, 1983).

In his model Duke identified six teaching situations: planning; instruction; classroom management; progress monitoring; clinical assistance; and care giving. He further delineated four components for each of the six categories, for a total of 24 components. The instructional components for planning include organizing instructional content, selecting appropriate content for lessons, developing instructional objectives for students, and planning for student assessment. The instructional components for instruction include introducing new content to students, reviewing or reteaching content to students, demonstrating new skills to students, and communicating academic expectations to

students. The instructional components for classroom management include maintaining classroom order, communicating behavior expectations to students, securing adequate resources, and managing time effectively. The instructional components for clinical assistance include diagnosing student needs, individualizing to meet student needs, providing remedial assistance to students, and working with parents. The instructional components for progress monitoring include providing students with appropriate feedback, checking for students understanding, assessing students mastery of skills, and identifying target areas for assistance. The instructional components for care giving include demonstrating respect for students, providing assistance and support to students, recognizing student progress, and valuing student differences.

These 24 components were included in the survey instrument as instructional components. Respondents were asked to rate the effectiveness of five self-evaluation strategies in helping teachers to improve each of the 24 instructional components. Definitions of the five self-evaluation strategies were provided with the survey to facilitate response to the questions (see Appendix B).

Internal consistency reliability was computed for the survey instrument. The results of the coefficient

alpha for the entire study is reported in Table 2.

Table 2

Study Reliability

	Alpha
Total Instrument	.98
Goal Setting Strategy	.95
Growth Contracting Strategy	.96
Self-Rating Strategy	.97
Self-Ranking Strategy	.97
Self-Observation Strategy	.94

Population and Sample

A total of 59 Nebraska Class III schools districts were identified as using teacher self-evaluation. The school districts were identified by examination of teacher evaluation policies and procedures on file at NDE. School districts were required to submit current teacher evaluation policies and procedures to NDE as part of Title 92, Nebraska Administrative Code, Rule 34 (1985) adopted in July, 1985. Most districts submitted policies in late 1985 or early 1986.

All 59 districts identified as using teacher self-evaluation were included in the study. Those

districts had 141 elementary schools, headed by 103 building principals. Some building principals served as principal in more than one building. All building principals of identified elementary schools were surveyed. A sample of 309 teachers from the identified schools were also surveyed. Teachers in identified schools were determined from the Nebraska Education Directory 1987-1988, which lists alphabetically all certificated staff for each school building. Three teachers assigned to buildings supervised by each of the 103 principals were selected through a random number process.

Data Collection

Data regarding principals' and teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of selected teacher self-evaluation strategies were collected. Respondents were asked to respond to a mailed questionnaire composed of Likert-type items representing ratings of the effectiveness of specific self-evaluation strategies.

Superintendents of sample school districts were contacted by letter (see Appendix C) to enlist their support for the study. Superintendents were asked to support the study by encouraging building principals and teachers in their district's elementary schools to

participate by responding to the mailed questionnaire.

Building principals were contacted by telephone and the study was described to them. Verbal commitments from principals to complete the survey were obtained. The survey was mailed on May 6, 1988 to the principals and selected teachers. A cover letter (see Appendix D and E) explaining the study was included in the mailing to principals and teachers. Confidentiality was maintained, but coding of questionnaires was utilized to facilitate data collection and follow-up requests.

Records were kept noting which surveys were returned. On May 20, 1988, two weeks after the survey was originally mailed, a second copy of the survey and the original cover letter were mailed to those who had not yet responded. An additional cover letter (see Appendix F) was included. The second mailing followed only two weeks after the first mailing due to the nearness of the completion of the school year. The surveys were mailed to principals and teachers at school addresses. It was important that principals and teachers receive the second mailing of the survey before the school year was completed in their district. A third mailing of the survey was made on September 21, 1988 to those who had not responded to the first or second mailing. A cover letter (see Appendix G) was included.

Surveys received through October 15, 1988 were included in the statistical analyses. Data were analyzed in the aggregate only; no individual responses were revealed. These procedures are similar to those used by Altschuld and Lower (1984) in a study of teacher evaluation in Ohio that surveyed building principals and randomly selected teachers. Saliency, timing, personal contact, and attention to detail characterized their procedures.

Statistical Analyses

After collection, the data were coded, transferred to computer diskette, and analyzed using the Statistical Packages For the Social Sciences (SPSS). (NIE et.al 1975) Computer services were provided by the University of Nebraska-Lincoln computer system. Consultants at the Nebraska Evaluation and Research Center (NEAR), University of Nebraska, provided interpretation assistance.

Mean scores and standard deviations were computed for each of the five self-evaluation strategies. The data were reported for the total instrument and for each of the teaching situations (planning, instruction, classroom management, clinical assistance, progress monitoring, and care giving) of the instrument. The data were reported for all respondents as a group and for the

subgroups of teachers and principals.

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether significant differences are present between mean scores. A split plot ANOVA design was utilized. The between factor was group (teachers, principals) and the within factor was strategy type (five strategies). An ANOVA was completed for the instrument as a whole and for each teaching situation.

Pearson's product moment correlation was used to determine the degree of relationship between teachers' and principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of each of the five self-evaluation strategies. Bivariate pairs consisted of a principal's rating and a teacher's rating of each strategy on each of the teaching situations and for the total instrument. The bivariate pairs consisted of the ratings by a principal and a teacher from the same elementary school.

A t-test for independent means was used to determine whether there was a significant difference in the perceived effectiveness of an evaluation strategy between those respondents with experience and those without experience using such a strategy.

The alpha level for significance for this study was adjusted to a level of .004 due to the number of tests conducted and the risk of inflating Type I error. A

Bonferroni adjustment of alpha was made (Kirk, 1982).

Summary

This study was conducted to determine the effectiveness of five selected strategies for using teacher self-evaluation as an administrative tool in improving instruction in the elementary school as perceived by elementary teachers and principals. A survey instrument, developed and piloted by the writer, was distributed to elementary principals and teachers in schools identified as using self-evaluation as part of their teacher evaluation procedures. An adequate number of surveys were returned to enable the writer to draw conclusions as to the perceived effectiveness of the five selected self-evaluation strategies in improving instruction in the elementary school.

The results of the assessment, the analysis of data, and its interpretation are presented in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of five selected strategies for using teacher self-evaluation as an administrative tool to improve instruction in the elementary school as perceived by elementary teachers and principals. To achieve this purpose, this study was designed to answer several questions:

1. To what extent is teacher self-evaluation used in elementary schools in Nebraska Class III school districts to improve instruction?

2. Is goal setting, as perceived by elementary teachers and principals, an effective teacher self-evaluation strategy in improving instruction?

3. Is growth contracting, as perceived by elementary teachers and principals, an effective teacher self-evaluation strategy in improving instruction?

4. Is self-rating, as perceived by elementary teachers and principals, an effective teacher self-evaluation strategy in improving instruction?

5. Is self-ranking, as perceived by elementary teachers and principals, an effective teacher self-evaluation strategy in improving instruction?

6. Is self-observation, as perceived by elementary teachers and principals, an effective teacher self-evaluation strategy in improving instruction?

The data for this investigation were collected by examining teacher evaluation policies and procedures on file at the Nebraska Department of Education and by sending questionnaires to elementary principals and teachers in 59 Class III school districts which used teacher self-evaluation as part of teacher evaluation procedures. The questionnaire was composed of Likert-type questions. Respondents were asked to rate the effectiveness of each of the five self-evaluation strategies (goal setting, growth contracting, self-rating, self-ranking, self-observation) in helping teachers to improve each of 24 instructional components. The instructional components were grouped into six teaching situations (planning, instruction, classroom management, clinical assistance, progress monitoring, and care giving). Respondents were also asked to make comments regarding the self-evaluation strategies and the effect they have on the improvement of instruction.

The intent of this chapter is to present the data

gathered in the research investigation and to present summary analyses of the data. The first section of this chapter addresses the information gathered from the examination of teacher evaluation policies and procedures on file at the Nebraska Department of Education. The second section describes the distribution of respondents. The data collected and analyses performed regarding the perceived effectiveness of the five selected self-evaluation strategies are addressed in the next two sections. The relationship between principals' and teachers' perceptions of effectiveness is described in the fifth section. The effect of experience with a self-evaluation strategy on the perceived effectiveness of that strategy is discussed in the sixth section. The final section includes a discussion of the comments made by the respondents to the survey.

Teacher Self-evaluation in Nebraska

Class III School Districts

School districts in Nebraska were required to submit current teacher evaluation policies and procedures to the Nebraska Department of Education as part of Title 92, Nebraska Administrative Code, Rule 34 (1985) adopted in July, 1985. Most districts submitted policies in late 1985 or early 1986. The teacher evaluation policies and

procedures submitted from Nebraska's 222 Class III school districts were examined. The purpose of the examination was to identify those districts which included teacher self-evaluation as part of their teacher evaluation procedures. A total of 59 districts were identified as using some type of teacher self-evaluation. Data compiled from the examination of NDE files are shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Use of Teacher Self-Evaluation in Nebraska Class III School Districts

Self-Evaluation Strategy	Number of Districts Using Strategy	Percent of Districts Using Strategy
Any Self-Evaluation Strategy	59	27
Goal Setting	19	09
Growth Contracting	29	13
Self-Rating	23	10
Self-Ranking	0	0
Self-Observation	5	2
More than one Self-Evaluation Strategy	17	8

Note. There are a total of 222 Class III districts in Nebraska. Data compiled from examination of NDE files.

The 59 districts that reported using at least one teacher self-evaluation strategy represent 27 percent of the 222 Class III districts in Nebraska. Of the 59 districts that use some type of teacher self-evaluation, 17 use more than one strategy. The most frequently used self-evaluation strategy was growth contracting, used by 29 school districts (13 percent). Self-rating was used by 23 districts (10 percent), goal setting by 19 districts (9 percent), and self-observation by 5 districts (2 percent). Self-ranking was not used by any of the Class III school districts.

The examination of the teacher evaluation policies of Class III school districts provided information about the use of teacher evaluation to improve instruction. All of the school districts indicated that a purpose of teacher evaluation in their districts was the improvement of instruction. Most districts listed the improvement of instruction as the primary purpose of teacher evaluation. It is noted here that the provisions of Rule 34 (1985) require districts to include a statement of the purpose of teacher evaluation in their district as part of the policy and procedures submitted to NDE. Rule 34 also specifies that procedures for teacher evaluation contain criteria upon which teachers will be evaluated and that evaluation instruments shall be designed primarily for

the improvement of instruction. It is not surprising that the teacher evaluation policies and procedures submitted to comply with Rule 34 indicated that the primary purpose of teacher evaluation was the improvement of instruction.

Teacher self-evaluation was utilized in 59 Class III districts. None of these districts, however, utilized self-evaluation as the sole method of teacher evaluation. All of the districts using self-evaluation indicated that self-evaluation was one of several strategies used to evaluate teachers. Only two districts indicated that self-evaluation was the primary strategy used for teacher evaluation. In most districts using a self-evaluation strategy, the primary method of teacher evaluation was observation by administrators. The self-evaluation strategy was used to supplement or augment the administrative observation and evaluation. Several districts indicated that self-evaluation was encouraged yet voluntary for teachers.

Self-rating was a self-evaluation strategy reported by 23 school districts. Many of these districts used an evaluation checklist and asked teachers to rate themselves. Often the checklist was identical to the checklist used by administrators to evaluate the teachers. Some districts required teachers to compare

the self-evaluation checklist with the checklist completed by the administrator.

Goal setting or growth contracting was reported as a teacher evaluation strategy by 48 of the 59 districts using self-evaluation. Both of these strategies involve the setting of improvement goals or job targets and the regular monitoring of progress toward the goals or job targets. Twelve districts, in addition to the 48 included above, indicated in their policies and procedures that goal setting was a part of the teacher evaluation process in their district. However, they did not specify whether monitoring of progress would occur or how it would occur. As a result, those districts were not included in the number of districts reported. The majority of the 48 districts identified as using goal setting or growth contracting have teachers report at conferences with administrators regarding the progress they have made toward their goals or job targets. A few districts require teachers to prepare written monitoring reports.

Summary. Most school districts in Nebraska include the improvement of instruction as the primary purpose of teacher evaluation. A total of 59 of Nebraska's 222 Class III school districts (27 percent) use some type of teacher self-evaluation as part of teacher evaluation

procedures. These districts include self-evaluation as one of several strategies to evaluate teachers.

Distribution of Respondents

Subjects for this study included 103 building principals and 309 selected teachers from the 141 elementary schools in Nebraska Class III school districts that include teacher self-evaluation as part of teacher evaluation procedures. Some building principals served as principal in more than one building, but were surveyed only once. Three teachers assigned to each principal were randomly selected from the Nebraska Education Directory 1987-88.

The original questionnaire was sent in early May, 1988. Approximately two weeks later, a second questionnaire was mailed to those who had not returned the survey. A third mailing of the questionnaire was sent in September, 1988 to those who had not returned either of the first two. The number of responses for each of the three mailings is shown in Table 4. A total of 286 principals and teachers returned the survey, representing a total return rate of 69.4%. Of those receiving the survey, 36% returned it on the first mailing, 24% on the second and 9% on the third.

Table 4
Number of Responses per Mailing

Group	Number of Surveys Mailed	Surveys Returned per Mailing Group			Total Responses per Group	Per- cent
		First	Second	Third		
Principals	103	61	15	10	86	83.5
Teachers	309	88	84	28	200	64.7
Total	412	149	99	38	286	
Percent of total mailed		36.2	24.0	9.2	69.4	
Percent of total responses		52.1	34.6	13.3	100.0	

Not all of the surveys returned were usable in the analysis of data. The instructions included with the survey indicated that all questions should be responded to regardless of the respondent's experience with a particular strategy. Some respondents, however, failed to respond to all questions for a given strategy, or failed to respond to an entire strategy. Many of the respondents returning incomplete surveys made notes regarding their lack of experience and/or opinion on certain of the strategies. Only those surveys which were complete were used in the analysis of data. The number of usable responses is shown in Table 5. Of the 412

surveys mailed, 286 were returned and 237 of those were used in the data analysis. The total return rate of usable responses was 57.5%. The usable return rate for principals was 69.9% and the rate for teachers was 53.4%.

Table 5
Number of Usable Responses

Group	Number of Surveys Mailed	Number of Surveys Returned	Number of Usable Surveys	Total Percent Returned	Total Percent Usable
Principals	103	86	72	83.4	69.9
Teachers	309	200	165	64.7	53.4
Total	412	286	237	69.4	57.5

Perceived Effectiveness of Five Self-Evaluation Strategies on the Improvement of Instruction

Teachers and principals in the selected schools were asked to rate the effectiveness of five self-evaluation strategies in helping teachers to improve each of 24 instructional components. The effectiveness scale consisted of the following ratings: 1 = not effective, 2 = minimally effective, 3 = somewhat effective, and 4 = very effective. Mean scores and standard deviations were determined for each self-evaluation strategy. Mean

scores were calculated by response groups (principals and teachers). A split plot analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether significant differences were present. The analysis of variance procedure was used to determine the significant differences between the two response groups and the five self-evaluation strategies. The between factor included principals and teachers. The within factor included the five self-evaluation strategies. Post hoc tests (Tukey) were conducted as follow ups to significant main effects.

The means and standard deviations for all respondents are shown in Table 6. The mean scores by self-evaluation strategy for all respondents were 3.17 for goal setting, 2.98 for growth contracting, 2.65 for self-rating, 2.61 for self-ranking, and 2.73 for self-observation.

The goal setting strategy received the highest effectiveness rating (3.17) indicating a rating between "somewhat effective" (3.00) and "very effective" (4.00). The growth contracting strategy received the second highest effectiveness rating (2.98) indicating a rating of "somewhat effective" (3.00). The self-rating (2.65), self-ranking (2.61), and self-observation (2.73) strategies received ratings between "minimally effective" (2.00) and "somewhat effective" (3.00). None of the

self-evaluation strategies approached a rating of "very effective". The effectiveness ratings for all five of the self-evaluation strategies was closest to "somewhat effective".

Table 6

Means and Standard Deviations of Self-Evaluation Strategies For All Respondents

Strategy	Mean	Standard Deviation
Goal Setting	3.17	.57
Growth Contracting	2.98	.63
Self-Rating	2.65	.66
Self-Ranking	2.61	.72
Self-Observation	2.73	.64

Note. Weights assigned to ratings were 1 = not effective, 2 = minimally effective, 3 = somewhat effective, and 4 = very effective; therefore, the larger the mean, the higher the perception of effectiveness.

The means and standard deviations for sub-groups of principals and teachers is presented in Table 7. The mean scores by self-evaluation strategy for principals were 3.16 for goal setting, 2.96 for growth contracting, 2.61 for self-rating, 2.50 for self-ranking, and 2.84 for self-observation. The mean scores by self-evaluation strategy for teachers were 3.17 for goal setting, 2.99 for growth contracting, 2.67 for self-rating, 2.66 for

self-ranking, and 2.68 for self-observation. Although scores differed somewhat for principals and teachers, both groups rated the five self-evaluation strategies in the same order of effectiveness (goal setting, growth contracting, self-observation, self-rating, self-ranking).

Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations of Self-Evaluation Strategies For Principals and Teachers

Strategy	Type of Respondent	Mean	Standard Deviation
Goal Setting	Principals	3.16	.44
	Teachers	3.17	.61
Growth Contracting	Principals	2.96	.54
	Teachers	2.99	.66
Self-Rating	Principals	2.61	.63
	Teachers	2.67	.67
Self-Ranking	Principals	2.50	.70
	Teachers	2.66	.72
Self-Observation	Principals	2.84	.59
	Teachers	2.68	.66

Note. Weights assigned to ratings were 1 = not effective, 2 = minimally effective, 3 = somewhat effective, and 4 = very effective; therefore, the larger the mean, the higher the perception of effectiveness.

The results of the split plot analysis of variance are presented in Table 8. Due to the number of tests

done and the risk of inflating Type I error, a Bonferroni adjustment of alpha was made (Kirk, 1982). The adjusted alpha level used was .004. The assumption of symmetry was tenable, therefore the analysis was computed univariately. The interaction between response group and strategy type was not significant, $F(4, 940) = 2.95, p > .004$. The two response groups (principals and teachers) did not show significant differences in perceived effectiveness of self-evaluation in general, $F(1, 940) = .07, p > .05$. The differences for the five strategy types were significant, $F(4, 940) = 54.47, p < .001$.

Table 8

Split Plot ANOVA Summary

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F-Ratio	Tail Probability
Group	.0799	1	.0799	.07	.7947
Strategy	47.8712	4	11.9678	54.47	.0000*
Interaction	2.5885	4	.6471	2.95	.0196
Error	206.5378	940	.2197		

*Significant at the alpha level of .001.

To determine which of the strategy types were significantly different from each other a post hoc Tukey test was performed. The critical pairwise difference for

the means was .118. As displayed in Table 9, the difference between goal setting and all other strategies was significant. The differences between growth contracting and self-rating, self-ranking, and self-observation were also statistically significant. The differences between self-rating and self-ranking and between self-rating and self-observation were not statistically significant. The difference between self-rating and self-observation was significant.

Table 9

Tukey Analysis for Self-Evaluation Strategies

Strategies	Goal Setting Diff.	Growth Contracting Diff.	Self- Rating Diff.	Self- Ranking Diff.	Self- Observa- tion Diff.
Goal Setting	-----	.1850*	.5164*	.5584*	.4383*
Growth Contracting	-----	-----	.3314*	.3734*	.2534*
Self-Rating	-----	-----	-----	.0420	.0781
Self-Ranking	-----	-----	-----	-----	.1201*

*Statistically significant.

Goal setting was rated the most effective of the five strategies and was significantly different from the other four strategies. Although significantly different, the difference between goal setting and growth

contracting was considerably less than the difference between goal setting and the other three evaluation strategies. Growth contracting, rated second in effectiveness of the five strategies, was also significantly different from the other four strategies. Again, the difference between growth contracting and goal setting was less than the difference between growth contracting and the other three strategies. Self-observation, the strategy rated third in overall effectiveness, was significantly different from goal setting and growth contracting which received higher ratings, and from self-ranking which received the lowest rating. Self-observation was not significantly different from self-rating which ranked fourth in effectiveness ratings. Self-rating and self-ranking were not significantly different from each other. They were rated the least effective of the five strategies.

Summary. The effectiveness rating for all five self-evaluation strategies was closest to a rating of "somewhat effective" on a scale of "not effective", "minimally effective", "somewhat effective", or "very effective". The goal setting and growth contracting strategies received the highest effectiveness ratings and those ratings were significantly different from the

ratings of the other strategies. Although differences existed between the self-observation, self-rating, and self-ranking strategies, those differences were not as large as the difference between each of those strategies and goal setting or growth contracting. Principals and teachers agreed on the order of effectiveness of the five strategies (goal setting, growth contracting, self-observation, self-rating, self-ranking). The differences in ratings between principals and teachers were not statistically significant.

Perceived Effectiveness of Five Self-Evaluation Strategies on the Improvement of Six Teaching Situations

Mean scores and standard deviations were determined for each teaching situation (planning, instruction, classroom management, clinical assistance, progress monitoring, and care giving) for each of the five self-evaluation strategies. A summary of mean scores for all respondents for all five strategies is shown in Table 10.

The goal setting strategy received the highest effectiveness rating for all six teaching situations, which indicates that goal setting is perceived as more effective in improving all six areas of teaching than any of the other self-evaluation strategies. The goal

Table 10

Teaching Situation Mean Scores by Strategy for All Respondents

	Strategies					Total
	Goal Setting	Growth Contract.	Self-Rating	Self-Ranking	Self-Observ	
Teaching Situation						
Planning	3.26	3.06	2.71	2.60	2.57	2.84
Instruction	3.14	2.90	2.68	2.65	3.08	2.89
Classroom Management	3.20	2.99	2.72	2.69	2.82	2.88
Clinical Assistance	3.15	3.00	2.55	2.52	2.37	2.72
Progress Monitoring	3.18	3.04	2.64	2.61	2.75	2.84
Care Giving	3.08	2.90	2.61	2.59	2.78	2.79
Total	3.17	2.98	2.65	2.61	2.73	

Note. Teaching situations consisted of the following questions on the survey instrument; planning = questions 1-4, instruction = questions 5-8, classroom management = questions 9-12, progress monitoring = questions 13-16, clinical assistance = questions 17-20, care giving = questions 21-24.

setting ratings for all six teaching situations were above 3.00 indicating a rating between "somewhat effective" (3.00) and "very effective" (4.00). The growth contracting strategy received the second highest effectiveness rating for five of the six teaching situations. This indicates that growth contracting is

perceived as more effective in improving teaching than self-rating, self-ranking, or self-observation. All six of the growth contracting ratings were between 2.90 and 3.06 indicating a rating of "somewhat effective".

Only one teaching situation rating for the strategies of self-rating, self-ranking and self-observation was above 3.00; the rating for instruction for the self-observation strategy was 3.08. All other ratings for those three strategies were between 2.57 and 2.82, indicating a rating between "minimally effective" (2.00) and "somewhat effective" (3.00).

A split plot analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine the relationship between the mean scores for each of the six teaching situations and to determine if significant differences were present. The ANOVA procedure was used to determine the significant differences between the two response groups and the five self-evaluation strategies for each teaching situation. The adjusted alpha level used was .004. Post hoc tests (Tukey) were conducted as follow ups to significant main effects.

The results of the split plot ANOVA for planning are presented in Table 11. The assumption of symmetry was tenable, therefore the analysis was computed univariately. The interaction between response group and

strategy type was not significant, $F(4, 940) = 3.06, p > .004$. The two response groups (principals and teachers) did not show significant differences in perceived effectiveness of self-evaluation in general, $F(1, 940) = .02, p > .05$. The differences for the five strategy types were significant, $F(4, 940) = 50.83, p < .001$.

Table 11

Split Plot ANOVA Summary for Planning

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F-Ratio	Tail Probability
Group	.0221	1	.0221	.02	.8977
Strategy	69.4304	4	17.3576	50.83	.0000*
Interaction	4.1868	4	1.0467	3.06	.0160
Error	321.0260	940	.3415		

*Significant at the alpha level of .001.

To determine which of the strategy types were significantly different from one another a post hoc Tukey test was performed. The critical pairwise difference for the means was .147. As displayed in Table 12, the difference between goal setting and each of the other four strategies was significant. The difference between growth contracting and each of the other four strategies was also significant. Self-rating, self-ranking and self-observation were not significantly different from

each other, but were significantly different from goal setting and growth contracting.

Table 12

Tukey Analysis for Planning

Strategies	Goal Setting Diff.	Growth Contracting Diff.	Self- Rating Diff.	Self- Ranking Diff.	Self- Observ Diff.
Goal Setting	-----	.1930*	.5506*	.6561*	.6825*
Growth Contracting	-----	-----	.3580*	.4631*	.4895*
Self-Rating	-----	-----	-----	.1055	.1319
Self-Ranking	-----	-----	-----	-----	.0267

*Statistically significant.

The results of the split plot ANOVA for instruction are presented in Table 13. The assumption of symmetry was tenable therefore the analysis was computed univariately. The interaction between response group and strategy type was not significant, $F(4, 940) = 2.70, p > .004$. The two response groups (principals and teachers) did not show significant differences in perceived effectiveness of self-evaluation in general, $F(1, 940) = .45, p > .05$. The differences for the five strategy types were significant, $F(4, 940) = 36.41, p < .001$.

Table 13

Split Plot ANOVA Summary for Instruction

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F-Ratio	Tail Probability
Group	.6156	1	.6156	.45	.5021
Strategy	48.0631	4	12.0158	36.41	.0000*
Interaction	3.5673	4	.8918	2.70	.0294
Error	310.2504	940	.3301		

*Significant at the alpha level of .001.

The results of the post hoc Tukey test are displayed in Table 14. The critical pairwise difference for the means was .144. The difference between goal setting and the strategies of growth contracting, self-rating, and self-ranking was significant. The difference between goal setting and self observation was not significant. The difference between growth contracting and each of the other four strategies was significant. Self-rating and self-ranking were not significantly different from each other but were significantly different from goal setting, growth contracting and self-observation. Self-observation was significantly different from each of the other four strategies.

Table 14

Tukey Analysis for Instruction

Strategies	Goal Setting Diff.	Growth Contracting Diff.	Self- Rating Diff.	Self- Ranking Diff.	Self- Observ Diff.
Goal Setting	-----	.2416*	.4599*	.4926*	.0570
Growth Contracting	-----	-----	.2184*	.2511*	.1846*
Self-Rating	-----	-----	-----	.0327	.4030*
Self-Ranking	-----	-----	-----	-----	.4357*

*Statistically significant.

The results of the split plot ANOVA for classroom management are presented in Table 15. The assumption of symmetry was tenable, therefore the analysis was computed univariately. The interaction between response group and strategy type was not significant, $F(4, 940) = 3.50, p > .004$. The two response groups (principals and teachers) did not show significant differences in perceived effectiveness of self-evaluation in general, $F(1, 940) = .63, p > .05$. The differences for the five strategy types were significant, $F(4, 940) = 35.34, p < .001$.

Table 15

Split Plot ANOVA Summary for Classroom Management

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F-Ratio	Tail Probability
Group	.8733	1	.8733	.63	.4298
Strategy	39.6144	4	9.90360	35.34	.0000*
Interaction	3.99182	4	.9796	3.50	.0076
Error	263.3937	940	.2802		

*Significant at the alpha level of .001.

The results of the post hoc Tukey test are displayed in Table 16. The critical pairwise difference for the means was .133. The difference between goal setting and each of the other four strategies was significant. The difference between growth contracting and each of the other four strategies was also significant. Self-rating and self-ranking were not significantly different from each other, but were significantly different from goal setting and growth contracting. Self-observation was significantly different from goal setting, growth contracting and self-ranking.

Table 16

Tukey Analysis for Classroom Management

Strategies	Goal Setting Diff.	Growth Contracting Diff.	Self- Rating Diff.	Self- Ranking Diff.	Self- Observ Diff.
Goal Setting	-----	.2068*	.4768*	.5095*	.3724*
Growth Contracting	-----	-----	.2701*	.3228*	.1656*
Self-Rating	-----	-----	-----	.0327	.1044
Self-Ranking	-----	-----	-----	-----	.1371*

*Statistically significant.

The results of the split plot ANOVA for clinical assistance are presented in Table 17. The assumption of symmetry was tenable, therefore the analysis was computed univariately. The interaction between response group and strategy type was not significant, $F(4, 940) = 1.63, p > .004$. The two response groups (principals and teachers) did not show significant differences in perceived effectiveness of self-evaluation in general, $F(1, 940) = .09, p > .05$. The differences for the five strategy types were significant, $F(4, 940) = 64.20, p < .001$.

Table 17

Split Plot ANOVA Summary for Clinical Assistance

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F-Ratio	Tail Probability
Group	.1305	1	.1305	.09	.7693
Strategy	89.9539	4	22.4885	64.20	.0000*
Interaction	2.2828	4	.5707	1.63	.1647
Error	329.2933	940	.3503		

*Significant at the alpha level of .001.

Table 18 displays the results of the post hoc Tukey test. The critical pairwise difference for the means was .148. The difference between goal setting and each of the other four strategies was significant. The difference between growth contracting and each of the other four strategies was also significant. Self-rating and self-ranking were not significantly different from each other but were significantly different from goal setting, growth contracting and self-observation. Self-observation was significantly different from each of the other strategies.

Table 18
 Tukey Analysis for Clinical Assistance

Strategies	Goal Setting Diff.	Growth Contracting Diff.	Self- Rating Diff.	Self- Ranking Diff.	Self- Observ Diff.
Goal Setting	-----	.1487*	.5971*	.6276*	.7848*
Growth Contracting	-----	-----	.4483*	.4789*	.6361*
Self-Rating	-----	-----	-----	.0306	.1878*
Self-Ranking	-----	-----	-----	-----	.1572*

*Statistically significant.

The results of the split plot ANOVA for progress monitoring are presented in Table 19. The assumption of symmetry was tenable, therefore the analysis was computed univariately. The interaction between response group and strategy type was not significant, $F(4, 940) = 1.38, p > .004$. The two response groups (principals and teachers) did not show significant differences in perceived effectiveness of self-evaluation in general, $F(1, 940) = .03, p > .05$. The differences for the five strategy types were significant, $F(4, 940) = 37.48, p < .001$.

Table 19
 Split Plot ANOVA Summary for Progress Monitoring

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F-Ratio	Tail Probability
Group	.0464	1	.0464	.03	.8581
Strategy	53.9026	4	13.4756	37.48	.0000*
Interaction	1.9871	4	.4968	1.38	.2383
Error	337.9814	940	.3596		

*Significant at the alpha level of .001.

Table 20 displays the results of the post hoc Tukey test. The critical pairwise difference for the means was .150. The difference between goal setting and self-rating, self-ranking, and self-observation was significant. The difference between goal setting and growth contracting was not significant. The difference between growth contracting and self-rating, self-ranking, and self-observation was also significant. Self-rating, self-ranking and self-observation were not significantly different from each other but were significantly different from goal setting and growth contracting.

Table 20

Tukey Analysis for Progress Monitoring

Strategies	Goal Setting Diff.	Growth Contracting Diff.	Self- Rating Diff.	Self- Ranking Diff.	Self- Observ Diff.
Goal Setting	-----	.1414	.5390*	.5760*	.4314*
Growth Contracting	-----	-----	.3977*	.4346*	.2901*
Self-Rating	-----	-----	-----	.0369	.1076
Self-Ranking	-----	-----	-----	-----	.1445

*Statistically significant.

The results of the split plot ANOVA for care giving are presented in Table 21. The assumption of symmetry was tenable, therefore the analysis was computed univariately. The interaction between response group and strategy type was not significant, $F(4, 940) = 1.39, p > .004$. The two response groups (principals and teachers) did not show significant differences in perceived effectiveness of self-evaluation in general, $F(1, 940) = .00, p > .05$. The differences for the five strategy types were significant, $F(4, 940) = 26.83, p < .001$.

Table 21

Split Plot ANOVA Summary for Care Giving

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F-Ratio	Tail Probability
Group	.0007	1	.0007	.00	.9843
Strategy	38.7237	4	9.6309	26.83	.0000*
Interaction	2.0057	4	.5014	1.39	.2356
Error	339.2367	940	.3609		

*Significant at the alpha level of .001.

The results of the post hoc Tukey test are displayed in Table 22. The critical pairwise difference for the means was .151. The difference between goal setting and each of the other four strategies was significant. The difference between growth contracting and each of the other four strategies was also significant. Self-rating and self-ranking were not significantly different from each other but were significantly different from goal setting, growth contracting, and self-observation. Self-observation was significantly different from all four other strategies.

Table 22
Tukey Analysis for Care Giving

Strategies	Goal Setting Diff.	Growth Contracting Diff.	Self- Rating Diff.	Self- Ranking Diff.	Self- Observ Diff.
Goal Setting	-----	.1783*	.4747*	.4883*	.3017*
Growth Contracting	-----	-----	.2964*	.3101*	.1234*
Self-Rating	-----	-----	-----	.0137	.1730*
Self-Ranking	-----	-----	-----	-----	.1867*

*Statistically significant.

Summary. Goal setting was considered to be the most effective self-evaluation strategy for all six teaching situations (planning, instruction, classroom management, clinical assistance, progress monitoring, care giving). Growth contracting was considered the second most effective strategy for five of the six teaching situations. Self-observation was considered the second most effective strategy in the instruction teaching situation, but was considered the least effective strategy in the planning and clinical assistance teaching situations. Self-rating and self-ranking were considered less effective than other strategies in all of the teaching situations.

Teachers and principals perceive goal setting and growth contracting to be more effective than other self-evaluation strategies in improving all areas of teaching. They perceive self-observation to be more effective than other strategies in improving direct instruction, but not in improving other aspects of teaching. Teachers and principals perceive self-rating and self-ranking as less effective than other self-evaluation strategies in improving all areas of teaching.

Relationship between Principals' and Teachers'
Perceptions of Effectiveness of Self-Evaluation
Strategies

As described earlier, the mean scores for principals and teachers were similar for all five self-evaluation strategies. Analysis revealed no significant differences between the ratings given by the two groups. Both groups rated the five self-evaluation strategies in the same order of effectiveness. To investigate the relationship between principals' and teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of teacher self-evaluation strategies, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were determined for each self-evaluation strategy. Sixty-seven bivariate pairs of one principal and one teacher from the same building were used in the

procedure. Little correlation was found between principals and teachers on any of the self-evaluation strategies. Table 23 presents the correlation coefficients between principals and teachers for the five self-evaluation strategies. The correlation coefficients for the teaching situations of each strategy are presented in Table 24. As with the strategies as a whole, little relationship was found between principals' and teachers' perceptions of effectiveness of the teaching situations of any of the five strategies.

Table 23

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients for Principals and Teachers

Strategy	Cases	Correlation Coefficient
Goal Setting	67	.1338
Growth Contracting	67	-.0443
Self-Rating	67	-.0524
Self-Ranking	67	-.1031
Self-Observation	67	.0907

Although teachers and principals have similar opinions regarding the effectiveness of self-evaluation strategies on the improvement of instruction, there is no

Table 24

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients for
Principals and Teachers by Teaching Situations for
Self-Evaluation Strategies

Strategy	Correlation Coefficient
Goal Setting	
Planning	.0830
Instruction	-.0068
Classroom Management	.1237
Progress Monitoring	.1055
Clinical Assistance	.0554
Care Giving	.2581
Growth Contracting	
Planning	.0575
Instruction	-.1040
Classroom Management	.0316
Progress Monitoring	-.0709
Clinical Assistance	-.0501
Care Giving	-.0365
Self-Rating	
Planning	.0897
Instruction	-.0349
Classroom Management	.0067
Progress Monitoring	-.1424
Clinical Assistance	-.0230
Care Giving	-.1196
Self-Ranking	
Planning	-.0895
Instruction	-.0704
Classroom Management	.0509
Progress Monitoring	-.0943
Clinical Assistance	-.0289
Care Giving	-.0266
Self-Observation	
Planning	.0288
Instruction	.0576
Classroom Management	.0942
Progress Monitoring	-.0134
Clinical Assistance	-.0505
Care Giving	.1029

correlation between individual teachers and principals from the same building.

Comparison of Ratings of Respondents With and Without Experience Using the Self-Evaluation Strategies

Respondents to the questionnaire were asked to indicate which of the five self-evaluation strategies they had experienced either in their present school or a previous one. Mean scores and standard deviations for the five self-evaluation strategies are shown in Table 25.

Table 25

Mean Scores and Standard Deviation of Self Evaluation Strategies For Respondents With and Without Experience Using that Strategy

Strategy	Level of Experience	Number	Percent	Mean	Standard Deviation
Goal Setting	With	186	85	3.20	.55
	Without	33	15	2.95	.69
Growth Contracting	With	74	34	3.22	.49
	Without	145	66	2.85	.66
Self-Rating	With	56	26	3.00	.53
	Without	163	74	2.54	.66
Self-Ranking	With	34	16	2.94	.82
	Without	185	84	2.55	.69
Self-Observation	With	51	23	3.03	.62
	Without	168	77	2.64	.62

The only self-evaluation strategy that had been used by more than 35 percent of the respondents was goal setting. Eighty-five percent of the respondents reported having experience using the goal setting strategy. Only 34 percent reported experience with growth contracting, 26 percent with self-rating, 16 percent with self-ranking, and 23 percent with self-observation. These percentages were compared to the percent of school districts that reported using each of the five strategies which are shown in Table 26. There is some discrepancy between the percentages. Eighty-five percent of respondents indicated having experience with goal setting while only 32 percent of the districts reported using that strategy, and 34 percent of respondents indicated experience with growth contracting while 49 percent of the districts reported using it. The definitions of goal setting and growth contracting are similar in that both include the setting and monitoring of goals by teachers. It is possible that respondents did not discriminate between the two strategies when reporting experience and the high percentage of experience reported with goal setting may represent experience with either goal setting or growth contracting. Twenty-six percent of the respondents indicated experience with self-rating while 39 percent of the districts reported using that strategy.

It is possible that school districts reported using this strategy in policies and procedures but do not actually use it in the schools. Some schools reported that self-evaluation was voluntary, which could also account for respondents not having experience with a strategy while school districts report its use. These discrepancies are interesting, but should have little effect on the other findings of this study.

Table 26

Use of Self-Evaluation Strategies by Fifty-Nine Districts Reporting Use of Self-Evaluation

Self-Evaluation Strategy	Number of Districts Using Strategy	Percent of Districts Using Strategy
Goal Setting	19	32
Growth Contracting	29	49
Self-Rating	23	39
Self-Ranking	0	0
Self-Observation	5	8

The mean scores of the perceived effectiveness ratings of those respondents reporting experience with a self-evaluation strategy were higher than the mean scores of those respondents without experience in that strategy for all five self-evaluation strategies. A t-test for

independent means was used for each self-evaluation strategy to determine whether there was a significant difference in the perceived effectiveness of the strategy between respondents with experience and without experience using that strategy. The adjusted alpha level used was .004. The results of those t-tests are shown in Tables 27 through 31.

For those 186 respondents who reported experience with the goal setting strategy, the mean of the responses was 3.20; for those 33 respondents who reported no experience with that strategy, the mean of the responses was 2.95. The difference between respondents with and without experience with the goal setting strategy was not significant at the adjusted alpha level ($t = 2.30$, $df = 217$, $p > .004$). Those respondents with experience in goal setting did rate the strategy higher than those respondents without experience.

The results of the other four t-tests indicated significant differences between the respondents with and without experience with a particular strategy. For the 74 respondents who reported experience with the growth contracting strategy, the mean of the responses was 3.22; for the 145 respondents who reported no experience with growth contracting, the mean of the responses was 2.85 ($t = 4.25$, $df = 217$, $p < .001$). For the 56 respondents who

reported experience with the self-rating strategy, the mean of the responses was 3.00; for the 163 respondents who reported no experience with self-rating, the mean of the responses was 2.54 ($t = 4.74$, $df = 217$, $p < .001$). For the 34 respondents who reported experience with the self-ranking strategy had a mean score of 2.94 while the 185 respondents who reported no experience with self-ranking, the mean of the responses was 2.55 ($t = 2.99$, $df = 217$, $p < .004$). For the 51 respondents who reported experience with self-observation, the mean of the responses was 3.03; for the 168 respondents who reported no experience with self-observation, the mean of the responses was 2.64 ($t = 3.89$, $df = 217$, $p < .001$). For all five self-evaluation strategies, those respondents reporting experience with that strategy rated the effectiveness of that strategy higher than those respondents reporting no experience with the strategy and in four of the five strategies that difference was statistically significant.

Table 27

Results of a T-Test Analysis of the Difference between Ratings of Effectiveness of the Goal Setting Strategy given by those With Experience and those Without Experience with that Strategy

Group	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
With Experience	186	3.20	.546
Without Experience	33	2.95	.691
Pooled Variance Estimate			
t Value	Degrees of Freedom	2-Tailed Probability	
2.30	217	.023	

Table 28

Results of a T-Test Analysis of the Difference between Ratings of Effectiveness of the Growth Contracting Strategy given by those With Experience and those Without Experience with that Strategy

Group	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
With Experience	74	3.22	.490
Without Experience	145	2.85	.662
Pooled Variance Estimate			
t Value	Degrees of Freedom	2-Tailed Probability	
4.25	217	.000	

Table 29

Results of a T-Test Analysis of the Difference between Ratings of Effectiveness of the Self-Rating Strategy given by those With Experience and those Without Experience with that Strategy

Group	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
With Experience	56	3.00	.526
Without Experience	163	2.54	.655
Pooled Variance Estimate			
t Value	Degrees of Freedom	2-Tailed Probability	
4.74	217	.000	

Table 30

Results of a T-Test Analysis of the Difference between Ratings of Effectiveness of the Self-Ranking Strategy given by those With Experience and those Without Experience with that Strategy

Group	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
With Experience	34	2.94	.815
Without Experience	185	2.55	.688
Pooled Variance Estimate			
t Value	Degrees of Freedom	2-Tailed Probability	
2.99	217	.003	

Table 31

Results of a T-Test Analysis of the Difference between Ratings of Effectiveness of the Self-Observation Strategy given by those With Experience and those Without Experience with that Strategy

Group	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
With Experience	51	3.03	.622
Without Experience	168	2.64	.617
Pooled Variance Estimate			
t Value	Degrees of Freedom	2-Tailed Probability	
3.89	217	.000	

Comments of Respondents

At the conclusion of the survey, respondents were provided the opportunity to make comments on the five self-evaluation strategies and the effect they have on the improvement of instruction. Of the 412 surveys distributed, 286 were returned and 70 of the respondents had written comments (24 percent). Thirteen principals (15 percent) and 57 teachers (29 percent) returned the survey with comments. Most of these could be categorized into comments about the survey and comments about the effectiveness of teacher self-evaluation.

Comments made about the survey were generally

critical. One comment made often (16 times), concerned the validity of responding to the effectiveness of a self-evaluation strategy without having direct experience with that strategy. Several respondents did not respond to strategies they had no experience with, making their responses unusable in the analysis. Other respondents (7) indicated that the survey was too difficult, too time consuming, or sent at a busy time.

Comments made regarding the effectiveness of self-evaluation strategies could be categorized into three groups. Positive comments about the effectiveness of teacher self-evaluation in general or about a particular self-evaluation strategy were made by 24 respondents. Comments indicating that the effectiveness of self-evaluation strategies depended on certain conditions were made by 15 respondents. Negative comments about the effectiveness of self-evaluation strategies were made by 15 respondents. A number of respondents commented that self-evaluation strategies were most effective when more than one was used at the same time, indicating support of a variety of strategies. Several respondents recommended sharing self-evaluation with administrators to increase effectiveness. Many comments were made supporting goal setting, growth contracting, and self-observation as effective evaluation

strategies.

Several respondents expressed concern that the effectiveness of self-evaluation depended on certain conditions. Nine respondents felt that the effectiveness of goal setting in improving instruction depended on the goals selected by the teachers. Eight respondents indicated that the effectiveness of any of the self-evaluation strategies depended on the attitude and motivation of the teacher to improve.

Comments that were critical of the effectiveness of self-evaluation were also made. Six respondents indicated that self-evaluation was time-consuming, required too much paper work, and was unnecessary. Several respondents were critical of self-observation, indicating that teachers can look good for a single taping session. Several respondents were also critical of self-rating and self-ranking. They expressed concern that teachers would either rate or rank themselves too low or too high.

The comments made about teacher self-evaluation echo many of the conclusions made by researchers as reported in the review of literature. The conclusion from the literature that a variety of evaluation strategies would be more effective than a single strategy was supported by the respondents to this survey. The importance of

teacher motivation as a factor in improving instruction was made clear. There are indications that sharing the results of self-evaluation with an administrator would maximize its effectiveness in the improvement of instruction. Goal setting, growth contracting, and self-observation received support in the literature as viable self-evaluation strategies, while researchers were more critical of self-rating and self-ranking. Comments received from respondents to this survey strongly supported these conclusions.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The study was designed to determine the effectiveness of five selected strategies for using teacher self-evaluation as an administrative tool to improve instruction in the elementary school as perceived by elementary teachers and principals. It was hoped that this study could identify strategies that administrators could utilize in the improvement of instruction. This study examined the use of teacher self-evaluation in Nebraska Class III school districts to improve instruction. This study also examined the perceptions of elementary principals and teachers regarding the effectiveness of five self-evaluation strategies identified in the review of literature. Finally, this study looked at the difference in perceived effectiveness between principals and teachers who have had experience with a self-evaluation strategy and those who have not had experience with that strategy. This chapter includes

a summary of the study, a discussion of the findings, several conclusions, and recommendations for research and practice.

Self-evaluation has been receiving increased attention in the literature as an alternative data source for teacher evaluation when the purpose of evaluation is the improvement of instruction and as a way to increase the involvement of teachers in the evaluation process. The potential of self-evaluation is in stimulating self-reflection and motivation toward change and growth. Five self-evaluation strategies were discussed frequently in the literature and were chosen for examination in this study. Goal setting and monitoring is defined as an evaluation strategy in which the teacher selects personal instructional improvement goals and regularly monitors progress toward those goals. Growth contracting is an evaluation strategy in which the teacher develops a contract that specifies job targets/objectives, methods of attainment, timelines, and progress measurement techniques. Self-rating is an evaluation strategy in which the teacher compares his or her performance on specified criteria with a predetermined standard. Self-ranking is an evaluation strategy in which the teacher analyzes his or her own teaching strengths and weaknesses and ranks them. Self-observation is an

evaluation strategy in which the teacher observes himself or herself through the use of video or audio tapes or other observation instruments.

To complete the study the following procedures were used.

1. A review of literature was conducted on the topics of need for instructional improvement in public schools, the role of the administrator in the improvement of instruction, the limitations of teacher evaluation in the improvement of instruction, the use of multiple data sources in teacher evaluation, teacher involvement in the evaluation process, and research on teacher self-evaluation.

2. Based on the review of literature, definitions were formulated for five teacher self-evaluation strategies.

3. A survey instrument was developed based on a view of teaching excellence identified in the review of literature.

4. Instrument reliability was verified through a pilot survey.

5. The population was identified by an examination of teacher evaluation policies and procedures submitted to the Nebraska Department of Education as required by Title 92, Nebraska Administrative Code, Rule 34 (1985).

All Class III school districts reporting the use of teacher self-evaluation were selected.

6. The survey was distributed to 103 principals and 309 selected teachers of identified elementary schools. A total of 286 surveys were returned, of which 237 were used in the analysis of data. The data represented a usable return rate of 70 percent from principals and 53 percent from teachers, for a total usable return rate of 58 percent.

7. Data from the surveys were tabulated and analyzed. Mean scores and standard deviations were calculated for each self-evaluation strategy. A split plot analysis of variance was used to determine if significant differences were present. Post hoc tests were conducted on areas where significant differences were indicated. Pearson's product moment correlation was used to determine the relationship between principals' and teachers' perceptions of effectiveness. A t-test for independent means was used for each self-evaluation strategy to determine whether there was a significant difference in the perceived effectiveness of the strategy between respondents with experience and respondents without experience using that strategy.

Discussion

The findings of this study are based on the data presented in Chapter 4. A total of 59 Nebraska Class III school districts were identified as using some type of teacher self-evaluation. This represents 27 percent of the 222 Class III districts in Nebraska. It appears that Nebraska school districts are using teacher self-evaluation at a similar level as other school districts in the United States. Kowalski (1978) reported a study of 375 school districts and indicated that one third used teacher self-evaluation. Twenty-two percent of the Class III districts in Nebraska used either goal setting or growth contracting as part of their evaluation plan. Goal setting and growth contracting are similar self-evaluation strategies in that both include the setting and monitoring of goals by teachers. Self-rating was used by ten percent of the districts, self-ranking by none of the districts, and self-observation by two percent.

None of the 59 Class III districts using self-evaluation utilized self-evaluation as the sole method of teacher evaluation. Self-evaluation was one of several strategies used to evaluate teachers. Only two districts indicated that self-evaluation was the primary

strategy used for teacher evaluation. This is consistent with the recommendations drawn from the review of literature which indicate that self-evaluation should be a component of an overall teacher evaluation system rather than exist as the only way to evaluate teachers. The literature strongly supports the use of multiple data sources for teacher evaluation and recommends self-evaluation as one way to supplement direct observation of teaching performance.

Principals and teachers in the elementary school consider self-evaluation to be effective to some degree, but not to a high degree in the improvement of instruction. Ratings for all five strategies fell between 2.61 and 3.17. A rating of 1 indicated "not effective", 2 indicated "minimally effective", 3 indicated "somewhat effective", and 4 indicated "very effective". An analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether there was a difference between the strategy types. Goal setting and growth contracting, the strategies ranked highest by principals and teachers, were significantly different from the other three strategies. Although differences existed between the self-observation, self-rating, and self-ranking strategies, those differences were not as large as the difference between each of those strategies and goal

setting or growth contracting. The data indicate that principals and teachers consider goal setting and growth contracting to be more effective in the improvement of instruction than self-rating, self-ranking, or self-observation.

Both principals and teachers rated the five self-evaluation strategies in the same order of effectiveness, indicating similar perceptions. Strategies were rated in the following order of effectiveness; goal setting and monitoring, growth contracting, self-observation, self-rating, self-ranking. The analysis of variance did not show significant differences between principals and teachers in the perceived effectiveness of self-evaluation. It should be pointed out that although the perceptions of the two groups are very similar there is no correlational relationship between principals and teachers as indicated by the Pearson product-moment correlation procedure.

A high percentage of principals and teachers reported experience with the goal setting and monitoring strategy (85%), but not with growth contracting (34%), self-rating (26%), self-ranking (16%), or self-observation (23%). The mean scores of principals and teachers who reported experience with a self-evaluation strategy were compared to those who

reported no experience with that strategy. For all five self-evaluation strategies, those principals and teachers reporting experience with that strategy rated the effectiveness of that strategy significantly higher than those reporting no experience with the strategy. The mean rating of all five strategies from those respondents without experience in that strategy fell between 2.54 and 2.95 on a four-point scale (2 indicating "minimally effective" and 3 indicating "somewhat effective"). Respondents without experience chose neutral responses. Mean scores of respondents with experience ranged from 2.94 to 3.22. These respondents chose more positive responses. The data indicate that experience with a self-evaluation strategy has a positive effect on the perception of effectiveness of that strategy. Educators with experience in self-evaluation are not reporting that it is a waste of time, as they have characterized some other types of teacher evaluation. They are indicating that self-evaluation has some potential in improving instruction.

Respondents to the survey were asked to make comments regarding the effectiveness of self-evaluation in the improvement of instruction. Some of the comments made supported what has been reported in the literature about self-evaluation. A number of respondents commented

that self-evaluation strategies were most effective when more than one was used at a time, indicating support of a variety of strategies. The research literature indicated that the use of multiple evaluation methods and data sources was recommended as a way to overcome some of the limitations of traditional evaluation. Self-evaluation, along with other methods of evaluation, was recommended to supplement direct observation of teaching.

Several respondents recommended the sharing of self-evaluation data with administrators as an important step in ensuring its effectiveness. This response from the principals and teachers in this study supports the conclusion drawn from the literature that self-evaluation is most effective when used and shared with an administrator. Concern was expressed by principals and teachers that the effectiveness of goal setting and growth contracting on the improvement of instruction depended on the goals selected by the teacher. When goals were selected that were easily attained, unimportant in the instructional process, or not in need of development there was little or no improvement of instruction. It becomes apparent that administrators could and should play an important role in helping teachers select and develop goals that would be meaningful and lead to the improvement of instruction.

The issue of teacher motivation to improve surfaced in the comments of the respondents to this study. The importance of teacher motivation as a factor in improving instruction was made clear. One of the limitations of traditional teacher evaluation identified in the research literature is low teacher involvement and the effect that has on teacher motivation. The research indicates that involving teachers in evaluation increases the acceptance of evaluation criteria and procedures, improves morale regarding evaluation, and has a positive effect on motivation to improve instruction. Comments by respondents to this study indicated that the effectiveness of any of the self-evaluation strategies depended on the attitude and motivation of the teacher to improve. The comments made did not indicate that self-evaluation led to improved motivation but rather that the effectiveness of self-evaluation depended on the motivation of the teacher. Many respondents recognized the importance of teacher motivation in order for improvement of instruction to occur.

The research strongly indicates that an administrator can have a strong, direct effect on the quality of instruction within a school. Monitoring, supervising, and enabling teachers to meet instructional goals are considered essential leadership functions.

Teacher evaluation is generally considered a major responsibility of administrators. Teacher self-evaluation can lead to the improvement of instruction, particularly when used with other evaluation strategies and when administrators are directly involved in the process. Self-evaluation, when used in this context, can be a viable administrative tool in the improvement of instruction.

Conclusions

Several conclusions can be drawn from the findings of this study.

1. Self-evaluation is being used in Nebraska as part of the teacher evaluation process. However, self-evaluation is always used in conjunction with other types of teacher evaluation and is rarely the primary method of teacher evaluation used in a school district.

2. None of the five self-evaluation strategies examined in this study (goal setting and monitoring, growth contracting, self-rating, self-ranking, self-observation) were considered "not effective" or "minimally effective" in the improvement of instruction in the elementary school. Neither were any of the strategies considered "very effective". All five self-evaluation strategies received ratings closest to "somewhat effective" in the improvement of instruction.

3. Self-evaluation which includes the setting of goals for improvement by teachers and methodical monitoring and reporting of progress toward those goals (goal setting and monitoring and growth contracting strategies) is considered by elementary principals and teachers as effective in the improvement of instruction in the elementary school.

4. Self-evaluation which includes comparison of performance to standards, analysis and ranking of teaching strengths, and self-observation of teaching (self-rating, self-ranking and self-observation strategies) is considered somewhat effective in the improvement of instruction in the elementary school.

5. Self-evaluation can be an effective administrative tool in the improvement of instruction when used with other evaluation strategies and when administrators are directly involved in the process.

Recommendations

The results and conclusions of this investigation led to recommendations for further research and recommendations for practicing administrators regarding the use of teacher self-evaluation as a tool to improve instruction in their schools.

Recommendations for research. The results and conclusions of this investigation led to the following recommendations for future research.

1. In the present study, the perceived effectiveness of five self-evaluation strategies in the improvement of instruction was investigated. It is recommended that the actual effectiveness of those five strategies on the improvement of instruction be studied. Such an investigation would be difficult as there is a paucity of good instruments to evaluate the quality of instruction. However, some components of instruction are more easily quantifiable and evaluated. The effect of self-evaluation strategies on those instructional components could be investigated. Results of that type of investigation would be useful in making sound recommendations regarding the use of self-evaluation strategies to improve instruction.

2. In the present study, schools generally used teacher self-evaluation strategies as a secondary or even voluntary method of teacher evaluation. Other types of teacher evaluation were the core of the evaluation process. It is difficult to separate the effectiveness of self-evaluation on the improvement of instruction and the effectiveness of other types of teacher evaluation. It is recommended that schools which use teacher

self-evaluation as the primary method of teacher evaluation be identified and investigated. Such a study would need to encompass schools in a wider geographic area, as Nebraska has only a few schools where self-evaluation is the primary method of teacher evaluation. This type of research should provide more information regarding the effectiveness of self-evaluation strategies on the improvement of instruction.

3. In the present study, the investigation focused on the perceptions of teachers and principals on the five self-evaluation strategies. Little is known regarding the perceived effectiveness of other teacher evaluation strategies. It is recommended that the study be replicated with the addition of traditional teacher evaluation strategies. The perceived effectiveness of the self-evaluation strategies could be compared with the perceived effectiveness of other teacher evaluation strategies. The results of such a study could be useful in making recommendations to administrators regarding evaluation strategies that would facilitate the improvement of instruction.

4. In the present study, a four-point rating scale of effectiveness was used. Respondents tended to choose either of the middle two ratings for all five evaluation

strategies. It is recommended that the study be replicated using a rating scale that would more easily discriminate between effectiveness levels. Information from such a rating scale would be helpful in recommending self-evaluation strategies for improving particular teaching situations.

5. Although it was not a focus of this study, several comments were made regarding the importance of teacher motivation in the effectiveness of any evaluation strategy in the improvement of instruction. The literature suggests that self-evaluation has potential in increasing teacher motivation to improve because of the increase in teacher involvement in evaluation. The comments made in this study suggest that the effectiveness of self-evaluation is dependent on teacher attitude and motivation. It is recommended that further study be made of the relationship of teacher motivation and the effectiveness of self-evaluation strategies in the improvement of instruction.

Recommendations for practice. The results and conclusions of this investigation led to the following recommendations for practicing administrators regarding the use of teacher self-evaluation as a tool to improve instruction in their schools.

1. All five self-evaluation strategies studied

(goal setting and monitoring, growth contracting, self-rating, self-ranking, self-observation) were perceived as "somewhat effective" in the improvement of instruction. It is recommended that they be used by administrators as tools for improving instruction.

2. It is recommended that any of the self-evaluation strategies should be used along with other evaluation strategies rather than as the only evaluation strategy. The literature and the comments of respondents in this study support the contention that self-evaluation is most effective when used with other types of teacher evaluation.

3. It is recommended that administrators should be directly involved in the self-evaluation process. Information learned by teachers through the self-evaluation process should be shared with administrators. Administrators should be responsible for providing direction and support for teachers in the self-evaluation process. Again, the literature and comments of respondents in this study indicate that self-evaluation is most effective with direct administrator involvement.

4. It is recommended that goal setting and monitoring and growth contracting be used for the improvement of instruction. They were perceived as more

effective in the improvement of instruction than the other self-evaluation strategies. They have also been used more often by Nebraska teachers and administrators.

5. It is recommended that if goal setting and monitoring or growth contracting is used by an administrator as a tool to improve instruction, the administrator should ensure that the goals selected are meaningful to the instructional process, in need of further development, and not too easily attained.

6. Self-observation, which was rated third in effectiveness of the five strategies by both principals and teachers, received many positive comments from respondents. Self-observation received support in the literature as a viable evaluation strategy. It is recommended that to be most effective in improving instruction, teachers need to receive specific training in how to use video or audio tapes to focus on teaching strengths and weaknesses and to use them for purposes of improvement.

7. It is recommended that administrators should be cognizant of the importance of teacher motivation in the achievement of instructional improvement. Self-evaluation may be ineffective if there is no interest or motivation on the part of the teacher to improve.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, L. (1986). Time for results: An overview. Phi Delta Kappan, 68, (4), 202-204.
- Altschuld, J. W. & Lower, M. A. (1984). Improving mailed questionnaires: Analysis of a 96 percent return rate. In D. C. Lockhart (Ed.) Making effective use of mailed questionnaires (pp. 5-18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Adler, M. J. (1982). The Paideia Proposal: An educational manifesto. New York: Macmillan.
- Barnes, S. (1981). Syntesis of selected research on teaching findings. Austin, TX: Research & Development Center for Teacher Education.
- Berdie, D. R. & Anderson, J. F. (1974). Questionnaires: Design and use. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Blecke, A. E. (1982). Encouraging teacher support for teacher evaluations. NASSP Bulletin, 66 (458), 16-21.
- Blumberg, A. (1980). Supervision and teachers: A private cold war. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Company.
- Blumberg, A. & Greenfield, W. (1980). The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Bolton, D. L. (1973). Selection and evaluation of teachers. Berkley, CA: McCutchan.
- Boyer, E. L. (1983). High School: A report on secondary education in America. New York: Harper & Row.
- Brighton, S. & Rose, G. (1965). Increasing your accuracy in teacher evaluation. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

- Brookover, W. B. & Lezotte, L. W. (1979). Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement. East Lansing: Michigan State University, College of Urban Development.
- Bush, R. N. (1979). Implications of the BTES. The Generator, 9 (1), 13-15.
- Bushman, J. H. (1974). Are teachers playing 'statue' in the classroom? NASSP Bulletin, 58 (386), 25-37.
- Carroll, J. G. (1981). Faculty self-evaluation. In J. Millman (Ed.) Handbook of teacher evaluation (pp. 180-200). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Centra, J. A. & Potter, D. A. (1980). School and teacher effects: An interrelational model. Review of Educational Research. 50 (2), 273-291.
- Christiansen, E. E. (1986). Teacher evaluation - who needs it? Roeper Review, 9 (1), 19-23.
- Commission on Reading. (1985). Becoming a nation of readers. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A. E., & Pease, S. R. (1983). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of the literature. Review of Educational Research, 53, 285-328.
- DeBevoise, W. (1984). Syntesis of research on the principal as instructional leader. Educational Leadership, 41 (5), 14-20.
- Denhem, C. & Lieberman, A. (1980). Time to learn. Sacramento: California Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing.
- Donaldson, R. M., & Posluszny, M. (1985). Professional growth plans for public school teachers. The Clearing House, 59, 169-173.
- Dunkin, M. & Biddle, B. (1974). The study of teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Duell, O.K. & Davison, R. (1987). Elementary principals' and teachers' views of various modes of instructional evaluation. ERS Spectrum, 5, 23-33.

- Duke, D. L. (1987). School leadership and instructional improvement . New York: Random House.
- Duke, D. L. (1985). What is the nature of educational excellence and should we try to measure it? Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 671-674.
- Duke, D. L., & Stiggins, R. J. (1986). Teacher evaluation: Five keys to growth . Washington D.C.: Joint publication of American Association of School Administrators, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals and National Education Association.
- Dunkleberge, G. E. (1982). Classroom observations - What should principals look for? NASSP Bulletin, 66 (458), 9-15.
- Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, 37, 15-27.
- Education Commission of the States (1983). Action for excellence.
- Elliott, J. (1978). Classroom accountability and the self-monitoring teacher. In W. Harlen (Ed.), Evaluation and the teacher's role (pp. 47-91). London: MacMillan Education Ltd.
- Gallop, G. H. (1979). The eleventh annual Gallop poll of the public's attitude toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 60, 33-45.
- Garvin, J. P. (1986). Growth contracts: A practical move toward excellence. NASSP-Bulletin, 70 (486), 100-101.
- Gephart, W. J., Ingle, R. B., & Saretsky, G. (1976). The evaluation of teaching--NSPER: 74. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Gersten, R. & Carnine, D. (1981). Administrative and supervisory support functions for the implementation of effective educational programs for low income students. Eugene, Ore.: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon.

- Glatthorn, A. A. (1984). Differentiated supervision. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Glickman, C. D. (1987). Unlocking school reform: Uncertainty as a condition of professionalism. Phi Delta Kappan, 69 (2), 120-122.
- Goens, G. A., & Lange, R. W. (1976). Supervision as instructional analysis. NASSP Bulletin, 60 (401), 16-20.
- Good, T., Biddle, B. & Brophy, J. (1975). Teachers make a difference. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. E. (1984). Looking in Classrooms, 3rd ed. New York: Harper & Row.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A Place Called School. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Haefele, D. L. (1980). How to evaluate thee, teacher--Let me count the ways. Phi Delta Kappan, 61, 349-352.
- Haertel, G. D., Waiberg, H. J., & Weinstein, T. (1983). Psychological models of educational performance: A theoretical syntesis of constructs. Review of Educational Research, 53 (1), 79-82.
- Hammer, L. E. (1987). Attitudes held by teachers towards teacher evaluation and towards specific teacher evaluation processes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE.
- Hawley, R. C. (1982). Assessing teacher performance. Amherst, MA: Education Research Associates.
- Heichberger, R. L., & Young, J. M., Jr. (1975). Teacher perceptions of supervision and evaluation. Phi Delta Kappan, 57, 210.
- Hunter, M. (1983). Mastery teaching. El Segundo, CA: Tip.
- Iwanicki, E. F. (1981). Contract plans: A professional growth approach to evaluating teacher performance. In J. Millman (Ed.) Handbook of teacher evaluation (pp. 203-228). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

- Jackson, S. A., Logson, D. M. & Taylor, N. E. (1983). Instructional leadership behaviors. Urban Education, 18 (1), 59-70.
- Johnston, G. S., & Yeakey, C. C. (1979). The supervision of teacher evaluation: A brief overview. Journal of Teacher Education, 30 (2), 17-22.
- Johnston, J. (1973). In L. Balzer (Ed.) A review of research on teacher behavior. Columbus, OH: ERIC/SMEAC.
- Keirstead, J. (1985). Direct instruction and experiential approaches: Are they really mutually exclusive? Educational Leadership, 42 (8), 25.
- Kilgore, A. M., Caffey, M., & Nordell, G. (1985, March). Developing and implementing a comprehensive teacher assessment system. Paper presented at the National Conference of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Chicago.
- Kirk, R. E. (1982). Experimental Design; Procedures for the Behavioral Sciences. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.
- Kowalski, J. P. S. (1978). Evaluating teacher performance. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Levin, B. (1979). Teacher evaluation: A review of research. Educational Leadership, 37 (3), 240-245.
- Lewis, A. C. (1982). Evaluating educational personnel. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Lewis, J. (1973). Appraising teacher performance. West Nyack, NY: Parker.
- Little, J. W. & Bird, T. D. (1984). Is there instructional leadership in high schools? First findings from a study of secondary school administrators and their influence on teachers' professional norms. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Educational Research Association.

- Manatt, R. (1982). Teacher performance evaluation: Practical application of research. Occasional paper 82-1. Ames, IA: Iowa State University.
- McAfee, D. T. (1975). Evaluation of the teacher: Do teachers and supervisors agree?. The High School Journal, 58, 336-342.
- McCurdy, J. (1983). The role of the principal in effective schools: Problems and solutions. Sacramento, CA: American Association of School Administrators.
- McGreal, T. L. (1983). Successful teacher evaluation. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- McLaughlin, M. W. (1984). Teacher evaluation and school improvement. Teachers College Record, 86 (1), 193-207.
- McNeil, J. D., & Popham, W. J. (1973). The assessment of teacher competence. In R. M. W. Travers (Ed.) Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand, McNally & Company.
- Medley, D. M. (1977). Teacher competence and teacher effectiveness: A review of process-product research. Washington D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Medley, D. M. & Coker, H. (1987). How valid are principals' judgements of teacher effectiveness. Phi Delta Kappan, 68 (2), 138-140.
- Millman, J. (1981). Handbook of teacher evaluation. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Moritz, W., & Martin-Reynolds, J. A. (1980). Split screen video taping: The genie in the bottle. Educational Leadership, 38 396-399.
- National Commission on Excellence. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Norris, W. R. (1980). Seven premises for improving teacher evaluation. NASSP Bulletin, 64 (434), 30-35.

- Ovard, G. F. (1975). Teacher effectiveness and accountability. NASSP Bulletin, 59 (387), 87-94.
- Peterson, P. & Walberg, H. (1979). Research on Teaching. Berkley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Company.
- Pine, G. J. & Boy, A. V. (1975). Necessary conditions for evaluating teachers. NASSP Bulletin, 59 (395), 18-23.
- Popham, W. J. (1975). Educational evaluation. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Purkey, W. W. (1970). Self-concept and school achievement. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Redfern, G. (1980). Evaluating teachers and administrators: A performance objectives approach. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Riley, R. D. & Schaffer, E. C. (1979). Self-certification: Accounting to oneself. Journal of Teacher Education, 30 (2), 23-26.
- Roelle, R. J. & Wood, P. A. (1980). Six ways to improve teacher evaluation. American School Board Journal, 167 (9), 36-41.
- Rosenshine, B. (1971). Teaching behaviors and student achievement. London: National Foundation for Educational Research.
- Rosenshine, B. (1983). Teaching functions in instructional programs. The Elementary School Journal, 83, 335-351.
- Rosenshine, B. & Furst, N. (1971). Research on teacher performance criteria. In B. O. Smith (Ed.) Research in teacher education: A symposium. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Rutherford, W. L. (1985). School principals as effective leaders. Phi Delta Kappan, 67 (1), 31-34.
- Shoemaker, J. & Fraser, H. W. (1981). What principals can do: Some implications from studies of effective schooling. Phi Delta Kappan, 63 (3), 178-182.

- Soar, R. S., Medley, D. M., & Coker, H. (1983). Teacher evaluation: A critique of currently used methods. Phi Delta Kappan, 65 (4), 239-247.
- Stevens, P., & Rosenshine, B. (1981). Advances in research on teaching. Exceptional Education Quarterly, 2, i.
- Stiggins, R. J. (1986). Teacher evaluation: Accountability and growth systems - different purposes. NASSP Bulletin, 70 (490), 51-58.
- Stiggins, R. & Bridgeford, N. J. (1985). Performance assessment for teacher development. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7 (1), 85-97.
- Stodolsky, S. S. (1984). Teacher evaluation: The limits of looking. Educational Researcher, , 11-18.
- Sweeney, J. (1982). Research synthesis on effective school leadership. Educational Leadership, 39 (5), 346-352.
- Title 92, Nebraska Administrative Code, Chapter 34 (1985). Nebraska Department of Education.
- Weber, G. (1971). Inner-city children can be taught to read: Four successful schools. Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education.
- Wellisch, J. B. and others. (1978). School management and organization in successful schools. Sociology of Education, 51, 211-226.
- Wise, A. E., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M. W., & Bernstein H. T., (1984). Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices. (Report No. R-3139-NIE). Santa Monica CA:Rand Corporation.

Appendix A

TEACHER EVALUATION SURVEY

TEACHER EVALUATION SURVEY

You have been asked to respond to this questionnaire on the effect of five self-evaluation strategies on the improvement of instruction. The purpose of the study is to determine which self-evaluation strategies would be useful to administrators and teachers for the purpose of instructional improvement. Your school was identified on the basis of teacher evaluation policies and procedures submitted to the Nebraska Department of Education. Those policies and procedures indicated your school uses some type of self-evaluation as a component of teacher evaluation. Five self-evaluation strategies have been identified and defined for this study. Using the enclosed definitions of the five strategies, please respond to the following questions.

Which self-evaluation strategies are currently being used in your school? (Mark all that apply)

- Goal setting & monitoring
- Growth contracting
- Self-Rating
- Self-Ranking
- Self-Observation
- None

Which self-evaluation strategies have you experienced (either at this school or a previous one)? (Mark all that apply)

- Goal setting
- Growth contracting
- Self-Rating
- Self-Ranking
- Self-Observation
- None

Any comments you might make on these five self-evaluation strategies and the effect they have on the improvement of instruction will be helpful in determining their usefulness in the teacher evaluation process.

DIRECTIONS: Using the enclosed definitions of the five self-evaluation strategies, please respond to all questions on the pages of this survey. Please indicate your perceptions of the effectiveness of the five strategies on each of the instructional components. Respond to all five strategies, even if you have no direct experience with that strategy.

How effective is each self-evaluation strategy in helping teachers to improve the following instructional components?

Instructional Components	SELF-EVALUATION STRATEGIES			
	Goal Setting & Monitoring	Growth Contracting	Self-Setting	Self-Ranking
1. organizing instructional content	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d
2. selecting appropriate content for lessons	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d
3. developing instructional objectives for students	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d
4. planning for student assessment	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d
5. introducing new content to students	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d
6. reviewing or reteaching content to students	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d
7. demonstrating new skills to students	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d
8. communicating academic expectations to students	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d
9. maintaining classroom order	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d
10. communicating behavior expectations to students	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d
11. securing adequate resources	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d
12. managing time effectively	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d

Goal Setting & Monitoring

Growth Contracting

Self-Setting

Self-Ranking

Self-Observation

very effective
somewhat effective
minimally effective
not effective

very effective
somewhat effective
minimally effective
not effective

very effective
somewhat effective
minimally effective
not effective

very effective
somewhat effective
minimally effective
not effective

very effective
somewhat effective
minimally effective
not effective

DIRECTIONS: Using the enclosed definitions of the five self evaluation strategies, please respond to all questions on the pages of this survey. Please indicate your perceptions of the effectiveness of the five strategies on each of the instructional components. Respond to all five strategies, even if you have no direct experience with that strategy.

How effective is each self-evaluation strategy in helping teachers to improve the following instructional components?

Instructional Components

	Goal Setting & Monitoring	Growth Contracting	Self-Rating	Self-Ranking	Self-Observation
13. diagnosing student needs	a b c d very effective somewhat effective minimally effective not effective	a b c d very effective somewhat effective minimally effective not effective	a b c d very effective somewhat effective minimally effective not effective	a b c d very effective somewhat effective minimally effective not effective	a b c d very effective somewhat effective minimally effective not effective
14. individualizing to meet student's needs	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d
15. providing remedial assistance to students	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d
16. working with parents	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d
17. providing students with appropriate feedback	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d
18. checking for students understanding	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d
19. assessing student's mastery of skills	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d
20. identifying target areas for assistance	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d
21. demonstrating respect for students	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d
22. providing assistance and support to students	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d
23. recognizing student progress	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d
24. valuing student differences	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d	a b c d

SELF-EVALUATION STRATEGIES

Appendix B

DEFINITIONS OF SELF-EVALUATION STRATEGIES

SELF-EVALUATION STRATEGY DEFINITIONS

- GOAL SETTING & MONITORING: An evaluation strategy in which the teacher selects personal instructional improvement goals and regularly monitors progress toward the selected goals.
- GROWTH CONTRACTING: An evaluation strategy in which the teacher develops a contract that specifies job targets/objectives, methods of attainment, timelines, and progress measurement techniques.
- SELF-RATING: An evaluation strategy in which the teacher compares his or her performance on specified criteria with a predetermined standard.
- SELF-RANKING: An evaluation strategy in which the teacher analyzes his or her own teaching strengths and weaknesses and ranks them.
- SELF-OBSERVATION: An evaluation strategy in which the teacher observes himself or herself through the use of video or audio tape or other observation instrument.

Appendix C

LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS



Department of Education Administration
1204 Seaton Hall
Lincoln, NE 68588-0638
Telephone: (402) 472-3726

May 4, 1988

Dear

A survey instrument concerned with the effect of five self-evaluation strategies on the improvement of instruction in elementary schools is being sent to elementary principals and teachers as part of a doctoral dissertation study being carried out at the Department of Educational Administration, University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The results of this study should help school districts and administrators expand their evaluation strategies to better meet the goal of instructional improvement.

Your school district was identified as using at least one type of self-evaluation as part of the teacher evaluation process; therefore, the responses of your elementary principals and teachers will be particularly valuable to others who may want to consider such methods. Responses will not be singled out but reported only as group data.

It will be appreciated if you will encourage these elementary principals and teachers in your district who receive a questionnaire to complete it. A summary of the survey results will be made available upon your request. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Robert J. Staicup'.

Robert J. Staicup
Professor and Chair

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Carol A. Beaty'.

Carol A. Beaty
Graduate Student

RJS:CAB:ph
Enc.

Appendix D

LETTER TO PRINCIPALS



Department of Education Administration
1204 Seaton Hall
Lincoln, NE 68588-0638
Telephone: (402) 472-3726

May 6, 1988

Dear

The attached survey instrument deals with the effect of five self-evaluation strategies on the improvement of instruction in elementary schools, and is being carried out at the Department of Educational Administration, University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The results of this study should help school districts and administrators expand their evaluation strategies to better meet the goal of instructional improvement.

Your school was identified as using at least one type of self-evaluation as part of the teacher evaluation process. As a professional educator experienced with self-evaluation methods, your responses will be particularly valuable to others who may want to consider such methods. Your responses will not be singled out but reported only as group data. Your anonymity is assured.

It will be appreciated if you will complete the enclosed form prior to May 18, 1988, and return it in the stamped, addressed envelope enclosed. It will also be appreciated if you will encourage the teachers in your building that receive a questionnaire to complete and return it. A summary of the survey results will be made available upon your request. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Robert J. Stalcup in cursive.

Robert J. Stalcup
Professor and Chair

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Carol A. Beaty in cursive.

Carol A. Beaty
Graduate Student

RJS/CAB:ph
Enc.

Appendix E

LETTER TO TEACHERS



University of
Nebraska
Lincoln

157

Department of Education Administration
1204 Seaton Hall
Lincoln, NE 68588-0638
Telephone: (402) 472-3726

May 6, 1988

Dear

The attached survey instrument deals with the effect of five self-evaluation strategies on the improvement of instruction in elementary schools and is being carried out at the Department of Education Administration, University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The results of this study should help school districts and administrators expand their evaluation strategies to better meet the goal of instructional improvement.

Your school was identified as using at least one type of self-evaluation as part of the teacher evaluation process. As a professional educator experienced with self-evaluation methods, your responses will be particularly valuable to others who may want to consider such methods. Your responses will not be singled out but reported only as group data. Your anonymity is assured.

It will be appreciated if you will complete the enclosed form prior to May 18, 1988, and return it in the stamped, addressed envelope enclosed. A summary of the survey results will be made available upon your request. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Robert J. Stalcup in cursive.

Robert J. Stalcup
Professor and Chair

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Carol A. Beaty in cursive.

Carol A. Beaty
Graduate Student

RJS/CAB:ph
Enc.

Appendix F

LETTER ACCOMPANYING SECOND
MAILING OF SURVEY



University of
Nebraska
Lincoln

159

Department of Education Administration
1204 Seaton Hall
Lincoln, NE 68588-0638
Telephone: (402) 472-3726

May 19, 1988

Dear Educator,

Approximately two weeks ago you received a copy of this survey instrument dealing with the effect of teacher self-evaluation on the improvement of instruction in elementary schools. As an educator myself I am aware that this is a very busy time of year and realize you may not have had the time to respond to the survey. However, your response is very important to make this an effective study and will be helpful in developing strategies to meet the goal of instructional improvement.

I have enclosed another copy of the survey instrument and ask that you complete it and return it in the stamped, addressed envelope by May 30, 1988. If you have already responded to the survey please disregard this reminder. I want to sincerely thank all of you who have returned the survey and those who will now take the time to respond. A summary of the survey results will be made available upon your request.

Sincerely,

Carol A. Beaty
Carol A. Beaty

Appendix G

LETTER ACCOMPANYING THIRD
MAILING OF SURVEY



University of
Nebraska
Lincoln

161

Department of Education Administration
1204 Seaton Hall
Lincoln, NE 68588-0638
Telephone: (402) 472-3726

September 21, 1988

Dear Educator,

Last May you received the attached survey instrument dealing with the effect of five self-evaluation strategies on the improvement of instruction in elementary schools. We are aware that May is a very busy month for educators and can appreciate that you were unable to respond to the instrument at that time. However, your response is very important in order to make this an effective study and we strongly urge you to complete and return the survey now.

The study is being carried out at the Department of Education Administration, University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The results of the study will help school districts and administrators expand their evaluation strategies to better meet the goal of instructional improvement. Your school was identified as using at least one type of self-evaluation as part of the teacher evaluation process. As a professional educator experienced with self-evaluation methods, your responses will be particularly valuable to others who may want to consider such methods. Your responses will not be singled out but reported only as group data. Your anonymity is assured.

It will be appreciated if you will complete the enclosed form prior to October 7, 1988, and return it in the stamped, addressed envelope enclosed. A summary of the survey results will be made available upon your request. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Robert J. Stalcup in cursive.

Robert J. Stalcup
Professor

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Carol A. Beaty in cursive.

Carol A. Beaty
Graduate Student