

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.

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 9105932

**North Carolina K-5 principals' perceptions of the teacher
performance appraisal instrument**

Lamm, Mary Hobgood, Ed.D.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1990

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

**NORTH CAROLINA K-5 PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS
OF THE TEACHER PERFORMANCE
APPRAISAL INSTRUMENT**

by

Mary Hobgood Lamm

**A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education**

**Greensboro
1990**

Approved by



Dissertation Advisor

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Advisor

Robert R. Rusk

Committee Members

Howard Bond

James Rusk

J. V. Shagin

February 16, 1990

Date of Acceptance by Committee

February 16, 1990

Date of Final Oral Examination

LAMM, MARY HOBGOOD, Ed.D. North Carolina K-5 Principals' Perceptions of the Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument. (1990) Directed by Dr. Dale L. Brubaker. 132 pp.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of North Carolina's K-5 public school principals regarding the Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument, with particular emphasis on whether it is viewed as being a reliable method for discriminating between teachers "at or above standard" and those "below standard". Since July, 1987, all school systems in North Carolina have been required to evaluate teachers using the Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument (TPAI). A systematic sampling of 316 K-5 public school principals in North Carolina provided the data through responses to a survey. The survey collected information on school and principal demographics, solicited information on seven open-ended questions pertaining to principals' use of the TPAI, and listed the 38 observable practices on the TPAI. Principals were asked to read and rate the 38 observable practices twice; once to indicate the degree to which a specific item allowed them to differentiate between teachers who were "at or above standard" and those "below standard", and once to indicate the degree of importance of the item in evaluating teachers who were "at or above standard" and "below standard".

Conclusions based on the analysis of the findings of the study were:

1. the TPAI is performing as hoped since principals were overwhelmingly positive in their perception that it

allowed them to differentiate between good and bad teaching practices

2. while the TPAI effectively differentiates between teachers "at or above standard" and those "below standard", it does not prescribe an individual plan of improvement for those teachers identified as "below standard"
3. while most principals are using the TPAI as they had been trained, it can be concluded from survey comments that minor changes are needed to refine the instrument
4. despite principals' comments that the TPAI is too time consuming, it can be concluded from their responses that, overall, they are satisfied with the TPAI.

SPECIAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I wish to extend a very special thanks to Dr. James Runkel who gave so much of his time and expertise, as well as his guidance, support, and encouragement to see me through this project. His assistance was invaluable. Thank you, Dr. Runkel!

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to extend thanks to the members of my committee, Dr. Dale Brubaker, Dr. Lloyd Bond, Dr. Svi Shapiro, and Dr. James Runkel, for their support and guidance. I also wish to thank my colleagues, Dr. Robert Jones, Dr. Clinton (Jake) Brown, and Dr. Cleo Meek, who gave me encouragement and support. Thanks also go to my husband, Paul, for his patience. A special thanks goes to Cindy Matthews, who spent many hours helping me with this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Problem	1
Purposes of the Study	7
Research Methodology	8
Definition of Terms	9
Limitations	10
Significance of the Study	11
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	13
The Principal's Role in Teacher Evaluation	13
Effective Evaluation Systems: Characteristics and Shortcomings	23
Rationale for Appraising School Personnel	36
III. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NORTH CAROLINA TEACHER PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL INSTRUMENT	38
IV. PROCEDURES	45
Introduction	45
Research Methodology	46
Description of the Survey Instrument	48

Description of the Sample	50
Summary	59
V. ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	62
Introduction	62
Responses to Four Major Study Questions	63
Major Study Findings	77
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY	79
Summary	79
Conclusions	85
Recommendations for Further Study	86
BIBLIOGRAPHY	89
APPENDIX A. SURVEY INSTRUMENT	95
APPENDIX B. LETTERS TO SELECTED K-5 PRINCIPALS	99
APPENDIX C. TEACHER PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM	102
APPENDIX D. RESPONSES TO SURVEY QUESTION	110
APPENDIX E. RESPONSES TO SURVEY QUESTION	114
APPENDIX F. RESPONSES TO SURVEY QUESTION	118

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Comparison of all North Carolina Principals and K-5 North Carolina Principals by Sex	51
2. Comparison of all North Carolina Principals and K-5 North Carolina Principals by Race	53
3. Age Span of Respondent North Carolina K-5 Principals	54
4. Years of Experience of North Carolina K-5 Principals as Principal	55
5. Years of Experience of North Carolina K-5 Principals as Teacher	57
6. Highest Degree Held by North Carolina K-5 Principals	58
7. Responses of North Carolina K-5 Principals by Educational Region	60
8. Overall Means and Standard Deviations for Eight Major Function Areas of the TPAI as Seen by North Carolina K-5 Principals	66
9. 2x2 Contingency Table Illustrating Ratings of TPAI by North Carolina K-5 Principals	67
10. Responses of North Carolina K-5 Principals by Race	70

11.	Responses of North Carolina K-5 Principals by Sex	71
12.	Persons Responsible for TPAI Evaluations as Reported by North Carolina K-5 Principals	72
13.	Providers of Training in the Use of the North Carolina TPAI	76

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

With the publication, in 1983, of two significant educational reports, teacher evaluation became a national focus. Both A Nation at Risk by the National Commission on Excellence in Education and Action for Excellence by the Education Commission of the States made recommendations concerning the evaluation of teachers. Those recommendations included the tying of salary, promotion, tenure, and retention decisions to an effective evaluation system that includes peer review so that superior teachers can be rewarded, average ones encouraged, and poor ones either improved or terminated (A Nation at Risk, 1983, p. 31). The recommendations also called for cooperation between boards of education, higher education and teachers, and for rewarding outstanding performance (Action for Excellence, 1983, p. 11).

In 1984, the North Carolina Commission on Education for Economic Growth in its study, Education for Economic Growth: An Action Plan for North Carolina, made similar recommendations. It recommended that the State Board of Education should:

1. design three positive annual evaluations of teacher performance before career status is granted
2. develop and implement a quality assurance program for

experienced teachers which should include:

- a. annual multiple-point evaluations by mentor teachers and administrators
- b. emphasis on reinforcement which is positive and criticism which is constructive
- c. an individualized plan to improve weaknesses and deficiencies
- d. progress on improvements as a part of continuing evaluation
- e. the dismissal of teachers who do not improve or meet basic training competencies (An Action Plan for North Carolina, 1984, p. 37).

Before the turn of this century, the evaluation of teachers was often "inspection" by administrators who were not trained in teaching or observing. Teachers were "inspected" to determine their conformity to the school district's expectations. These expectations could be personal or professional and might focus on such diverse issues as student behavior or the teacher's personality (Weber, 1987, p. 1).

Since 1900, teacher evaluation has become more humanized by including more concerns for the development of teachers' skills. Researchers began to isolate significant teaching behaviors, believing that good teaching could be developed with enough attention and effort (Weber, 1987, p. 1).

By the 1970's, the public began to demand accountability for expenditures in education. And by the early 1980's teacher

evaluation became highly fashionable. As of 1983, twenty-six states had mandated teacher evaluation measures (Weber, 1987, p. 2).

In a recent study of teacher evaluation procedures sponsored by the Rand Corporation, school administrators cited four purposes for evaluation:

1. personnel decisions involving teacher placement, tenure, and promotion
2. staff development, such as identifying areas for teacher in-service training
3. school improvement, focusing on upgrading the general level of instruction
4. accountability (Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein, 1985, pp. 61-69).

Most researchers agree that the principal is the person who is most often charged with the responsibility for teacher evaluation (Bridges, 1985, p. 19). According to Raymond Calabrese, the principal must become an instructional leader who understands classroom observation and staff evaluation (1986, p. 272). But for many principals, teacher evaluation consists predominantly of the principal rating the teacher's performance and professional characteristics by the use of a checklist (Ishler, 1984, p. 21).

Principals, when surveyed, responded that the role of instructional leader is their most important responsibility. However, the ways in which principals actually spend their time are not consistent with this priority (Acheson, 1985, p.1).

Research shows principals spend 75% of their time on management-related issues and only 25% of their time on leadership.

On a principal's job description, 85% of the items refer to managing and only 14% refer to instruction (Calabrese, 1986, p. 272). Most principals actually see their primary task as the running of a smoothly operating plant. That means calling substitute teachers, playing nurse, ordering and distributing supplies, making class assignments, balancing the budgets, making repairs, and writing press releases (Ellis, 1986, p. 22). According to Calabrese, classroom observation as a means of evaluation is not a priority for some principals. Reasons for this may be:

1. a lack of understanding of the classroom observation process
2. job descriptions that make principals managers rather than instructional leaders
3. the size of schools
4. complexity of programs
5. limited control
6. teacher specialization (p. 272).

The principal is expected to be knowledgeable in regard to a range of generic teaching skills and a variety of strategies. Further expectations include expertise in the process of observing classes, recording relevant data, and giving feedback to the teacher in a useful way through conferences (Acheson, 1985, p. 2). In order to carry out classroom observations, the principal needs a range of knowledge and skills to do the job well. This includes:

1. knowledge of the subject matter being taught
 2. understanding of the instructional strategy being used
 3. ability to understand and interpret student behavior
 4. access to a range of data collection and devices
 5. sensitivity to a variety of personalities among teachers
 6. recognition of suitable outcomes or goals for the teacher
- (Acheson, 1985, p. 6).

As in many other states, North Carolina saw the need for an evaluation instrument which would provide for the fair and impartial evaluation of teachers, and for training in its use by those persons charged with the responsibility for evaluation. Educators and legislators in North Carolina began, in 1978, to direct their efforts toward the development of a performance-based evaluation instrument (Holdzkom, 1987, pp. 40-41).

In 1982, a study was undertaken which solicited views from teachers, principals and supervisors on teachers' responsibilities. From this study, a teacher evaluation instrument was developed and piloted in twenty-four school units. It was found that principals tended to rate all teachers alike. When multiple evaluators observed teachers, there was disagreement about the quality of performance (Stacey, Kuligowski, and Holdzkom, 1987, p.1). The evaluation system was perceived as having these serious flaws:

1. the criteria or standards were not clearly understood by all observers
2. procedures for data collection and analysis varied from school to school

3. the use of multiple observers was not required (Stacey, Kuligowski, and Holdzkom, 1987, p. 2).

The standards for evaluation were re-examined and, in 1983, a second study was conducted through a contract with a group of university-based researchers composed of Marvin Wyne, Gary Stuck, and Kinnard White from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. After an intensive review of the research literature, a panel of experts in effective teaching research along with teachers and administrators reviewed the results. The panel consisted of Don Peterson, University of South Florida; Tom Good, University of Missouri; Gaea Linehardt, University of Pittsburgh; John Carroll, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill; and teachers and administrators from the Chatham County and Burlington City school systems. Twenty-eight specific teaching skills were isolated and grouped into five major teaching functions:

1. management of instructional time
2. management of student behavior
3. instructional presentation
4. instructional monitoring
5. instructional feedback

Three functions with ten observable practices were added to reflect organizational values and norms:

1. facilitating instruction
2. interacting within the educational environment
3. non-instructional duties (Stacey, Kuligowski & Holdzkom, 1987, pp. 2-3).

From this work, the North Carolina Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument (TPAI) was developed. A thirty-hour in-service training course on Effective Teaching was delivered to all persons who would participate in the evaluation of teachers, either as evaluators or evaluatees. For evaluators, a 24-hour course in the techniques of observation and evaluation was provided. In 1987, a ten-hour booster training program was delivered to evaluators (Stacey, Kuligowski & Holdzkom, 1987, pp. 3-4). As of July 1, 1987, every teacher in North Carolina was being evaluated annually through the use of the TPAI.

Purposes of Study

This study focused on the North Carolina K-5 public school principals' perceptions of the TPAI, with particular emphasis on whether it was viewed as a reliable method for discriminating between teachers "at or above standard" and those "below standard". Through a survey of selected North Carolina public school K-5 principals, answers were sought to the following questions:

1. are North Carolina K-5 principals satisfied that the TPAI enables them to identify those teachers who are "at or above standard" and those "below standard"?
2. does the TPAI provide the data needed to set up individual improvement programs for teachers identified as "below standard"?
3. do principals use the TPAI as they were trained to use it? If

not, in what ways do they use it differently and why?

4. are modifications of the TPAI needed? If so, what modifications do the principals recommend?

Research Methodology

Through a selected sampling, this study surveyed the 1267 K-5 public school principals in North Carolina to investigate their perceptions of the TPAI. After consultation with Dr. Lloyd Bond, a member of the educational research staff at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, the decision was made to survey one-fourth of the 1267 K-5 principals in the following manner:

Every fourth name from the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction's list of K-5 schools was selected. Every fourth principal selected would provide a systematic and representative sampling.

The 316 principals from systematically sampled schools were asked to complete a survey during December, 1988 and January, 1989. The survey asked the principals questions regarding their perceptions in the use and effectiveness of the TPAI. (See Appendix A -- The Survey Instrument).

This study was descriptive in nature in that it described a population of principals. Data collected were summarized and classified according to sex, race, and educational region of the

principal to determine if any of these variables influenced the perceptions.

Definition of Terms

Terms or phrases listed below are defined for clarity and consistency according to their use in this study:

at or above standard:	rating at which teaching performance is considered acceptable
below standard:	rating which indicates that performance is inadequate or unacceptable
evaluator:	person charged with the responsibility for observing teacher performance and making judgments/decisions concerning teachers' performance
perception:	insight, intuition, or knowledge gained by understanding; the view one holds regarding a specific issue based on prior knowledge and personal experience
principal:	the appointed head of a school who is the primary evaluator of teachers' performance

teacher evaluation:	process by which the determination of the value/worth of teacher performance is made
TPAI:	Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument-the instrument used in North Carolina to determine if a teacher is performing at or above standard or below standard

Limitations

1. Ideally, interviewing every elementary principal in North Carolina would provide the richest and most complete knowledge of their perceptions of the TPAI. The second best alternative would be to survey the population. Because funds and time did not permit either of these options, only a representative sample of principals' perceptions was done. Three hundred sixteen principals (one of every four North Carolina K-5 principals) received the survey.
2. Each principal brings to the evaluation process his/her own background of experiences which may bias the evaluation, regardless of the fact that the principal had participated in the TPAI training.
3. The sampling process depended on the response from the

principals receiving the survey instrument. Not all principals responded.

Significance of the Study

As early as 1978, North Carolina educators and legislators saw the need for the development of a system for professional evaluation and improvement (Holdzkom, 1987, p. 41). By 1983, a teacher performance appraisal instrument had been developed. Evaluators received, in addition to the thirty-hour course on Effective Teaching required for all participants, an additional twenty-four-hour course in observation techniques (Stacey, Kuligowski, & Holdzkom, 1988, pp. 3-4).

In an earlier study, this writer interviewed ten principals in educational regions three and eight to determine how they perceived the TPAI. Concern was expressed by several of these principals that the TPAI was not the effective instrument it was claimed to be.

This study examined the perceptions of the TPAI by public school K-5 principals in North Carolina, in an effort to determine if those perceptions affect the way in which they use the instrument. Using the data and recommendations from the principals surveyed, it is hoped that changes may be made in the use of the TPAI or in the instrument itself to make it a more effective evaluation tool.

Chapter Two, a review of the literature, examines the necessity for teacher evaluation systems and the principal's role in evaluation.

Chapter Three describes the Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument in North Carolina and examines the reasons for its development and use. Chapter Four contains a description of the design and methodology of the study. The survey instrument and the Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument are included. The findings of the survey and an analysis of the data are reported in Chapter Five. Conclusions drawn from the findings along with recommendations for further study are presented in Chapter Six.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to investigate North Carolina K-5 public school principals' perceptions of the TPAI. This chapter is divided into three sections. The first deals with the principal's role and responsibility in teacher evaluation. The second part outlines the characteristics of effective evaluation systems and also lists some shortcomings of standard evaluation systems. The third and final section is devoted to the rationale for appraising the performance of school personnel and the steps necessary in developing a program for measurement-based evaluation of teacher performance.

The Principal's Role in Teacher Evaluation

Principals bear the primary responsibility for teacher evaluation (Bridges, 1985, p. 20). The principal is expected to have expertise in the process of observing classes, recording relevant data, and giving feedback to the teacher in a useful way through helpful conferences and accurate reports (Acheson, 1985, p. 1). According to Bridges, the principal needs to possess the following abilities and knowledge if evaluation responsibilities are to be performed effectively:

1. the ability to describe and analyze what is happening in a classroom
2. the ability to provide an unbiased rating of a teacher's performance
3. the ability to diagnose the cause(s) for a teacher's poor performance
4. the ability to prescribe remediation that is appropriate to the teacher's classroom deficiencies
5. the ability to conduct conferences with teachers regarding their instructional performance
6. the ability to document matters related to 1 through 5
7. knowledge of the legal bases for evaluating and dismissing incompetent teachers (p. 20).

Research by Acheson (1985) supports this belief. According to him, the classroom observer needs a range of knowledge and skills to do the job well. These include:

1. knowledge of the subject matter being taught
2. understanding of the instructional strategy being used
3. ability to understand and interpret student behavior
4. access to a range of data collection devices
5. sensitivity to a variety of personalities among teachers
6. recognition of suitable outcomes or goals for the teacher (p. 6).

Peggy Ishler, in her 1984 study, reported that the responsibility for implementing an effective evaluation system rests largely with the principal. Principals need to be trained in observation and

evaluation skills. They need to go through intensive in-service that includes:

1. information on effective schools and effective teaching practices
2. information on effective evaluation practices including goal setting techniques, conferencing, observation techniques, and report writing techniques
3. information on faculty development resources
4. observation
5. practice with feedback on the use of these skills on the job
6. coaching each other as principals, assistants, and department heads work together with the techniques during the year (p. 15).

Raymond Calabrese contends that school effectiveness can be increased by improving the principal's ability to understand and assist in the process of improving instruction in the classroom (1987, p. 272). The ultimate responsibility for developing effective schools rests with the principal; he or she must become an instructional leader who understands classroom observation and staff evaluation. Classroom observation is one aspect of teacher evaluation. For some principals, classroom observation is not a priority. Among the reasons cited are:

1. lack of understanding of the classroom observation process
2. job descriptions that make principals managers rather than instructional leaders

3. the size of the school
4. the complexity of programs
5. limited control
6. teacher specialization (p. 272).

Classroom observation by the principal needs to be well planned, rather than hurried. Principals have tried to compensate for the limited time spent in classroom observation by relying on observation instruments such as checklists or rating scales (Calabrese, p. 273). Data collected in this manner may be unreliable and pose the possibility of the observer misinterpreting what is happening in the classroom. Principals must become aware of personal biases if they are to correctly interpret classroom behavior. Principals can more accurately assess what happens in the classroom by becoming aware of effective teaching and implementing the following strategies:

1. the principal must break down the complexity of the classroom
2. the principal should focus on student response
3. the principal should review the observation instrument currently in use to determine if it is more concerned with the teacher as manager than with what happens in the classroom
4. the principal must maximize the time committed to observation
5. the principal should assist the teacher in developing instructional objectives
6. the schools can improve classroom instruction through a

program of inservice related to instruction and observation (Calabrese, pp. 273-274).

Keith Acheson (1985) describes desirable supervisory techniques. Prior to the formal classroom observation, the principal/evaluator:

1. meets with the teacher
2. finds out what the lesson objectives are and what strategies the teacher plans to use during the visit
3. finds out what the teacher expects students to be doing during the observation visit
4. finds out any concerns of the teacher and any problems he/she is having
5. involves the teacher in deciding what will be observed and the type of data to be collected during the observation visit
6. helps the teacher translate concerns into specific teaching behaviors which can be observed
7. suggests a variety of observational techniques which could be used during the observation visit
8. suggests methods which the teacher can use to gather data about his/her own teaching without help from others (Acheson, p. 22).

During the formal classroom observation, the principal/evaluator:

1. makes verbatim notes of selected parts of what is said by teacher and students
2. writes the teacher's questions for later analysis
3. writes responses from students to teacher's questions for later analysis

4. records whether or not individual students are working at their assigned tasks
5. makes a chart to show patterns and amount of student response in class discussions
6. makes audio recordings of everything that is said in class
7. makes charts to show movements of the teacher and students during the teaching process
8. makes video recordings of the teacher and students during the teaching process
9. observes and makes notes about the behavior of a specific child if the child has been identified as a problem student by the teacher
10. records his/her subjective feelings about whether the class is good or bad
11. stays for at least 30 minutes for the observation visit (Acheson, p. 23).

After the formal observation, the principal/evaluator:

1. meets with the teacher to discuss what was observed
2. gives the teacher direct advice to improve instruction
3. gives opinions regarding the observed teaching to the teacher
4. relates the teacher's perceptions of the class to the objective observational data which was collected during the observation visit
5. encourages the teacher to make inferences, and to express opinions as well as feelings about the observational data

collected by the evaluator

6. asks questions of the teacher during the conference to help clarify the evaluator's opinions and feelings
7. encourages the teacher to consider alternative teaching techniques and explanations of classroom events
8. is willing to modify his/her objectives for the conference to accommodate the teacher's priorities
9. listens more than he/she talks during the conference
10. acknowledges what the teacher says and shows that he/she understands what the teacher is saying
11. gives praise and encouragement for specific growth in the teaching skills of the teacher which have been observed by the evaluator
12. recommends resources which deal with areas in which the teacher wishes/needs to improve (Acheson, p. 23).

Principals bring different attributes to the evaluation process (Duke and Stiggins, 1986, p. 16). Ideally, the teacher and principal should be matched in needs and interests. This match is not likely to be found, but there are general characteristics which have been acknowledged to be vital to the success of the evaluation process. Six attributes have been identified which may affect the quality of the teacher evaluation process (p. 22). They are:

1. credibility
2. persuasiveness
3. patience
4. trust

5. track record

6. modeling (p. 22-26).

For a principal to have credibility, he/she must have valuable knowledge of direct relevance to the teacher, the content area, grade level, and the particular group of students. Credibility is a function of many things, including:

1. knowledge of the technical aspects of teaching
2. knowledge of subject area
3. years of classroom teaching experience
4. years of experience in the school and school district
5. recency of teaching experience
6. familiarity with the teacher's classroom and students

(p. 22).

At the secondary level, a key issue focuses on knowledge of content. No principal can be knowledgeable across all content areas. But a principal must be able to comment on each of the following general aspects of lesson content:

1. accuracy of the information presented
2. relevance to student concerns
3. appropriateness for the level of student ability
4. appropriateness for course objectives
5. balance and fairness (p. 23).

Roelle and Wood in their article, "Six Ways to Improve Teacher Evaluation" (1980), list six guidelines to help the principal in the role of evaluator. Those guidelines are:

1. pre-employment evaluation

2. focus on evaluation during inservice training
3. establishment of a regular pattern of classroom visits
4. documentation of everything
5. never overlooking an infraction of school policies
6. providing teachers with opportunities for self-evaluation
(pp. 36 and 41).

The principal may need to rely on evaluation feedback from more than one source, but the single greatest contributor to credibility is likely to be the observer's familiarity with a teacher's classroom and students (Duke and Stiggins, p. 23).

Principals must also be able to persuade teachers to alter their actions by providing clear, convincing reasons why change is needed.

Some reasons may be:

1. district goals
2. community concerns
3. school needs assessment
4. classroom observations
5. analyses of student performance
6. research findings
7. state and federal mandates
8. court rulings (p.24).

Principals typically have more to do than there is time to do it. Cutting corners is tempting, but there is no substitute for patience in the evaluation process. Explaining why change is needed takes time and patience. Those who would presume to suggest changes in teacher behavior must inspire trust. The teacher must know the

principal's intentions, and feel secure that communications will be held in confidence. The track record of the principal is important. Tips for the principal that may help in getting teachers to take his/her suggestions/assistance seriously are:

1. avoid giving the impression that suggestions for improvement are guaranteed to work
2. don't feel compelled to have an answer for everything
3. when unable to find a solution to a problem, get the teacher's assistance in setting up an on-site research project to study the problem (p. 26).

Modeling is an effective way for the principal to demonstrate a new idea, technique, or desirable attitude. Asking teachers to assess the principal's performance might make teachers regard evaluation more positively (p. 26).

Linda Darling-Hammond, in her 1986 proposal for evaluating teaching, cites five principles:

1. selection and induction into teaching should be rigorous and dominated by peers so that the standards can be effectively transmitted and the public can have confidence in the competency of teachers
2. periodic reviews of individual teachers' performances should be conducted by expert peers and administrators who use a wide range of indicators dealing with both the substance and process of teaching
3. special forums and support systems should be formed for the referral and redress of cases of incompetence or

unprofessional performance

4. peer review of teaching practice should be an ongoing process and should include all teachers so that the standards of practice can be continually developed and improved
5. collective control of technical decisions about the structure, form, and content of their work should rest with teachers (p. 544).

Effective Evaluation Systems: Characteristics and Shortcomings

Evaluation of teaching performance is undergoing changes, due to educational reform and the movement toward accountability in education (Buttram and Wilson, 1987). A review of exemplary teacher evaluation systems points to five areas in which the practice has changed in the past decade. Progressive districts are:

1. linking evaluation systems to research on effective practices
 2. providing improved training for evaluators
 3. holding administrators more accountable for conducting evaluations
 4. using evaluation-identified teacher deficiencies to focus staff development
 5. making teachers active partners in the evaluation process
- (p. 5).

Districts are becoming more conscientious about relating evaluation criteria to the research on effective teaching. Training

is being provided to ensure that evaluations are fair as well as reliable, and principals are increasingly being held accountable for implementing teacher evaluation systems. Districts are beginning to integrate evaluation and supervision, and to tie evaluation findings to intervention-oriented staff development programs. Administrators and teachers are collaborating more in the evaluation process (p. 6).

David T. Conley, in his 1987 article in Educational Leadership, outlines eight characteristics which he considers critical attributes of effective evaluation systems. They are:

1. all participants accept the validity of the system
2. all participants thoroughly understand the mechanics of the system
3. evaluatees know that the performance criteria have a clear consistent rationale
4. evaluators are properly trained in the procedural and substantive use of the system
5. levels of evaluation are employed, each with a different goal
6. the evaluation distinguishes between the formative and summative dimensions
7. a variety of evaluation methods are used
8. evaluation is a district priority (p. 60-64).

Conley believes that the district must show commitment to the evaluation process, and the commitment needs to take several forms.

Evaluators must have sufficient time to accomplish the evaluation process, as performance appraisal is time-consuming. Adequate training opportunities must be provided for both evaluators and evaluatees. Training programs must provide agreement on a model of effective instruction, on some degree of common vocabulary, and on standards for measuring these elements. The evaluation process must be tied into the goals of the district, particularly those related to the improvement of instruction. The improvement process must be driven by evaluation which identifies strengths and weaknesses, providing focus for the district's inservice offerings, and guiding administrators in the improvement process.

Thomas McGreal, a leading authority on teacher evaluation systems, cites nine characteristics which effectively functioning evaluation systems have in common. They are:

1. participants share an attitude that the purpose of the evaluation system is to provide assistance in improving instruction
2. the requirements placed on the participants in a system reflect completely the actual purpose of the system
3. teacher evaluation is separated from teaching evaluation
4. goal setting is the major activity of evaluation
5. a narrow focus in the teaching activity is the material for evaluation
6. preconferences occur prior to the observation
7. multiple sources of data are used

8. different requirements are mandated for tenured and non-tenured teachers

9. a complete training program is available to both supervisors and teachers (McGreal, 1982, p.1).

According to McGreal, the most effective way to produce improved instruction is through a positive, supportive relationship between a knowledgeable supervisor and a teacher (p. 3).

The major form of data collection in evaluation is classroom observation (p. 9). Reliability of classroom observation can be increased in two ways. The first is by narrowing the range of things one looks for during observation; goal setting can accomplish this. The second way is directly related to the kind and amount of information the observer has prior to the observation visit; the preconference can accomplish this. Effective evaluation systems are directly related to the amount of training received by the participants. An appropriate training program would include:

1. goal setting skills for all participants, including supervisors and teachers
2. definitions, explanations, examples, and practice in the selected teaching focus
3. explanation of, and practice in, the use of student descriptive data and artifact collection
4. classroom observation skills
5. conferencing skills
6. a general view for all participants, covering the local district's prevailing attitude toward the purpose of evaluation

(p.13).

Darling-Hammond (1983) supports this belief. She poses conditions for the successful operation of a teacher evaluation system. They are:

1. an understanding of the criteria and processes involved which is shared by all participants
2. a shared sense that the criteria reflect the most important aspects of teaching
3. the perception by teachers that the procedure helps them in their teaching
4. the perception by principals that the procedure helps them provide instructional leadership
5. perception by participants that the procedure achieves a balance between control and autonomy for all involved (p. 320).

Freda Holley in her article, "Personnel Evaluation: Essentials for Success" (1982), outlines the essentials in good evaluation systems:

1. top management supports fully
2. well designed components
3. focus on things that truly matter
4. elements that promote behavior change are in place
5. directed toward improvement
6. competent evaluators
7. bias-free
8. utilization of data obtained from that system
9. main purpose of evaluation not overshadowed by dismissal purposes (pp. 6-8).

Research by Jerry Bellon (1982) indicates that effective evaluation programs have several common characteristics. They:

1. are based on positive assumptions about teachers and their desire to be competent
2. have top-level leaders who are committed to positive evaluation programs whose major purpose it to help teachers improve their performance
3. contain programs which have been cooperatively planned, organized, and implemented
4. view teachers as full partners in all activities related to the development of the program
5. incorporate the expectations of the teachers into the rationale and procedures that are basic to the evaluation program
6. attend to both formative and summative evaluative processes
7. have as the primary focus behavior of teacher and student
8. do not depend on checklists for summarizing the formative or summative evaluation data (p. 11).

According to Wise, et al (1985), a well-designed, properly functioning teacher evaluation process is the major communication link between the school system and its teachers (p. 61). Not only does it impart concepts of teaching to teachers and frame the conditions of their work but it also helps the school system structure, manage, and reward the work of teachers (p. 61). The primary goal of teacher evaluation should be the improvement of

individual and collective teaching performance in the school (p. 69). The evaluation of teachers is one of the most powerful ways to impact on instruction (p. 76). Some results of teacher evaluation, according to Wise, et al, are:

1. improved teacher-administrator communication
2. increased teacher awareness of instructional goals and classroom practices
3. improved school climate
4. a sense of team effort at the building level
5. an increased sense of pride and professionalism
6. better school system-teacher union relations
7. improved classroom instruction
8. gains in student achievement
9. more funds allocated for staff development
10. increased public confidence in the schools (pp. 76-77).

This same study cited the following dilemmas underlying teacher evaluations:

1. divisions of authority and responsibility among teachers, principals, and central office administrators in the design and implementation of the teacher evaluation process
2. the degree of centralization and standardization of the management of the process
3. distinction between the formal process and the process as implemented
4. the extent to which the process balances control and autonomy, flexibility, and commonality (p. 77).

After studying evaluation systems in four school districts, this study by Wise, et al, reached the following conclusions:

1. a teacher evaluation system must suit the educational goals, management styles, conception of teaching, and community values of the school district
2. top-level commitment to and resources for evaluation outweigh checklists and procedures
3. the school district must decide the main purpose of its teacher evaluation system and match the process to the purpose
4. teacher evaluation must be seen to have utility to sustain resource commitments and political support
5. teacher involvement and responsibility improve the quality of teacher evaluation (pp. 103-110).

Five major problems of teacher evaluation were cited by this study. They were:

1. lack of sufficient resolve and competence by principals to evaluate effectively
2. teacher resistance or apathy
3. lack of uniformity and consistency within a school system
4. inadequate training for evaluators
5. the difficulty of the principal (a generalist evaluator) assessing the competency of a specialist teacher (pp.75-76).

Peterson and Kauchak, in their 1982 article, listed three major obstacles to the development of effective evaluation practices. They are:

1. the existence of few practices and procedures which provide useful data about the assessment of teachers and teaching
2. the inability of large numbers of audiences (professionals, legislators, school administrators, the public, and teacher training institutions) involved to work together
3. preemption by administrative evaluation of the vast majority of present work in the area of teacher evaluation (pp. 17-18).

In the evaluation of teaching, it is important to use multiple data sources. One should use a variety of assessments of teacher quality and balance and weigh these factors according to the goals of the evaluator (p. 9). According to Peterson and Kauchak, some multiple data sources include:

1. credentials
2. personal characteristics
3. student outcomes (pupil achievement)
4. classroom visits
5. self-report
6. student reports
7. peer review (pp.12-18).

Credentials, the documentation of professional training, do not assist in evaluating the immediate, manifest qualities of teachers. There are three reasons for this:

1. training programs and courses may be directed toward specific abilities which are not always assessed by the measures being used

2. credentials do not systematically affect any specific behaviors across populations of teachers
3. the teaching act is individual (p. 12).

However, Peterson and Kauchak argue that prepared people do perform better in the classroom (p. 13).

Personal characteristics such as intelligence, prior experiences, friendliness, tact, style, language, humor, energy, stability, caring, grooming, dress, punctuality, and patience have great appeal as evaluative criteria. These characteristics are presumed to be easily recognizable in individuals, but using them in teacher evaluation presents problems. One is determining which characteristics are considered important and productive; and the second is to agree on how they are to be measured (pp. 13-14). There is little agreement among people in judging characteristics; however, the use of personal characteristics is a common strategy in evaluating teachers (p. 14).

Pupil achievement as an evaluation criterion has had great initial appeal to many in teacher assessment (p. 15). There are three major obstacles to the use of student achievement in teacher evaluation:

1. problems surrounding the logical connections between teacher performance and student outcome
 2. technical difficulties in the measurement of student gains
 3. the effect outcome systems have on educational programs
- (p. 15).

Teacher quality and efforts are not always directly related to student learning. Many factors beyond the control of teachers

affect pupil growth. Five major problems arise when attempting to accurately measure student learning for the purposes of teacher evaluation. They are:

1. what is to be tested is not clear
2. valid and reliable tests for summative evaluation are not widely available
3. administration of these tests is difficult and expensive
4. data pertaining to gains in achievement are needed but hard to get
5. the stability of teacher influences is low (p. 16).

The classroom visit is the most widely used method of obtaining data for evaluation. It is based on the idea that the best way to evaluate the quality of a teacher is to see that person in action (p. 19). Classroom visits do serve some important and needed administrative functions. They:

1. ensure classroom control
2. serve as a check on a number of district guidelines for teachers
3. provide opportunities for the observer to become more familiar with a teacher's work
4. check on classroom appearance for order and neatness (p. 19).

The limited scope of classroom visits presents problems in the evaluation and improvement of teacher performance. Reliability is a major problem. Because classrooms are very complicated places which change over time, many visits are required in order to get a

true picture. The observer also focuses the observation according to the situation and personal interests. Because of the inadequate recording system, the observer relies on recollections which are influenced by preexisting conceptions. The relationship between observer and teacher is important. The visit itself alters the teaching and behavior of students in the classroom (p.21).

W. James Popham, in his 1986 article, "Teacher Evaluation: Mission Impossible," states that one major obstacle to the creation of a first-rate teacher evaluation system is that the bulk of what we know about the instructional process is correctional in nature (p. 57). He lists the shortcomings of standard evaluation systems:

1. administrative ratings - principals tend to use their own teaching experience as a "yardstick" for rating other teachers
2. classroom observation - these usually distort a teacher's performance; a canned lesson is likely to occur
3. pupil test performance - many standardized norm-referenced achievement tests do not take into account differences in instructional methods or students' abilities and attitudes
4. student ratings - often students' estimates of a teacher's skill are based on the teacher's popularity or the students' interest in the subject matter
5. teacher competency tests - there is no evidence that these tests reflect the actual classroom applications of teacher's skills
6. professional portfolios - these are likely to be fashioned in

a way to gain the most points, and may become contrived extravaganzas designed to win recognition and promotions

7. teacher appraisal interviews - there is the likelihood that in these interviews, teachers will make contrived declarations in order to create a good impression
8. teachers' self-evaluations - like everyone else, teachers are markedly partisan when judging themselves (pp. 57-58).

Grossnickle and Cutter (1984) cite three assumptions about the administrator evaluation approach:

1. they have skill and experience in the instructional process
2. they can demonstrate leadership and concern for quality instruction by working with teachers during evaluation
3. decisions concerning retention or dismissal, tenure, and salary issues can be made (57).

This approach has weaknesses, however. They are:

1. too much emphasis placed on observing the class session with little or no attention given to providing advice and specific remediation
2. too little time spent on the observation process
3. visits by the "boss" viewed as threatening by teachers
4. change in teacher behavior when principal is present; they feel they must "put on a show" to please the boss
5. feeling by teachers that administrators are not unequivocally qualified or competent to perform observation/evaluation
6. little or no training by evaluators in observation techniques, and little or no preparation done by evaluators before

observing a teacher (p. 57).

Medley (1984) states that the existing methods of teacher evaluation have attempted to predict competence from preexisting teacher characteristics; to assess competence through paper-and-pencil tests; and to infer competence from teacher performance ratings and test scores of pupils.

Rationale for Appraising School Personnel

Lewis, in his book Appraising Teacher Performance, lists ten arguments in his rationale for appraising the performance of school personnel. They are:

1. to improve performance
2. to maintain systematic appraisal programs
3. to keep the teacher informed as to what is expected of him/her
4. to assess performance in relation to results expected
5. to improve personal development of teachers
6. to enable the teacher to determine for himself/herself where fault lies for lack of performance
7. to enable the teacher to enlighten the administrator on some points concerning performance
8. to enable the teacher to develop on the job
9. to provide counseling opportunities, resources, and time for the teacher's personal development
10. to enable the administrator to assist the teacher in

achieving objectives (Lewis, p. 177).

In his book Measurement-Based Evaluation of Teacher Performance, Medley emphasizes that the first step in the development of a program for measurement-based evaluation of teacher performance is the identification of a set of dimensions of teacher performance, a set of summary measures, and a set of specific items of behavior to be used as the basis for scoring performance on the dimensions identified (p. 74). To ensure that the measurement-based teacher evaluation program is effective in improving instruction, evidence is needed that the specific measures of teacher competence and the competency indicators being used are valid in a particular situation and with the specific teachers and pupils involved.

CHAPTER THREE

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NORTH CAROLINA TEACHER PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL INSTRUMENT

Since 1978, the State of North Carolina, through the combined efforts of the General Assembly, the Department of Public Instruction, universities, and professional education associations, has been involved in the development of a system for professional development and improvement (Holdzkom, p. 40). In 1979, the General Assembly enacted a statute requiring that local boards of education evaluate the performance of teachers annually using criteria established by the State Board of Education. Local boards could not ignore or countermand the criteria set by the State Board of Education, but they were free to add to the evaluation process. The Board asked the Department of Public Instruction to construct an evaluation instrument that would measure teacher competence (Holdzkom, p. 41).

Efforts were directed toward the construction of a consensus-based instrument for teacher evaluation. Educators in North Carolina recognized that research-based knowledge of teaching skill was not available to assist with the creation of evaluation systems (Stacey, Kuligowski, and Holdzkom, p. 1). So an elaborate process was begun to collect consensual views on teachers' responsibilities. Teachers, principals, and supervisors

were invited to participate. The resulting instrument was implemented in 24 school systems in 1982, and reliability studies were conducted by the Division of Research and Testing, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. Because principals tended to rate all teachers similarly on a number of dimensions, and because there were serious disagreements about the quality of performance when multiple evaluators were used, a second effort was considered to be necessary (Stacey, Kuligowski, and Holdzkom, pp. 1-2). Standards for evaluation were re-examined, and in 1983 a second study to review the literature was contracted with a group of researchers (Marvin Wyne, Gary Stuck, and Kinnard White) from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Criteria for the literature review specified that the study should meet a number of conditions including:

1. the study had to focus on one or more teaching practices that were observable
2. the teaching practice had to be alterable
3. the consequences of the practice had to be related to increased student achievement or time-on-task
4. the research study had to be empirical (p. 2).

After the literature review was completed, the results were reviewed by a panel of experts in effective teaching research and by a panel of teachers and administrators. Panel members were Don Peterson, University of South Florida; Tom Good, University of Missouri; Gaea Linehardt, University of Pittsburgh; and John Carroll, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill. Teachers and

administrators from the Chatham County and Burlington City school systems participated in the review. From this study, 28 specific teaching skills were isolated and grouped into five major teaching functions:

1. management of instructional time
2. management of student behavior
3. instructional presentation
4. instructional monitoring
5. instructional feedback.

These five functions comprised the core of the evaluation instrument. Even though they did not meet the research criteria, three functions with ten observable practices were added to reflect organizational values and norms:

1. facilitating instruction
2. interacting within the educational environment
3. noninstructional duties (Stacey, Kuligowski, and Holdzkom, p. 3.)

David Holdzkom, in his 1987 article in Educational Leadership, offered a few points of explanation about these practices and functions:

1. the practices may be manifested in different ways
2. the practices interact within and across functions
3. the functions, not the practices, are evaluated (Holdzkom, pp. 41-42).

After the performance criteria had been established, it became important to devise appraisal procedures that could be consistently

applied, and which would also permit both goals of performance evaluation to be met:

1. evaluation should lead to ongoing opportunities for performance feedback and professional development
2. evaluation should lead to summative judgments based on data collected during the year (Stacey, Kuligowski, and Holdzkom, p. 3).

The decision was made not to rate the teacher's performance after each observation. Evaluators would observe and code teachers' behaviors during classroom visits. The evaluation system came to be characterized by:

1. multiple classroom observations
2. observations that focused on a variety of teaching behaviors of high and low inference
3. documentation that would result in a set of narrative formative evaluation reports and a year-end quantified, summative evaluation report (Stacey, Kuligowski, and Holdzkom, p. 3).

Under the North Carolina Teacher Performance Appraisal System, this set of carefully sequenced activities leads up to performance evaluation. The principal usually fills the observer role; however, in some school systems, full-time observers are employed periodically. Both the principal and an observer/evaluator observe the teacher over the course of the year. The principal observes each teacher in class on at least three separate occasions. One observation is announced in advance, and is preceded by a conference in which the

teacher and observer discuss the general characteristics of the students, special needs of individuals, and the specific lesson that will be observed. The teacher gives a copy of the lesson plan to the observer, and the observer reviews the observation instrument with the teacher (Holdzkom, p. 43).

During the actual classroom visit, the observer is present throughout the entire class or teaching period. The observer, seated in an unobtrusive place in the room, notes specific examples of the practices as demonstrated by the teacher. Following the visit, the observer prepares a narrative report which provides the basis for a post observation conference. During this conference, the observer clarifies any questions and provides feedback to the teacher based on the information collected during the observation (Holdzkom, p. 43).

During the school year, three observations are conducted. One observation visit is announced, one is unannounced, and the other may or may not be announced. A post observation conference is always held. Near the end of the school year, the principal reviews the data from each of the observations, and assigns a numerical rating on a scale of 1-6 to each of the eight function areas. This rating is then shared with the teacher. The teacher and principal, using as a basis the data collected over the year, collaboratively set goals and strategies that will lead to professional development. This Professional Development Plan is a record of the action plan for improvement or enhancement of teaching skills (Holdzkom, p. 43).

The implementation of this system depended upon competent, well-trained observers. In order to establish a basic understanding of the performance appraisal criteria, a 30-hour in-service training course on Effective Teaching was delivered to all persons who would participate in the system, either as evaluators or evaluatees. A 24-hour course in the techniques of observation and evaluation was provided to evaluators, along with a six-hour course in the development of professional growth plans. And, in February 1987, a ten-hour booster training program was delivered to evaluators (Stacey, Kuligowski, and Holdzkom, pp. 3-4).

During November and December 1985, there were 25 training sessions held on the Teacher Performance Appraisal System at which representatives of every local educational agency in the state were given opportunities to participate. Two additional training sessions were conducted by the State Department of Public Instruction in January 1986 to ensure that local educational agencies participating in the pilot program had sufficient opportunities to receive training for administrators and teachers. The State Department of Public Instruction suggested that the training was especially appropriate for principals and observer/evaluators. Because the Department of Public Instruction staff was not able to provide training in the use of the new observation/evaluation system, a turnkey training model was adopted. Participants trained by the Department of Public Instruction were expected to provide, through local workshops, training to their colleagues who did not receive training directly

from the staff of the Department of Public Instruction (Teacher Performance Appraisal System Training: A Report of Outcomes, pp. 1-2).

This instrument was pilot-tested during the 1985-86 and 1986-87 school years by 24 school systems, and as of July 1, 1987, all school systems in North Carolina were required to evaluate teachers with this instrument (See Appendix C).

CHAPTER FOUR

PROCEDURES

Introduction

This study focused on North Carolina K-5 public school principals' perceptions of the TPAI, with particular emphasis on whether it was viewed as being a reliable method for discriminating between teachers "at or above standard" and those "below standard". Answers were sought to the following questions:

1. are North Carolina K-5 principals satisfied that the TPAI enables them to identify those teachers who are "at or above standard" and those "below standard"?
2. does the TPAI provide the data needed to set up individual improvement programs for teachers identified as "below standard"?
3. do principals use the TPAI as they were trained to use it? If not, in what ways do they use it differently and why?
4. are modifications of the TPAI needed? If so, what modifications do the principals recommend?

Surveys were mailed to 316 selected K-5 public school principals in North Carolina. Of those 316, 173 (54.7%) responded. The responses were summarized to ascertain if sex, race, or the educational region of principals made a difference in the

representativeness of the sample. Responses to each observable practice were summarized by the degree to which principals felt the item provided information to differentiate between "at or above standard" and "below standard", and the degree of importance of each item in evaluating the teacher as being "at or above standard" or "below standard". Included in this chapter are the research methodology, a description of the survey instrument, and a description of the population responding to the survey.

Research Methodology

In this study, North Carolina K-5 public school principals were surveyed to determine their perceptions of the TPAI, with particular emphasis on whether it is viewed as a reliable method for discriminating between teachers "at or above standard" and those "below standard". One-fourth of the K-5 principals in North Carolina were systematically selected to receive the survey instrument. Every fourth name on the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction's list of K-5 schools was selected, and a total of 316 principals from the systematically selected schools received the survey instrument. The first mailout of the survey instrument was completed on December 5, 1988. A cover letter to principals explaining the purpose of the survey was attached. Principals who wished to receive a copy of the completed summary were asked to include with the response their names and addresses. Surveys were coded with a number to keep a record of the individuals responding.

On January 16, 1989, a reminder and a second survey were mailed to those selected principals who had not responded to the initial survey. With the second mailing, a total of 173 responses were received, a response rate of 54.7%. The data were analyzed to determine if principals perceived the TPAI as being effective in discriminating between teachers who are "at or above standard" and those "below standard". Responses to open-ended questions were tabulated to determine if principals were using the TPAI as they had been trained to use it, and reasons for deviation in their use of it. Principals were also asked if they would recommend changes or modifications in the TPAI, and those responses were tabulated and summarized. The second question under consideration in this study: "does the TPAI provide the data needed to set up individual improvement programs for teachers identified as "below standard"?" posed a problem. When all the data were put together and examined, all concerned believed that the answer to this question could be extracted from the responses on the surveys. This did not occur; however, the question can be answered in two ways: (1) analyses of the instrument itself, and (2) the extent to which the instrument provides data in the sense that it isolates the problem by diagnosis but does not provide descriptive data. Data were analyzed according to sex, race, and educational region of principals to determine if any of these variables made a difference in the representativeness of the sample. To determine if the relationships were significant, a chi square test of association was used to compare the frequencies.

Description of the Survey Instrument

The survey instrument was developed from the actual Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument used for teacher evaluation in North Carolina. Clinton L. Brown, Assistant Director of the Science Division of the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction; Robert R. Jones, Director of the Mathematics Division of the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction; and Cleo M. Meek, Assistant Director of the Mathematics Division of the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, assisted in the development of the format and demographic questions.

Six items were used to determine personal information regarding the principals:

1. age
2. years of experience as principal or assistant principal
3. years of experience as teacher
4. highest educational degree obtained
5. race
6. sex

Six additional items elicited responses about the school:

1. educational region
2. school's enrollment as of 10-1-88
3. the number of K-5 teachers in the school who are evaluated based on the TPAI
4. was the school a TPAI pilot unit
5. did the school have an assistant principal

6. was the school rural or urban

Lamm conducted an independent study in 1987 which provided guidance in the development of seven open-ended questions (1987):

1. who performs evaluations in the school
2. who do you feel should perform the evaluations
3. what percentage of time is spent in the evaluation process
4. does the TPAI enable you to differentiate between teachers who are "at or above standard" or "below standard"
5. what is the number of teachers you feel can be effectively evaluated using the TPAI
6. who provided the training in the techniques of observation and evaluation
7. do you deviate from the training

A final question elicited responses for recommendations in regard to changing either the TPAI or the evaluation procedures.

Each of the 38 observable TPAI practices was listed, with four possible responses indicating the degree to which the respondents felt the item was important. The possible responses were: Substantial, Some, Limited, None. Survey participants first read to determine the degree to which the item provided information to differentiate between teacher performance "at or above standard" and "below standard", and second to determine the degree of importance of the item in evaluating teacher performance as being "at or above standard" or "below standard".

After the survey was in draft form, three principals were asked to review it and make comments/recommendations for changing it.

The survey was then finalized and mailed to selected North Carolina K-5 principals.

Description of the Sample

316 selected principals of K-5 public schools in North Carolina were asked to participate in the study. (Where available, state level demographic data were compared to determine the extent to which the sample was representative of the state.) Of the various demographic data obtained in this study, data on principal's race, sex, and educational region were available from state records. The chi square test of association was calculated on these three variables to determine if the sample differed significantly in this regard from the population. Of the 173 principals who responded, 71.7% (124) were males and 28.3% (49) were females. Statistics listed in the Statistical Profile of the North Carolina Public Schools, published by the North Carolina Board of Education in 1988, did not provide a breakdown of principals by grade level or grade spans. However, for comparison purposes, of the 1941 listed North Carolina public school principals, 78.5% were males and 21.5% were females. Table 1 indicates that the sample tended to have more females in it than the state population of principals. There was a correspondingly smaller percentage of males in the sample than in the state population of principals. However, the distinction between statistical significance and practical significance is relevant here. The differences of less than 7 percentage points in the males

Table 1:

**COMPARISON OF ALL NORTH CAROLINA PRINCIPALS AND
K-5 NORTH CAROLINA PRINCIPALS BY SEX**

	STATE		SAMPLE		TOTALS
MALE	78.5%	1523	71.7%	124	1647
FEMALE	21.5%	418	28.3%	49	467
		1941		173	2114

$\chi^2(\text{corrected for continuity}) = 4.325, df=1, p < .05$

(or females) in the sample is unlikely to distort seriously the responses to the survey in the populations.

Of the respondents, 149 or 86.1% were white and 24 or 13.9% were black. Information provided by the Statistical Profile of North Carolina Public Schools in 1988 notes that 78.6% of the principals were white, 20.2% were black, and 1.2% were listed as "other". Table 2 shows the comparison between the state statistics and the sample. While the chi square is significant, it is doubtful that these small differences affect the representativeness of the results. The reader should note that the available state statistics reflect the total number of principals in the state (1941), while this study represents K-5 principals. Statistics on the number of K-5 principals in the state are not available.

The ages of the principals ranged from 32 to 66, with the mean age being 46.9. Age spans were grouped as 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, and over 60. Table 3 summarizes the information to show that 22.0% percent of the respondents were in the 31-40 age span, 43.9% were in the 41-50 age span, 27.7% were in the 51-60 age span, and 3.5% were over 60. 2.9% of the sample did not respond to this question. Information on principals' ages is not collected by the state, so there is no basis for comparison.

Table 4 summarizes information on the respondents' years of experience as principal. The years of experience as principal ranged from 1 to 34 years, with the mean years of experience being 13.8. 17.9% of the respondents were in the 1-5 years experience range, while 20.8% reported 6-10 years experience, 19.1%

Table 2:

**COMPARISON OF ALL NORTH CAROLINA PRINCIPALS AND
K-5 NORTH CAROLINA PRINCIPALS BY RACE**

	STATE		SAMPLE		TOTALS
WHITE	78.6%	1525	86.1%	149	1674
BLACK	20.2%	392	13.9%	24	416
OTHER	1.2%	24	0%	0	24
	100%	1941	100%	173	2114

$\chi^2 = 6.513, df = 2, p < .05$

Table 3:

**AGE SPAN OF RESPONDENT
NORTH CAROLINA K-5 PRINCIPALS**

31-40	41-50	51-60	Over 60	NO RESPONSE
22.0%	43.9%	27.7%	3.5%	2.9%

$\bar{x}=46.93$, $s=7.50$

Table 4:

**YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF NORTH CAROLINA K-5
PRINCIPALS AS PRINCIPAL**

1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	OVER 20	NO RESPONSE
17.9%	20.8%	19.1%	20.2%	18.5%	3.5%

$\bar{x}=14.19, s=11.48$

reported 11-15 years experience, 20.2% reported 16-20 years experience, and 18.5% reported over 20 years experience. 3.5% of the sample did not respond to this question.

The range of experience as a teacher for the respondents was not as evenly distributed. The range was from 1 to 28 years of teaching experience, with a mean of 9.2 years teaching experience. Table 5 indicates that 27.7% reported 1-5 years teaching experience, 39.9% reported 6-10 years teaching experience, 13.9% reported 11-15 years teaching experience, 10.4% reported 16-20 years teaching experience, and 5.2% reported over 20 years teaching experience. 2.9% of the sample did not respond to this question.

As shown in Table 6, 15 (8.7%) of the respondents hold doctoral degrees, 74 (48.5%) hold sixth year degrees, and 84 (42.8%) had obtained the master's degree. In North Carolina, principals are required to hold at least a master's degree. Information is collected by the state on the highest degree held by certified personnel, but is not broken down into categories for principals, assistant principals, or teachers.

There are eight educational regions in North Carolina. In Region 1, surveys were mailed to 18 (24.7%) of the K-5 principals with a response rate of 44.4% (8). Surveys were mailed to 36 (25%) of the K-5 principals in Region 2, with a response rate of 47.2% (17); while in Region 3, 46 (24.9%) of the K-5 principals were mailed surveys and 63% (29) responded. In Region 4, 41 (24.9%) received surveys and 14.5% (25) responded, while surveys were mailed to 53 (25.2%) of K-5 principals in Region 5 with responses from 58.2%

Table 5:

**YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF NORTH CAROLINA K-5
PRINCIPALS AS TEACHER**

1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	OVER 20	NO RESPONSE
27.7%	39.9%	13.9%	10.4%	5.2%	2.9%

$\bar{x}=9.19, s=5.57$

Table 6:**HIGHEST DEGREE HELD BY
NORTH CAROLINA K-5 PRINCIPALS**

MASTERS	SIXTH YEAR	DOCTORATE
42.8%	48.5%	8.7%

(28). In Region 6, 51 (23.5%) were mailed surveys and 49% (25) responded. In Region 7, surveys were mailed to 38 (26.8%) principals with responses from 60.5% (23), while in Region 8, 33 (25.2%) principals were surveyed and 54.5% (18) responded. As shown in Table 7, a chi square test of association was calculated to determine if responses by region were significant. At the .05 level, differences in the responses by educational region were not significant.

Summary

For this study, a sample of 316 K-5 public school principals across North Carolina was surveyed to determine their perceptions of the TPAI, with particular emphasis on whether it was viewed as being a reliable method for discriminating between teachers "at or above standard" and those "below standard".

The survey instrument was developed with the assistance of a team of consultants from the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction and was reviewed by three principals. Demographic information was elicited on the individuals and the schools. The actual TPAI evaluation used by the state of North Carolina was a part of the survey. Open-ended questions provided principals with the opportunity to add comments, and the final question on the survey instrument provided principals with the opportunity to make recommendations for modifying either the TPAI itself or the evaluation procedures.

Table 7:

**RESPONSES OF NORTH CAROLINA K-5 PRINCIPALS
BY EDUCATIONAL REGION**

REGION	TOTAL NUMBER OF PRINCIPALS	TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES
1	73	8
2	144	17
3	185	29
4	165	25
5	210	28
6	217	25
7	142	23
8	131	18
TOTALS	1267	173

$\chi^2=2.627$, $df=7$, NS

The data were analyzed according to sex, race, and educational region of principals to determine if the sample was representative of the population of principals in the state.

CHAPTER FIVE

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine North Carolina K-5 public school principals' perceptions of the TPAI, with particular emphasis on whether it was viewed as a reliable method for discriminating between teachers "at or above standard" and those "below standard". Answers were sought to the following questions:

1. are North Carolina K-5 principals satisfied that the TPAI enables them to identify those teachers who are "at or above standard" and those "below standard"?
2. does the TPAI provide the data needed to set up individual improvement programs for teachers identified as "below standard"?
3. do principals use the TPAI as they were trained to use it? If not, in what ways do they use it differently and why?
4. are modifications of the TPAI needed? If so, what modifications do the principals recommend?

Data were collected from a survey of 316 North Carolina K-5 public school principals. The first page of the survey elicited information on principal and school demographics, the results of which were discussed in Chapter Four. The first page also included seven open-ended questions pertaining to principals' use of the TPAI.

Next on the survey came a listing of the 38 observable practices of the TPAI.

Principals were asked to read and rate the 38 observable practices on the survey twice; once to indicate the degree to which a specific item allowed them to differentiate between a teacher "at or above standard" or "below standard", and once to indicate the degree of importance of the item in evaluating teachers "at or above standard" or "below standard".

Responses to Four Major Study Questions

The survey findings which follow are grouped under each of the four main study questions. (Responses to the open-ended questions are also included here.)

QUESTION 1: are North Carolina K-5 principals satisfied that the TPAI enables them to identify those teachers who are "at or above standard" and those "below standard"?

Principals overwhelmingly were positive in their ratings, indicating that they perceive the TPAI as allowing them to differentiate between good and bad teaching practices, and they also perceived the items as being important in evaluating teachers.

On pages two and three of the survey (see Appendix A), the 38 observable practices contained in the actual TPAI were listed. Principals were directed to read the observable practices and indicate their responses on the left side, which indicated the degree to which the items provided information to differentiate between

"at or above standard" and "below standard". They were then to read each observable practice again and indicate their responses on the right side, which indicated the degree of importance of the item in evaluating a teacher as being "at or above standard" or below standard".

For purposes of analysis, the items were grouped under the eight major TPAI functions. It was felt that more reliable information could be obtained if grouped since the eight major functions represent related sets of behavior. The eight functions were: Management of Instructional Time, which included items 1.1 through 1.4; Management of Student Behavior, which included items 2.1 through 2.5; Instructional Presentation, which included items 3.1 through 3.11; Instructional Monitoring of Student Performance, which included items 4.1 through 4.4; Instructional Feedback, which included items 5.1 through 5.4; Facilitating Instruction, which included items 6.1 through 6.5; Communicating Within the Educational Environment, which included items 7.1 through 7.2; and Performing Non-Instructional Duties, which included items 8.1 through 8.3.

On the left side of the survey, the respondents were asked to rate the degree to which the item provided information to differentiate between "at or above standard" and "below standard" by marking either of four boxes: None, Limited, Some, Substantial. On the right side of the survey, the respondents were asked to rate the degree of importance of each item in evaluating the teacher as being "at or above standard" or "below standard" by marking either of the

four boxes: None, Limited, Some, Substantial. The ratings were assigned number values as follows: None - 1, Limited - 2, Some - 3, and Substantial - 4.

Table 8 displays the overall means and standard deviations for the eight major functions of the TPAI in regard to both the degree of differentiation and the degree of importance. All the items were rated high, between 3 and 4. Note that the importance ratings range from 3.28 to 3.55. While the difference between 3.55 and 3.28 under the Importance column is not large enough to be significant, it does show that management of instructional time is very important. Principals indicated by their responses that they perceived the TPAI as providing information which allowed them to differentiate between "at or above standard" and "below standard", and they perceived the items on the TPAI as important in evaluation. The items were perceived as being both important and relevant to good teaching behavior, and the instrument allowed for the differentiation between good and bad teaching practices.

Table 9 shows a 2 x 2 contingency table to help illustrate this. This theoretical model uses an arbitrary dichotomy of items rating None or Limited as low and Some or Substantial as high. Items in quadrant 1 could be eliminated from the questionnaire because they would be both low in importance and low in the ability to differentiate. Items in quadrant 2 are clearly bad items, not important but allowing for differentiation between "at or above standard" and "below standard". Items in quadrant 4 are of questionable value, high in importance but not allowing for

Table 8:

**OVERALL MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR EIGHT MAJOR FUNCTION
AREAS OF THE TPAI AS SEEN BY NORTH CAROLINA K-5 PRINCIPALS**

	Differentiation		Importance	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Items 1.1-1.4 (Management of Instructional Time)	3.70	0.57	3.55	0.69
Items 2.1-2.5 (Management of Student Behavior)	3.67	0.56	3.53	0.67
Items 3.1-3.11 (Instructional Presentation)	3.58	0.62	3.45	0.70
Items 4.1-4.4 (Instructional Monitoring of Student Performance)	3.55	0.63	3.41	0.73
Items 5.1-5.4 (Instructional Feedback)	3.60	0.61	3.41	0.73
Items 6.1-6.5 (Facilitating Instruction)	3.54	0.65	3.31	0.80
Items 7.1-7.2 Communicating Within The Educational Environment)	3.71	0.55	3.42	0.80
Items 8.1-8.3 Performing Non-Instructional Duties)	3.53	0.65	3.28	0.57

Table 9:

2 X 2 CONTINGENCY TABLE ILLUSTRATING RATINGS OF TPAI BY
NORTH CAROLINA K-5 PRINCIPALS
I m p o r t a n c e

		H	L
H		3	2
L		4	1

D
i
f
f
e
r
e
n
t
i
a
t
i
o
n

differentiation between "at or above standard" and "below standard". Using this criteria, all 38 items would fall in quadrant 3. That is, these high quality items were seen as both important and useful in allowing for differentiation between good and poor teaching behaviors.

The mean of the importance ratings across all the items was 3.60, with a range from 3.34 to 3.83, and the mean of the differentiation ratings across all items was 3.43, with a range from 3.13 to 3.69. In all cases, the items were rated as both important and allowing for differentiation.

There is a decided tendency for the two sets of rankings to be positively correlated. The correlations ranged from a low of 0.41 to a high of 0.69, with a mean correlation of 0.58, after Fisher's transformations.

When the TPAI survey data were analyzed by responses according to race, it was found that in every major function area black principals rated the TPAI higher ($p < .001$) than white principals. Although the pairwise difference is small, there appears to be a small but pervasive difference in perception by race as to the "importance" and "ability to differentiate" of the items on the TPAI.

When the TPAI survey data were analyzed according to responses by sex, in seven of the eight major function areas for importance, females rated the instrument higher ($p < .05$) than males. In five of the eight major function areas for differentiation, females rated the instrument higher than males. There were no significant differences in females' ratings in the ability to differentiate. Overall, there

seems to be a significant tendency for black and female principals to rate the TPAI higher than white male principals. Tables 10 and 11 illustrate this fact.

In response to the open-ended question on the survey - "Who performs evaluations in your school?" - Table 12 illustrates the frequencies and percentages of the responses as to whether evaluations are performed by the principal, assistant principal, teacher evaluator, or other. Responses indicate that all the principals perform evaluations; 38% indicated that an assistant principal assisted in the evaluation; 10% reported that teacher evaluators assisted with the evaluation; 8% indicated that "other" persons assisted with the evaluation.

"Others" were identified as elementary school coordinators, outside and/or inside evaluators, central office staff, assistant superintendent, directors, career development support teams for career development personnel, and supervisors.

In answer to the open-ended question on the survey - "If different from the above, who do you feel should perform the evaluations?" - the responses indicated that there was some confusion. In the earlier question, all 173 principals responding indicated that they performed evaluations. Of the 18 principals who responded to this particular question, 13 indicated that the principal or assistant principal should be the person to perform the evaluations; three indicated that outside evaluators should perform the evaluations; nine indicated that teachers should perform the evaluations; and two indicated that supervisors or

Table 10:**RESPONSES OF NORTH CAROLINA K-5 PRINCIPALS BY RACE**

	Importance				Differentiation			
	Mean		Standard Deviation		Mean		Standard Deviation	
	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White
Items 1.1-1.4 (Management of Instructional Time)	3.82	3.51	0.48	0.71	3.83	3.67	0.45	0.58
Items 2.1-2.5 (Management of Student Behavior)	3.67	3.51	0.54	0.69	3.74	3.66	0.53	0.56
Items 3.1-3.11 (Instructional Presentation)	3.65	3.42	0.55	0.72	3.69	3.56	0.57	0.62
Items 4.1-4.4 Instructional Monitoring of Student Performance)	3.55	3.39	0.56	0.75	3.64	3.54	0.58	0.64
Items 5.1-5.4 (Instructional Feedback)	3.64	3.38	0.62	0.75	3.69	3.59	0.57	0.61
Items 6.1-6.5 (Facilitating Instruction)	3.60	3.26	0.59	0.82	3.70	3.52	0.52	0.67
Items 7.1-7.2 (Communicating Within the Educational Environment)	3.70	3.38	0.59	0.82	3.78	3.70	0.47	0.56
Items 8.1-8.3 (Performing Non-Instructional Duties)	3.49	3.25	0.66	0.84	3.61	3.51	0.58	0.66

Table 11:**RESPONSES OF NORTH CAROLINA K-5 PRINCIPALS BY SEX**

	Importance				Differentiation			
	Mean		Standard Deviation		Mean		Standard Deviation	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Items 1.1-1.4 (Management of Instructional Time)	3.57	3.49	0.67	0.76	3.68	3.73	0.58	0.54
Items 2.1-2.5 (Management of Student Behavior)	3.50	3.61	0.67	0.67	3.66	3.72	0.57	0.53
Items 3.1-3.11 (Instructional Presentation)	3.40	3.57	0.72	0.63	3.57	3.63	0.63	0.57
Items 4.1-4.4 Instructional Monitoring of Student Performance)	3.41	3.43	0.73	0.72	3.56	3.52	0.62	0.68
Items 5.1-5.4 (Instructional Feedback)	3.39	3.46	0.73	0.75	3.61	3.58	0.59	0.64
Items 6.1-6.5 (Facilitating Instruction)	3.22	3.53	0.83	0.69	3.51	3.64	0.66	0.63
Items 7.1-7.2 (Communicating Within the Educational Environment)	3.34	3.62	0.85	0.59	3.72	3.70	0.55	0.55
Items 8.1-8.3 (Performing Non-Instructional Duties)	3.21	3.48	0.84	0.71	3.50	3.59	0.67	0.59

Table 12:

**PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR TPAI EVALUATIONS
AS REPORTED BY NORTH CAROLINA K-5 PRINCIPALS**

Principal		Assistant Principal		Teacher Evaluator		Other	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
173	100	66	38	17	10	14	8

other county evaluators should perform the evaluations.

When answering the open-ended question - "What percentage of your time is spent in the evaluation process (include pre-conference, observation, summarization of notes, post conference)?" - principals reported a range from 5% to 90%, with the mean time being 31.22% and the standard deviation for the sample being 17.64. Of the 173 surveys returned, 160 or 92.5% answered this question.

In answer to the open-ended question - "Overall, does the TPAI enable you to differentiate between teachers who are "at or above standard" or "below standard" - if no, why not?" - principals were overwhelmingly positive, with 79.8% saying "yes". Those responding "no" provided a variety of reasons why they do not consider the TPAI as enabling them to differentiate between "at or above standard" and "below standard". Appendix D contains the explicit reasons, given by those responding "no". Some principals responded that they had difficulty with the distinction between "at or above standard" and "below standard".

In answer to the open-ended question - "If you are the only person responsible for evaluation in your school, please state the specific number of teachers you feel you can effectively evaluate using the TPAI." - 76 principals responded. In Table 12, 173 principals responded that they were responsible for evaluation with 97 having additional persons assisting. That left 76 who were totally responsible for evaluation. Of the responses offered by those 76, the range was from 5 to 35, with the mean being 16.86 and the standard deviation being 6.64. The investigator had hoped to elicit information from all the respondents, but because of the wording in

the question, only those who were solely responsible for evaluation responded.

QUESTION 2: does the TPAI provide the data needed to set up individual improvement programs for teachers identified as "below standard"?

At the time the survey was being developed, it was reviewed by consultants from the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, by three principals, by the Dissertation Committee, and by the investigator. All concerned failed to detect that this question was omitted from the questionnaire. Nevertheless, some information on this topic would be gleaned from close inspection of the instrument itself and an analysis of the open-ended responses of the responding principals.

Tables 10 and 11, discussed earlier, provide evidence that the instrument is viewed as reliable in allowing principals to differentiate between good and bad teaching practices. Moreover, the TPAI is diagnostic in the sense that it allows principals to isolate problem areas related to specific classroom behaviors (e. g., management of instructional time, management of student behavior, instructional presentation). The instrument, however, is not prescriptive in that it does not provide information to principals on what can be done to remedy any teacher deficiencies that may be uncovered.

QUESTION 3: do principals use the TPAI as they were trained to use it - if not, in what ways do they use it differently and why?

Several open-ended questions on the survey elicited responses in answer to this question. Table 13 provides a breakdown of responses to the open-ended question - "Who provided the training for the twenty-four hour course in the techniques of observation and evaluation?" Personnel from the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, whether Raleigh-based or regional center based, provided the training to 75, or 43.4%, of the respondents. The majority of the respondents, 93 or 53.8%, received training from central office personnel. The remaining 2.8% (5 respondents) received their training from community colleges, a university, a staff development center, and a management training center.

The next open-ended question asked - "Do you deviate from the training - if so, how and why?" In response to this question, 18.5% of the respondents reported that they deviated from the training. Each of the 32 respondents made comments as to how or why he/she deviated. All of the comments, which are varied, are found verbatim in Appendix E. Some of the deviations included omitting the preconferences, incorporating more than one method to obtain data, making more than three visits per year, and script taping the observation.

QUESTION 4: are modifications of the TPAI needed? - if so, what modifications do principals recommend?

The survey did not require a "yes or no" answer to this question. However, the last item on the survey asked - "What recommendations would you make in regard to changing either the TPAI or the evaluation procedures?" The recommendations are

Table 13:

**PROVIDERS OF TRAINING
IN THE USE OF THE NORTH CAROLINA TPAI**

SDPI		LEA		OTHER	
N	%	N	%	N	%
75	43.4	93	53.8	5	2.8

listed verbatim in Appendix F. Many of the recommendations centered around the observation that the process is time consuming, that more assistance is needed in evaluation (hiring assistant principals to assist), that the rating scale needs to be more narrow in selections, and that the number of observations for tenured teachers needs to be decreased.

Major Study Findings

The major findings of this study based upon the analysis of data, were:

1. principals perceived the TPAI as providing information which allowed them to differentiate between "at or above standard" and "below standard" teachers.
2. principals indicated by their responses that they perceived the TPAI items as being important and relevant to good teacher behavior.
3. in every major function area of the TPAI, black principals tended to rate the instrument higher than white principals, in both the abilities to differentiate and importance.
4. in seven of the eight major function areas under the importance column, female principals rated the instrument higher than their male counterparts, while in five of the eight major function areas for differentiation, female principals rated the instrument higher than male principals.
5. principals, in the majority, are using the TPAI as they were

trained to use it. Only 18.5% of the respondents reported that they deviated from the training.

6. ninety-seven of the respondents made comments or recommendations for change.

Of the respondents, many did not recommend changes but rather commented positively or stated "none" in responses to the question. Many of the respondents recommended more than one change. The recommended changes varied, with several recommending more than one change. There were 12 recommendations for more staff to assist in evaluation, 14 recommendations for narrowing the rating scale, 4 recommendations for the addition of knowledge of content/subject matter, and 23 recommendations for fewer required evaluations. Ten respondents commented that the instrument and process were too time consuming, while seven commented that the instrument was too lengthy and recommended either that some functions be condensed or the form changed. Twenty of the recommendations did not fit under any of these groupings; they made be found in the Recommendations for Change in Appendix F. Two respondents commented that the instrument was poor and needed to be trashed.

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Summary

Teacher evaluation became a national focus in 1983 when A Nation at Risk and Action for Excellence were published. Both made recommendations concerning the evaluation of teachers.

In 1984 the North Carolina Commission on Education recommended that the State Board of Education develop some kind of performance appraisal instrument for teachers.

Most researchers in the area of staff development agree that the principal is the person responsible for teacher evaluation. Principals, when surveyed, have responded that their most important responsibility is instructional leadership. On the other hand, many of the people who have done research on teacher evaluation have indicated that classroom observation as a means of evaluation has not been a priority for many principals.

In 1979, the North Carolina General Assembly directed the State Board of Education to establish criteria for a performance-based evaluation instrument. The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction developed drafts of the instrument and pilot tested such an instrument. The end result was the

Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument (TPAI). The first step in the use of the TPAI was to require that all teachers and school administrators receive a 30-hour training course in Effective Teacher Training. In addition, persons (more often than not, principals and assistant principals) who would perform the actual evaluation received a 24-hour course in techniques of observation and evaluation. Since July 1, 1987, every teacher in North Carolina has been annually evaluated through the use of the TPAI.

This study focused on the North Carolina K-5 public school principals' perceptions of the TPAI, with particular emphasis on whether it is viewed as being a reliable method for discriminating between teachers "at or above standard" and those "below standard". Through a survey of selected North Carolina K-5 public school principals, answers were sought to the following questions:

1. are North Carolina K-5 principals satisfied that the TPAI enables them to identify those teachers who are "at or above standard" and those "below standard"?
2. does the TPAI provide the data needed to set up individual improvement programs for teachers identified as "below standard"?
3. do principals use the TPAI as they were trained to use it? If not, in what ways do they use it differently and why?
4. are modifications of the TPAI needed? If so, what modifications do the principals recommend?

This study, using a selected sampling, surveyed the 1267 K-5 public school principals in North Carolina to investigate their

perceptions of the TPAI. The selected sample consisted of one-fourth of the 1267 K-5 principals. Every fourth name on the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction's list of K-5 school principals was selected. The 316 principals surveyed responded during December, 1988 and January, 1989.

A three-part literature review was done by the investigator. The first part dealt with the principal's role and responsibility in teacher evaluation; the second with the characteristics of effective evaluation systems and some of the shortcomings of such systems; and the third with the rationale for the appraisal of school performance and the steps necessary in developing a program for measuring teacher performance.

In regard to the principal's role in teacher evaluation, the literature survey showed the following:

1. the principal bears the primary responsibility for teacher evaluation
2. the principal needs to possess certain abilities and knowledge if evaluation responsibilities are to be performed correctly
3. the principal needs intensive training in observation and evaluation skills
4. the principal must become an instructional leader who understands classroom behavior
5. the principal must be knowledgeable regarding supervisory techniques
6. the effective principal possesses some general

characteristics which are acknowledged to be vital to the success of the evaluation process

7. the principal needs to rely on evaluation feedback from more than one source
8. the principal must be able to persuade teachers to alter their actions by convincing them of the need for change.

The following points were brought out regarding effective evaluation systems:

1. evaluation systems are linked to research on effective practices
2. training is provided for evaluators
3. administrators are held accountable for conducting evaluation
4. teachers are made active partners in the process.

The major form of data collection in evaluation is classroom observation. Training is essential in order for this to be of value.

In regard to shortcomings with teacher evaluation, Peterson and Kauchak cited several problems. Among them were:

1. the lack of sufficient resolve and competence by principals to evaluate effectively
2. teacher resistance or apathy
3. lack of uniformity and consistency within a school system
4. inadequate training for evaluators.

In regard to the rationale for appraising school personnel, Lewis provides reasons for appraisal. Among them are:

1. improvement of performance

2. assessment of performance in relation to results expected
3. provision of opportunities for teacher's personal as well as professional development
4. provision of methods for administrator to use in assisting the teacher in achieving objectives.

Readers interested in a more extensive review of the development of the TPAI than is found in the summary are referred to Chapter Three. The full TPAI is found in Appendix C.

Chapter Four contained descriptions of the survey instrument and the sample. The survey instrument is found in Appendix A.

As indicated previously, 316 selected North Carolina K-5 public school principals were asked to participate in the study. 173 principals (54.7%) responded, of whom 124 were males and 49 were females. The male/female breakdown showed slightly more female K-5 principals in it than the percentage of total female principals in the state. However, this was not considered to affect the validity of the study.

Of the 173 respondents, 86.1% (149) were white and 13.9% (24) were black. Statewide 78.6% were white and 20.2% were black. It is doubtful that these small differences affected the representativeness of the sample.

Continuing the demographics, 22% of the responding principals fell in the 31-40 range, 43.9% were in the age 41-50 range, 27.7% were in the 51-60 range, and 3.5% were in the over 60 age range.

Data were summarized on the respondents' years of experience as principal. 17.9% of the principals fell in the 1-5 years experience

range, 20.8% fell in the 6-10 years experience range, 19.1% fell in the 11-15 years experience range, 20.2% fell in the 16-20 years experience range, and 18.5% fell in the over 20 years experience range.

Respondents were asked to report on years of experience as a teacher. 27.7% fell in the 1-5 years experience range, 39.9% fell in the 6-10 years experience range, 13.9% fell in the 11-15 years experience range, 10.4% fell in the 16-20 years experience range, and 5.2% fell in the over 20 years experience range.

8.7% of the responding principals hold doctoral degrees, 48.5% hold the sixth year degree, and 42.8% hold the master's degree.

The response rate for each educational region was: 44.4% for Region 1, 47.2% in Region 2, 63% in Region 3, 61% in Region 4, 52.8% in Region 5, 49% in Region 6, 60.5% in Region 7, and 54.5% in Region 8.

Chapter Five contained the major study findings. They were:

1. principals indicated by their responses that they perceived the TPAI as providing information which allowed them to differentiate between teachers "at or above standard" and those "below standard"
2. principals indicated by their responses that they perceived the items as being important and relevant to good teacher behavior
3. in every major function area of the TPAI, black principals rated the instrument higher than white principals, in both the ability to differentiate and importance

4. in seven of the eight major function areas under the importance column, female principals rated the instrument higher than their male counterparts while in five of the eight major function areas for differentiation, female principals rated the instrument higher than male principals
5. the majority of principals are using the TPAI as they were trained to use it
6. ninety-seven of the respondents made comments or recommendations for change. These recommendations included more assistance with evaluation, narrowing the rating scale, and fewer observations/evaluations for tenured teachers. These recommendations can be found verbatim in Appendix F.

The remainder of this chapter reports the conclusions and recommendations for further study.

Conclusions

Analysis of the findings of the study led to the following conclusions:

1. the TPAI is performing as hoped since principals were overwhelmingly positive in their perception that it allowed them to differentiate between good and bad teaching practices
2. while the TPAI effectively differentiates between teachers "at or above standard" and those "below standard", it does

not prescribe an individual plan of improvement for those teachers identified as "below standard"

3. while most principals are using the TPAI as they had been trained, it can be concluded from survey comments that minor changes are needed to refine the instrument, and these principals did not hesitate to make comments (See Appendices E and F for principals' comments and recommendations.)
4. despite principals' comments that the TPAI is too time consuming, it can be concluded from their responses that, overall, they are satisfied with the TPAI.

Recommendations for Further Study

After collecting and analyzing the data from this study, there are four main recommendations to be made for further study. They are:

1. since all North Carolina educators, as either evaluators or evaluatees, participate in the evaluation system, a similar survey of selected K-5 teachers should be conducted to determine their perceptions of the TPAI, and to determine if they consider it a reliable method for discriminating between teachers who are "at or above standard" and those "below standard". If such a study of teachers' perceptions were conducted and combined with this study of principals' perceptions, it seems that the TPAI could be refined to make it an even more reliable instrument for evaluating teachers,

and for discriminating between teachers who are "at or above standard" and those "below standard". The resulting instrument would have had input from both evaluators and evaluatees who have been participating in the system since July 1, 1987.

2. to get a better idea of exactly how the TPAI is used, rather than viewed, an in-depth study of the actual use of the instrument, including teacher feedback, would provide the kind of data regarding its use that both policy-makers and practitioners could use.
3. since the bottom line in evaluation is increased student achievement, it would be of interest to investigate the extent to which the TPAI results are tied to student outcomes. Even though the causal connection between student achievement and teacher effectiveness is difficult to isolate, it would be of use to attempt to relate the ratings on the TPAI to actual student achievement.
4. since the study showed that black principals had a tendency to rate the TPAI higher in all categories, and female principals in some categories, than did white male principals; a more in-depth study of this phenomena might provide some conclusions as to why this is so. While the study did not provide any answers as to why black and female principals reponded more favorably than white male principals, a possible reason could be that black and female principals as a minority of all principals feel that

they have to prove their effectiveness more than white male principals. Consequently they may be less inclined to feel confident in substituting their independent judgment and conclusions over the TPAI.

These recommendations for further study would provide more insight into the evaluation process in North Carolina.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A guide for the review of procedures and instruments used in teacher performance evaluation. (1979). New Mexico: The School Principalship Task Force.

A manual for developing reasonable objective, nondiscriminatory standards for evaluating teacher performance. (1971). State College, Mississippi: Mississippi Educational Services Center.

Acheson, K. (1985). The principal's role in instructional leadership. Eugene, Oregon: Oregon School Study Council. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 254 960).

Beaver, P. B. (1986). Evaluation as a means for teacher improvement: using the North Carolina teacher performance appraisal system as a model. Dissertation presented to the faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Bellon, J. J. (1982). Teacher evaluation: from the teacher's perspective. The CEDR Quarterly, 15(4), 9-11.

Bridges, E. M. (1985). It's time to get tough with the turkeys. Principal, 64(3), 19-21.

Brubaker, D. L. and Simon, L. H. (1986). Emerging conceptions of the principalship. Journal of Instructional Psychology, 13(4), 1-26.

Brubaker, D. L. and Simon, L. H. (1987). How do principals view themselves and other principals? NASSP Bulletin, 71(495), 72-78.

Buttram, J. L. and Wilson, B. L. (1987). Promising trends in teacher evaluation. Educational Leadership, 44(7), 4-7.

- Calabrese, R. L. (1986). Effective schools and classroom instruction. The Clearing House, 59(6), 272-274.
- Conley, D. T. (1987). Critical attributes of effective evaluation systems. Educational Leadership, 44(7), 60-64.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1986). A proposal for evaluation in the teaching profession. The Elementary School Journal, 86(4), 531-551.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A. E., and Pease, S. R. (1983). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: a review of the literature. Review of Educational Research, 53(3), 285-328.
- Duke, D. L. and Stiggins, R. J. (1986). Teacher evaluation: five keys to growth. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Education Commission of the States. (1983). Action for excellence: a comprehensive plan to improve our nation's schools. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Education for economic growth: an action plan for North Carolina. (1984). The Report and Recommendations of the North Carolina Commission on Education for Economic Growth.
- Ellis, T. R. (1986). Teacher evaluation is hard work - and it should be. Principal, 64(4), 22-24.
- Evaluating teacher performance. (1978). Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, Inc.
- George, P. S. (1987). Performance management in education. Educational Leadership, 44(7), 32-39.
- Grant, S. and Carvell, R. (1980). A survey of elementary school principals and teachers: teacher evaluation criteria. Education, 100(3), 223-226.

- Grossnickle, D. R. and Cutter, T. W. (1984). It takes one to know one - advocating colleagues as evaluators. NASSP Bulletin, 68(469), 56-60.
- Hain, J. H. and Smith, G. J. (1968). Evaluation of teachers - the principal's dilemma. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 013 490).
- Harris, D. M. (1986). Developmental teacher evaluation. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Holdzkom, D. (1987). Appraising teacher performance in North Carolina. Educational Leadership, 44(7), 40-44.
- Holdzkom, D. and Kuligowski, B. (1987). Almost all you ever wanted to know... Education Report, 3(3), (Special Supplement).
- Holley, F. M. (1982). Personnel evaluation: essentials for success. The CEDR Quarterly, 15(4), 6-8.
- Ishler, P. (1984). Upgrading education means upgrading the teacher evaluation system: merging evaluation information and effective teaching research - an inservice approach. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Education, New Orleans, LA.
- House, E. R. (1973). School evaluation: the politics and process. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corp.
- Hunter, M. C. (1973). Appraising teaching performance: one approach. National Elementary Principal, 52(5), 60-62.
- Knapp, M. S. (1982). Teacher evaluation practices within schools. The CEDR Quarterly, 15(4), 3-5.
- Kult, L. E. (1978). Improving teacher evaluations by principals. Clearing House, 52(1), 17-21.

- Lamm, M. H. (1987). Evaluation: the elementary principal's dilemma. Unpublished independent study, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, NC.
- Lewis, J., Jr. (1973). Appraising teacher performance. West Nyack, NY: Parker Publishing Co., Inc.
- McGreal, T. L. (1982). Developing a teacher evaluation system: commonalities of those systems that function most effectively. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 226 418).
- Medley, D. M., Coker, H., and Soar, R. S. (1984). Measurement-based evaluation of teacher performance. New York: Longman.
- Medley, D. M. and Coker, H. (1987). How valid are principals' judgments of teacher effectiveness? Phi Delta Kappan, 69(2), 138 - 140.
- Moss, R. L. (1971). Teacher evaluation. School and Community, 57(5), 16-17.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: the imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: Department of Education.
- Olds, R. (1974). Performance evaluation rates a close look. Compact, 7(3), 13-16.
- Peterson, K. and Kauchak, D. (1982). Teacher evaluation: perspectives, practices, and promises. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 233 996).
- Pigford, A. B. (1987). Teacher evaluation: more than a game that principals play. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(2), 141 - 142.
- Popham, W. J. (1988). Educational evaluation. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Popham, W. J. (1986). Teacher evaluations: mission impossible. Principal, 65(4), 56-58.

Putting research into educational practice. (January, 1971). Teacher evaluation. U. S. Office of Education: Brief No. 21. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 044 546).

Roelle, R. J. and Wood, P. A. (1980). Six ways to improve teacher evaluation. The American School Board Journal, 167(9), 36-41.

Smith, W. F. and Andrews, R. L. (1987). Clinical supervision for principals. Educational Leadership, 45(1), 34-37.

Stacey, D., Kuligowski, B. and Holdzkom, D. (1988). Evaluation of the effectiveness of the North Carolina teacher performance appraisal system (tpas). Raleigh, NC: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction.

Teacher performance appraisal system training: a report of outcomes. (1986). Raleigh, NC: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 271 452).

The condition of being an educator: an analysis of North Carolina's public schools. (1987). Public School Forum of North Carolina.

Thorson, J. R., Miller, R. K. and Bellon, J. J. (1987). Instructional improvement through personnel evaluation. Educational Leadership, 44(7), 52-55.

Tobin, W. E. (1973). A principal looks at evaluation. National Elementary Principal, 52(5), 92-95.

Weber, J. R. (1987). Teacher evaluation: annotated bibliography. Elmhurst, IL: North Central Regional Education Laboratory. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 287 214).

- Weber, J. R. (1987). Teacher evaluation as a strategy for improving instruction: synthesis of literature. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 287 213).
- Weller, L. D. (1982). Teacher performance assessment instruments: a "personalized" approach to staff development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 223 606).
- Williams, J. C. (1987). The role of the principal as verified by North Carolina teachers. Dissertation presented to the faculty of the Graduate School of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.
- Wise, A. E., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M. W., and Bernstein, H. T. (1985). Teacher evaluation: a study of effective practices. The Elementary School Journal, 86(1), 61-121.
- Woolever, R. M. (1985). State-mandated performance evaluation of beginning teachers: implications for teacher educators. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(2), 22-25.

APPENDIX A
Survey Instrument

Directions: Complete the survey on this page and the check list on the following two pages. When completed, fold in half, staple and mail.

**SURVEY OF K-5 PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE TEACHER
PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL INSTRUMENT**

Principal Information

1. Your age _____
2. Years of Experience as Principal
and/or Assistant Principal _____
3. Years of Experience as Teacher _____
4. Highest Degree Obtained
Bachelor's _____
Master's _____
Specialist (Sixth Year) _____
Doctorate _____
5. Race
Black _____
White _____
American Indian _____
Hispanic _____
Asian _____
6. Male _____
Female _____

School Information

1. Educational Region
I. _____ V. _____
II. _____ VI. _____
III. _____ VII. _____
IV. _____ VIII. _____
2. Your School's enrollment as of 10/1/88 _____
3. Number of K-5 Teachers (including
Special Area Teachers) in your
School who are evaluated based on
the TPAI _____
4. TPAI Pilot Unit _____
TPAI Non-Pilot Unit _____
5. Assistant Principal _____
No Assistant Principal _____
6. Rural School _____
Urban School _____

- * Who performs evaluations in your school?
Principal _____
Assistant Principal _____
Teacher Evaluator _____
Other _____ (specify by title) _____
- * If different from the above, who do you feel should perform the evaluations?

- * What percentage of your time is spent in the evaluation process? (include pre-conference,
observation, summarization of notes, post-conference) _____
- * Overall, does the TPAI enable you to differentiate between teachers who are "at or
above standard" or "below standard"? yes _____ no _____

If no, why not? _____
- * If you are the only person responsible for evaluation in your school, please state the specific
number of teachers you feel you can effectively evaluate using the TPAI. _____
- * Who provided the training for the twenty-four hour course in the techniques of observation and
evaluation? _____
- * Do you deviate from the training? _____

If so, how and why? _____

Directions: Read the observable practice and "x" the appropriate response on the left side. Read each observable practice again, and "x" the appropriate response on the right side. It is important that you complete the left side responses before beginning the right side.

Degree to which item provides information to differentiate between "at or above standard" and "below standard"					Degree of importance of item in evaluating teacher as being "at or above standard" or "below standard"			
Substantial	Some	Limited	None	Observable Practice	Substantial	Some	Limited	None
				1.1 Teacher has materials, supplies and equipment ready at the start of the lesson or instructional activity.				
				1.2 Teacher gets the class started quickly.				
				1.3 Teacher gets students on task quickly at the beginning of each lesson or instructional activity.				
				1.4 Teacher maintains a high level of student time-on-task.				
				2.1 Teacher has established a set of rules and procedures that govern the handling of routine administrative matters.				
				2.2 Teacher has established a set of rules and procedures that govern student verbal participation and talk during different types of activities--whole-class instruction, small group instruction, etc.				
				2.3 Teacher has established a set of rules and procedures that govern student movement in the classroom during different types of instructional activities.				
				2.4 Teacher frequently monitors the behavior of all students during whole-class, small group, and seat work activities and during transitions between instructional activities.				
				2.5 Teacher stops inappropriate behavior promptly and consistently, yet maintains the dignity of the student.				
				3.1 Teacher begins lesson or instructional activity with a review of previous material.				
				3.2 Teacher introduces the lesson or instructional activity and specifies learning objectives when appropriate.				
				3.3 Teacher speaks fluently and precisely.				
				3.4 Teacher presents the lesson or instructional activity using concepts and language understandable to the students.				
				3.5 Teacher provides relevant examples and demonstrations to illustrate concepts and skills.				
				3.6 Teacher assigns tasks that students handle with a high rate of success.				
				3.7 Teacher asks appropriate levels of questions that students handle with a high rate of success.				
				3.8 Teacher conducts lesson or instructional activity at a brisk pace, slowing presentations when necessary for student understanding but avoiding unnecessary slowdowns.				
				3.9 Teacher makes transitions between lessons and between instructional activities within lessons efficiently and smoothly.				
				3.10 Teacher makes sure that the assignment is clear.				
				3.11 Teacher summarizes the main point(s) of the lesson at the end of the lesson or instructional activity.				
				4.1 Teacher maintains clear, firm and reasonable work standards and due dates.				

Directions: Read the observable practice and "x" the appropriate the response on the left side. Read each observable practice again, and "x" the appropriate response on the right side. It is important that you complete the left side responses before beginning the right side.

Degree to which item provides information to differentiate between "at or above standard" and "below standard"					Degree of importance of item in evaluating teacher as being "at or above standard" or "below standard"			
Substantial	Some	Limited	None	Observable Practice	Substantial	Some	Limited	None
				4.2 Teacher circulates during classwork to check all students' performance.				
				4.3 Teacher routinely uses oral, written, and other work products to check student progress.				
				4.4 Teacher poses questions clearly and one at a time.				
				5.1 Teacher provides feedback on the correctness or incorrectness of in-class work to encourage student growth.				
				5.2 Teacher regularly provides prompt feedback on assigned out-of-class work.				
				5.3 Teacher affirms a correct oral response appropriately, and moves on.				
				5.4 Teacher provides sustaining feedback after an incorrect response or no response by probing, repeating the question, giving a clue, or allowing more time.				
				6.1 Teacher has an instructional plan which is compatible with the school and system-wide curricular goals.				
				6.2 Teacher uses diagnostic information obtained from tests and other assessment procedures to develop and revise objectives and/or tasks.				
				6.3 Teacher maintains accurate records to document student performance.				
				6.4 Teacher has instructional plan that matches/aligns objectives, learning strategies, assessment and student needs at the appropriate level of difficulty.				
				6.5 Teacher uses available human and material resources to support the instructional program.				
				7.1 Teacher treats all students in a fair and equitable manner.				
				7.2 Teacher interacts effectively with students, co-workers, parents, and community.				
				8.1 Teacher carries out non-instructional duties as assigned and/or as need is perceived.				
				8.2 Teacher adheres to established laws, policies, rules, and regulations.				
				8.3 Teacher follows a plan for professional development and demonstrates evidence of growth.				
What recommendations would you make in regard to changing either the TPAI or the evaluation procedures? _____ _____ _____								

APPENDIX B

Letters to Selected K-5 Principals

December 5, 1988

TO: Selected Principals
FROM: Mary H. Lamm
SUBJECT: K-5 Principals' Perceptions of the Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument

As of July 1, 1987 all teachers in North Carolina must be evaluated using the Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument (TPAI). I am conducting a study which will examine the K-5 principals' perceptions of the TPAI.

You were selected to participate in this study through a systematic sampling procedure. Your assistance is needed to determine whether the TPAI is perceived as a reliable method for discriminating between teachers "at or above standard" and those "below standard". Please complete the enclosed survey according to the directions, and return to me by December 20, 1988. Your cooperation and participation are appreciated.

Your response will be kept confidential. If you would like to have a copy of the results of the study, please enclose your name and address with the survey.

Thank you for taking time from your busy schedule to assist me with this study.

MHL/cm

January 16, 1989

TO: Selected Principals

FROM: Mary H. Lamm

SUBJECT: K-5 Principals' Perceptions of the Teacher
Performance Appraisal Instrument

In December, 1988, surveys were mailed to selected principals requesting information on perceptions of the Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument (TPAI) regarding its reliability as a method for discriminating between teachers "at or above standard" and those "below standard." While response to the survey has been good, some selected principals have not completed the survey. If you have not completed the survey, please take a few minutes from your busy schedule to read and respond by January 30, 1989. If you have already completed and returned the survey, please accept my appreciation for your cooperation.

The information will be kept confidential. If you would like to have a copy of the results of the study which I am conducting as a part of my graduate studies, please enclose your name and address with the survey.

MHL/cm

APPENDIX C

Teacher Performance Appraisal System

TEACHER PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM

- INSTRUCTIONS
1. Based on the evidence from observation and discussion, the evaluator is to rate the teacher's performance with respect to the 8 major functions of teaching listed below.
 2. The evaluator is encouraged to add pertinent comments at the end of each major function.
 3. The teacher is provided an opportunity to react to the evaluator's ratings and comments.
 4. The evaluator and the teacher must discuss the results of the appraisal and any recommended action pertinent to it.
 5. The teacher and the evaluator must sign the instrument in the assigned spaces.
 6. The instrument must be filed in the teacher's personnel folder.
 7. The rating scale will be as follows:

Level of Performance

6. Superior

Performance within this function area is consistently outstanding. Teaching practices are demonstrated at the highest level of performance. Teacher continuously seeks to expand scope of competencies and constantly undertakes additional, appropriate responsibilities.

5. Well Above Standard

Performance within this function area is frequently outstanding. Some teaching practices are demonstrated at the highest level while others are at a consistently high level. Teacher frequently seeks to expand scope of competencies and often undertakes additional, appropriate responsibilities.

4. Above Standard

Performance within this function area is frequently high. Some teaching practices are demonstrated at a high level while others are at a consistently adequate/acceptable level. Teacher sometimes seeks to expand scope of competencies and occasionally undertakes additional, appropriate responsibilities.

3. At Standard

Performance within this function area is consistently adequate/acceptable. Teaching practices fully meet all performance expectations at an acceptable level. Teacher maintains an adequate scope of competencies and performs additional responsibilities as assigned.

2. Below Standard

Performance within this function area is sometimes inadequate/unacceptable and needs improvement. Teacher requires supervision and assistance to maintain an adequate scope of competencies, and sometimes fails to perform additional responsibilities as assigned.

Unsatisfactory

Performance within this function area is consistently inadequate/unacceptable and most practices require considerable improvement to fully meet minimum performance expectations. Teacher requires close and frequent supervision in the performance of all responsibilities.

**Rating Scale
(Please Check)**

Superior	Well Above Standard	Above Standard	At Standard	Below Standard	Unsatisfactory
----------	---------------------	----------------	-------------	----------------	----------------

Teacher Name _____

School _____

1. Major Function: Management of Instructional Time

- 1.1 Teacher has materials, supplies and equipment ready at the start of the lesson or instructional activity.
- 1.2 Teacher gets the class started quickly.
- 1.3 Teacher gets students on task quickly at the beginning of each lesson or instructional activity.
- 1.4 Teacher maintains a high level of student time-on-task.

Comments _____

2. Major Function: Management of Student Behavior

- 2.1 Teacher has established a set of rules and procedures that govern the handling of routine administrative matters.
- 2.2 Teacher has established a set of rules and procedures that govern student verbal participation and talk during different types of activities--whole-class instruction, small group instruction, etc.
- 2.3 Teacher has established a set of rules and procedures that govern student movement in the classroom during different types of instructional activities.
- 2.4 Teacher frequently monitors the behavior of all students during whole-class, small group, and seat work activities and during transitions between instructional activities.

Rating Scale
(Please Check)

Superior	Well Above Standard	Above Standard	At Standard	Below Standard	Unsatisfactory
----------	---------------------	----------------	-------------	----------------	----------------

2.5 Teacher stops inappropriate behavior promptly and consistently, yet maintains the dignity of the student.

Comments _____

3. Major Function: Instructional Presentation

<input type="checkbox"/>					
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

- 3.1 Teacher begins lesson or instructional activity with a review of previous material.
- 3.2 Teacher introduces the lesson or instructional activity and specifies learning objectives when appropriate.
- 3.3 Teacher speaks fluently and precisely.
- 3.4 Teacher presents the lesson or instructional activity using concepts and language understandable to the students.
- 3.5 Teacher provides relevant examples and demonstrations to illustrate concepts and skills.
- 3.6 Teacher assigns tasks that students handle with a high rate of success.
- 3.7 Teacher asks appropriate levels of questions that students handle with a high rate of success.
- 3.8 Teacher conducts lesson or instructional activity at a brisk pace, slowing presentations when necessary for student understanding but avoiding unnecessary slowdowns.
- 3.9 Teacher makes transitions between lessons and between instructional activities within lessons efficiently and smoothly.

Rating Scale
(Please Check)

Superior	Well Above Standard	Above Standard	At Standard	Below Standard	Unsatisfactory
----------	---------------------	----------------	-------------	----------------	----------------

3.10 Teacher makes sure that the assignment is clear.

3.11 Teacher summarizes the main point(s) of the lesson at the end of the lesson or instructional activity.

Comments _____

4. Major Function: Instructional Monitoring of Student Performance

- 4.1 Teacher maintains clear, firm and reasonable work standards and due dates.
- 4.2 Teacher circulates during classwork to check all students' performance.
- 4.3 Teacher routinely uses oral, written, and other work products to check student progress.
- 4.4 Teacher poses questions clearly and one at a time.

Comments _____

5. Major Function: Instructional Feedback

5.1 Teacher provides feedback on the correctness or incorrectness of in-class work to encourage student growth.

Rating Scale
(Please Check)

Superior	Well Above Standard	Above Standard	At Standard	Below Standard	Unsatisfactory
----------	---------------------	----------------	-------------	----------------	----------------

- 5.2 Teacher regularly provides prompt feedback on assigned out-of-class work.
- 5.3 Teacher affirms a correct oral response appropriately, and moves on.
- 5.4 Teacher provides sustaining feedback after an incorrect response or no response by probing, repeating the question, giving a clue, or allowing more time.

Comments _____

Major Function: Facilitating Instruction

- 6.1 Teacher has an instructional plan which is compatible with the school and system-wide curricular goals.
- 6.2 Teacher uses diagnostic information obtained from tests and other assessment procedures to develop and revise objectives and/or tasks.
- 6.3 Teacher maintains accurate records to document student performance.
- 6.4 Teacher has instructional plan that matches/aligns objectives, learning strategies, assessment and student needs at the appropriate level of difficulty.
- 6.5 Teacher uses available human and material resources to support the instructional program.

**Rating Scale
(Please Check)**

Superior	Well Above Standard	Above Standard	At Standard	Below Standard	Unsatisfactory
----------	---------------------	----------------	-------------	----------------	----------------

Comments _____

7. Major Function: Communicating Within The Educational Environment

- 7.1 Teacher treats all students in a fair and equitable manner.
- 7.2 Teacher interacts effectively with students, co-workers, parents, and community.

Comments _____

8. Major Function: Performing Non-Instructional Duties

- 8.1 Teacher carries out non-instructional duties as assigned and/or as need is perceived.
- 8.2 Teacher adheres to established laws, policies, rules, and regulations.
- 8.3 Teacher follows a plan for professional development and demonstrates evidence of growth.

Comments _____

Evaluator's Summary Comments _____

Teacher's Reactions to Evaluation _____

Evaluator's signature and date

Teacher's signature and date

Signature indicate
that the written
evaluation has bee
seen and discussed

APPENDIX D

Responses to questions:

"Overall does the TPAI enable you to differentiate between teachers
who are " at or above standard" or "below standard"?

yes _____ no _____ If no, why not?

"

RESPONSES TO DIFFERENTIATION:

1. It is difficult to evaluate subtle negative behaviors.
2. Already know - but makes us check a little closer.
3. Not specific enough distinction between the two.
4. Difficult to determine at or above standard.
5. I know this without instrument.
6. Even poor teachers can put on a show when formally observed.
7. All have been at or above standard. I think it could differentiate.
8. Fairly well.
9. There is more than one way to get from point "A" to point "B".
10. It, too, requires subjective judgments.
11. In comparison to whom - no one really knows what the difference between above standard and below is.
12. I have difficulty with the "at" and "above standard".
13. Not clearly defined.
14. Class visitations, informal observations provide information.
15. The instrument's composition leads to "you do this or do not", not how well.
16. Too specific, do not see the forest for the trees.

17. Not specific enough.
18. One doesn't need an instrument to determine who is above average.
19. General observations more effective than formal observations.
20. Is less helpful with above standard.
21. A teacher may be doing the things required to be "at standard" on the TPAI and not "teaching" anything very well.
22. The at/above standard and below are not the problem. The ones very difficult to differentiate are well above and superior.
23. There are some tangibles that are not on the instrument.
24. Needs to be more finite and involve more behaviors.
25. The instrument itself is only a guide - many other factors are involved. Sometimes difference is minute between at standard and below standard.
26. A teacher would be a fool to not do well knowing what the evaluator is looking for using the TPAI, also FODA and FODI.
27. There is no way to show creativity for a teacher.
28. Teachers may "perform" appropriately but fail to actually meet standards - TPAI does not look at results but rather only process - may do everything correctly, but not effectively.

29. Only evaluates isolated "performances".

30. If a principal doesn't know staff in detail, the TPAI is not the answer. It is only part of knowing a teacher.

APPENDIX E

**Responses to questions:
"Do you deviate from the training?"**

If so, how and why?

"

DEVIATE FROM TRAINING

1. Some behaviors taught in the training program create negative climatical effects in the school.
2. Because I'm human. I try to stay consistent from the beginning of the year to the end, but find that it is also hard to do.
3. Many times I script the observation.
4. I use one extra summary sheet. It aids in dealing with certain details.
5. To work with individual differences in the staff.
6. Add specific refinements to instructional presentation based on effective teaching and cognitive research, depending on level of teacher.
7. FODI and FODA are excessively burdensome. Therefore, I employ a listing of the sub-criteria under each major function and assess thereby.
8. Do not have face-to-face preconferences.
9. Time and various duties prevent my following time lines exactly. Do not allow me to say teachers always do or most of the time do - dropins help but with three formal observations there is little time.

10. Greater emphasis on VI. Planning for instruction in post-observation conferences and pre-observation collection of data (lesson plans).
11. May incorporate more than one method of gaining written data.
12. No one instrument can cover all areas completely.
13. Not all teachers require the same exact process for pre-observation conference.
14. I use the training I had in clinical supervision from Anderson/Snyder and also Madeline Hunter.
15. I do more than three visits during the year.
16. I use a blank sheet and script tape the observation.
17. I prefer to script most of my observations and I do not think the system of checks for the FODI tells you very much.
18. I sometimes do not do a pre-conference because I know the problem children and I also know the teaching objectives for each grade for each nine weeks.
19. At times, common sense has to enter in.
20. Data collection. I find by using my method I can identify more closely with the learning and teaching process.

21. Consider other significant factors which contribute to effective teaching.
22. I do not write everything down. I script the information as I go, placing comments beside the appropriate statements.
23. I use my own script tape form.
24. Don't require written pre-conference. Feel they're more needed just talking with me. I don't ask what point of lesson will be. If I can't see that, how will kids get the point?
25. My system of scripting is somewhat different.
26. Many factors cannot be measured by a scale.
27. Adapt forms/procedures to better fit particular situation.
28. I do not always number all occurrences and then do not always use + or -. I use data to support or give specifics on functions.
29. The training was helpful but I do not feel one can always follow exact training. All individual cases are different.
30. If you don't see it or hear it you do not put it down.
31. Very informal pre-conference for effective tenured teachers.
32. Mine more applicable. Write observations that are not on sheets that I feel are important.

APPENDIX F

Responses to question:

"What recommendations would you make in regard to changing either
the TPAI or the evaluation procedures?"

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. None - much research has gone into this instrument.
2. Tenured teachers with no problems should be formally observed one time per year without two informal written up observations which still require three and one-half hours for the process.
3. We need no more change! Teachers need to become comfortable with what we have.
4. Re: 8.2, most teachers are not aware of school law and many policies based on school law. Every educator should be required to take "school law" after one year of employment.
5. All of these practices are not observable at every observation. This should be clarified to all evaluators.
6. Tenured personnel do not need to be observed as much as we presently observe them. One time every three years would be enough. Initially certified people need more observations.
7. There are too many levels of performance, too many degrees of acceptable and above performances exist in the instrument.
8. Reduce the number of evaluations which must be written, or assign additional staff to help with it.
9. Reduce the number of tenured teachers to one per year unless

administration feels more than one is needed.

10. The practices on the TPAI can be "performed" without one ounce of teaching occurring. Some performances do not have "degrees" of differentiation. In addition, it is difficult to know what is considered 80% of the state's teacher effectiveness as they recommended in the training. Poor instrument!
11. Hiring someone to do the evaluations. They are very time consuming.
12. None - the process is time consuming but has had positive effect.
13. Make adjustments or revisions gradually on the teacher instrument.
14. None, except it takes up too much time for writing the narratives on the FODAs. Assistant principal one-half time needed.
15. We have refined what the teacher should do in the classroom. We need to establish a form to measure her/his effectiveness as a professional person, i.e., extra duties, professional demeanor, willingness, good planner, and a host of other items.

16. One person to do evaluations so principal has opportunity to attend to other important school matters.
17. Condense - it is too lengthy.
18. Perhaps checklists with comments would suffice rather than the more time consuming narrative necessary in the formative evaluation instrument.
19. Functions 6-8 should be rated "exceeds standards", "at standard", "below standard". The FODA needs to be simplified. It takes too long to do one. Consider some type of check-off system for standards which are "at standard". Practices "above standard" or "below standard" should be explained in detail. Revise the rating scale for all functions. It's extremely difficult to distinguish between "above standard", "well above standard", and "superior".
20. I feel the TPAI is a reliable instrument for discriminating between teachers "at or above standard" and those "below standard".
21. Trash the TPAI! Replace this instrument (and mind set) which presumes/infers that observable behaviors = student learning, with a process that measures pupil growth/gains attributable to

a specific teacher's good work. Reward teachers commensurately.

22. I still have concerns over mastery of subject matter of teacher.

Occasionally, I hear incorrect facts presented - I always correct and question, but am never real sure where it is best to record.

Since this is confidential: 3.3 - I have concerns about the word "says" (sez) - often in classes, it is incorrectly pronounced. I have chosen not to make this an issue. I think it is cultural.

Other example: govern mint.

23. The present instrument takes the affective domain into little or no consideration. We stress climate as a primary effective schools correlate and yet it has no place here!

24. None, except to be able to exercise discretion on limiting the number of observations for teachers who consistently score in the 5 or 6 range.

25. Change rating to at standard or below motivation of students - warm caring atmosphere inclusion as practice. (I despise the TPAI as it is now administered.)

26. Observe tenured teachers once each year as long as no practice is below "at standard". Probationary teachers should be

observed twice each year. This instrument has helped weak teachers at least become good teachers. It is of little value to highly skilled teachers and after several evaluations results are so consistent they are repetitive and of little interest.

27. Use outside evaluators. Incorporate a teacher's use of creativity or the teachable moment into the instrument.
28. None.
29. We need county wide evaluators to provide another opinion.
30. Reduce numbers to be observed. Training for new teacher aides needed.
31. Eliminate evaluating everyone three times per year, evaluate using staggering years, document as necessary. Reassign outside/inside evaluators, those positions could be better utilized as curriculum personnel.
32. I have no problem with the practices/items addressed in the evaluation process as these have been around a long time; however, I have problems in the degree or frequency of use to determine anything above at standard. The chore of script writing in shorthand or whatever seems to take away from true

observation and evaluation purposes - that of enjoying the lesson, observing in more detail the students and teacher.

33. Visit career teachers only once a year.
34. Differentiate the number of observations of 10 year plus experienced teachers.
35. The TPAI does not effectively help determine the teacher's mastery of subject matter nor does it deal with overall contribution to the school. However, let's be realistic - if you had a school with 150 students, 10 teachers, all the funds you need, and no other responsibility, you could do a super job of performance appraisal. I have over 700 students, almost 100 staff members. And many expectations by our central office staff, etc.
36. I have none. Evaluation is difficult and will always be somewhat subjective, we just have to live with it.
37. Reduce the levels of performance from six to four or five. Differentiation is difficult at the levels above "at standard".
38. Incorporate 6.1 - 6.5 in pre- and post conference content. Move 6.1 to 1.1 and change numbers 1.1 - 5.4 to 2.1 - 6.4.

39. Go back to a narrative.
40. Reduce the number of items - change items to be more specific.
41. None.
42. I like this evaluation procedure.
43. None at this time.
44. Do away with sections 6, 7, and 8 when making observations, only use with summative evaluation.
45. Evaluate each year for probationary teachers and once every five years for tenured - except with problem teachers or career ladder teachers - one yearly observation required for tenured staff.
46. One evaluation for tenured teachers, three evaluations for non-tenured staff.
47. Do formal evaluation for fewer staff members and make it more thorough (6-12 observations, many unannounced). This could be done by using a three year cycle for most teachers.
48. There is no single form or procedure that can accurately assess performance. Evaluation combines observation of teachers in many different situations and includes teacher's knowledge of subjects being taught as well as TPAI items. What the teacher

knows must be considered and can not be assumed simply because he/she is certified. Three observations, pre and post conferences for the superior teacher is waste of time - principal needs flexibility to determine the need.

49. Change scale to at standard; above standard for upper and below standard for lower. The instrument allows for clear differentiation between those three.

50. I have few problems with the process or the instrument. However, it is difficult to determine or differentiate the levels of performance for functions 7 and 8. A three point scale may be better for these functions - (Unsatisfactory, Standard, or Above Standard). Function 6 is very important in differentiating levels of performance because this is related to planning, diagnosing, and creativity.

51. Need to be able to reward outstanding contributions to school system or education generally - not enough emphasis on professional growth.

52. The TPAI #3 Instructional Area should match in wording the 6 point lesson plan. The wording is different and I think it would be more effective if they were the same.

53. The rating scale has too many levels above standard. I would much prefer above standard and superior or "commendations", leaving out one. The FODA takes forever. Is there any alternative?
54. Process is very time consuming. Three observations per teacher on alternating years does not seem necessary for all.
55. Assistance for principals who have no help in evaluation. More objectivity and honesty in pinpointing the below standard, ineffective teacher. In our county last year only 17 teachers (out of thousands) received "below standard". I gave two of those. This is absurd and unrealistic. Without help in evaluation, it is also the principal's responsibility to remediate those with sub-standard performance marks. Help is needed with this remediation process.
56. Establish a check list. Eliminate numerical ratings. Creates too much stress in schools. Go to a narrative write-up without using numbers.
57. None.
58. I would like to see the following happen:
- a. as a principal if I am to evaluate more time to be more

effective

b. more time to be the instructional leader

c. more training in the evaluation process. The TPAI I can deal without problems.

59. None.

60. I like the present tool.

61. None.

62. More finite on out of class duties, etc.

63. No change, but evaluate 50% of your faculty each year.

64. Need more personnel to allow administrators to do more thorough job with smaller number of teachers.

65. ICP - three or more evaluations per year. Career - one per year rotating with three every five years for one-fourth of the faculty.

66. Form having check-off list to cut down on the amount of writing that is required.

67. Three formal evaluations are not necessary to properly evaluate the teacher.

68. More training of evaluators to improve reliability.

69. Establish more guidelines for inner-rater reliability. More

creative ways are needed for writing FODAs.

70. Give number ratings for all areas every observation.
71. Each observation from an outside observer should be joint with an administrator. Should be jointly discussed and rated.
72. Shorten instrument to cover less observable practices.
73. TPAI is a good instrument.
74. Cut down on observation of super tenured teachers.
75. Requiring less frequent observations, especially for principals who have been with basically the same faculty several years.
76. Change rating scale: needs improvement, unsatisfactory, meets performance expectations, exceeds expectations, and not applicable.
77. I have no problems with the current system of evaluation.
78. The state provides evaluators. Two evaluators cannot provide for the human element, both are too much stress for all concerned. Do away with evaluation and work through the principals to improve teacher's performance.
79. I want a change made in the Rating Scale from present to "Above Standard" (1), "Standard" (2), "Below Standard" (3), ONLY !!!!
80. I look for signs or students and parents telling me how happy

they are in so and so's room and what they are learning. If they are excited, they are learning. I want to know that the teacher is teaching manners, stressing respect for themselves and others (values if you please - I do).

81. I wish a section could be added for "content of material".
82. Combine 1.2, 1.3, combine 3.4, 3.6, combine 3.7, 4.4, put 7.2 under function VIII.
83. Get more help to principals, like outside evaluators. Also give more guidelines on how to discriminate as to levels of performance (ratings!).
84. Expand practices to emphasize the quality of opportunities teachers provide toward an understandable lesson with appropriate approaches to learning. Expand measurements of using oral and written work products to include creativity, active learning, purpose materials.
85. Change the rating scale from a five point to a three point!!!
86. Fewer observations of career teachers.
87. None, I like the instrument. No instrument is perfect, however, I feel this touches all areas. The evaluator just has to use good judgment and know they can't expect a six point lesson plan

every time they walk through the door. Not all lessons lend themselves to that model.

88. More help for those principals who have no assistant principals.

89. I would include the area of content of lesson.

90. 6,7,8 have been most difficult to evaluate, however, we have new county guidelines this year and am sure it will be better - Ms. Short, Buncombe County has this material.

91. Possible check list of practices and degree of effectiveness - comments on practices rather than narrative on each area.

92. Observation of isolated situation(s) does not measure teacher attitude(s), level of dedication, and day to day student rapport. It is more a measure of teacher's ability to "perform" for an audience.

93. More help in doing the observations.

94. The instrument does need refining. It does the job, but it could be better. Let teachers refine the instrument (a state committee).

95. Only one observation for Career II and holding.

96. Repeated evaluation times per year could be changed. Add more to evaluation than the items on TPAI. Too many times. Too

much paper and pencil detailed work on staff people who are effective. Type of observation isn't applicable (many times). It's a waste of principal's time.

97. Anecdotal are essential for documentation of 6, 7, and 8. Some items such as 1.2 are either present or absent - there are no degrees. Items do not help to truly differentiate between Standard, Above Standard, Well Above Standard, and Superior. Good beginning teacher instrument - not satisfactory for career professionals.