2000

Birmingham City School System teachers' perceptions of the Professional Education Personnel Evaluation Program of Alabama as it relates to their schools' academic status.

Douglas Lee Ragland
University of Alabama at Birmingham

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced 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.

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.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

NOTE TO USERS

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI

BIRMINGHAM CITY SCHOOL SYSTEM TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL EVALUATION PROGRAM OF ALABAMA AS IT RELATES TO THEIR SCHOOLS' ACADEMIC STATUS

by

DOUGLAS LEE RAGLAND

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the graduate faculty of The University of Alabama at Birmingham.
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA

2000

UMI Number: 9997057

Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION
GRADUATE SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA AT BIRMINGHAM

Degree Ed.D. Program Educational Leadership

Name of Candidate Douglas Lee Ragland

Committee Chairs Harold Bishop and David Dagley

Title Birmingham City School System Teachers' Perceptions of the Professional Education Personnel Evaluation Program of Alabama as It Relates to Their Schools' Academic Status

Birmingham city school teachers' perceptions of the Professional Education Personnel Evaluation Program of Alabama (PEPE), as it relates to their schools' academic status, were examined in the following constructs: benefit, fairness, consistency, adequacy, and supervision. Also, variables such as academic status and grade level were examined.

There were 122 surveys sent out to randomly selected teachers in the Birmingham City School System. Of these 122 surveys, 88 were returned, resulting in a return rate of 72%. In the quantitative analysis the respondents did not reveal any significant differences in their perceptions of PEPE based on the academic status of their respective schools. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed one significant difference between the grade levels, and that was in the beneficial construct. In essence, elementary teachers viewed PEPE more positively than early childhood teachers. In the qualitative analysis, the teachers expressed concerns about the adequacy of the process and the evaluators' ability to convey and conduct this process. The conclusions in this study were as follows: (a) Teachers and administrators need to be more collaborative in setting goals, and (b) administrators must do a better job of conveying and conducting this process so that teachers can understand and accept this process. Recommendations of the study were as

follows: (a) The evaluation process should be collaborative between teachers and administrators, and (b) ongoing training and professional development should be conducted and maintained as a top priority annually.

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to the loving memory of my father, who instilled within me spiritual and character values of faith, honesty, dedication, determination, diligence, and the belief that education is and should always be a top priority. Without the grace of God and my father's influence the attainment of this degree would not have been possible.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am eternally grateful to many for their encouragement, support, and assistance. I would like to thank the following individuals: Drs. Harold Bishop and Dave Dagley, co-committee chairs, and Drs. Jim Mc Lean, Boyd Rogan, and Claudia Williams, committee members, for their expertise, guidance, and support.

I would like to thank my future wife, Teresa Wiggins, for her love, support, motivation, encouragement, and spiritual guidance, and my mother for her love, patience, and understanding.

Last, but not least, I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Johnny E. Brown, Superintendent of Birmingham City Schools; members of the Birmingham City Board of Education; and the supportive teachers in the Birmingham City School System who participated in this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

CHAPTER

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

Teacher evaluation systems, in terms of structure and purpose, are indeed a national problem and could possibly affect student achievement if not perceived well by teachers. Results from a replication of a study of teacher evaluation practices in our 100 largest school districts indicate a large percentage of districts have begun to consider and implement means of controlling for adverse effects of evaluation context variables through adopting written policy and procedures for decision making (Loup, 1997). According to Annunciata (1997), teacher evaluation is viewed as a two-edged sword: one side purports professional growth and the other side is poised above the practitioner demanding accountability for use in employment or licensure decisions. Teachers fear the evaluation process and this, combined with administrators' compelling role to perform this task without thorough and meaningful explanation to the teachers, makes the process perfunctory at best.

The Alabama Legislature has passed educational bills into law in an effort to support education statewide. These actions on the part of our legislators have involved career ladder incentive teacher evaluation programs developed as a result of diligent efforts by outstanding educators across the state (Alabama State Department of Education, 1998). For nearly 2 decades, expanded and thorough research has consistently revealed that excellence in schools, more so than anything else, is attributed to the

performances of teachers and administrators. Also, research has shown that school districts that have exemplary evaluation programs and processes predicated on great opportunities for professional growth and development truly enhance educational quality in their respective districts (Marchant & Bowers, 1990; Van der Linde, 1998). Acknowledgment and acceptance of these findings was one of the influencing factors that motivated the Alabama State Board of Education to adopt a resolution in 1988 that requires the evaluation of all certified educational personnel (Alabama State Department of Education). According to the Alabama State Department of Education, school districts have the option to use an evaluation program developed by their own districts based on the Alabama State Board of Education Requirements. This action was also paramount in providing the motivation for the Alabama State Legislature to enact legislation to support the state board's resolution with the full force of the law. This process was initiated under the leadership of Dr. Wayne Teague, State School Superintendent, state and national consultants, and the state board of education. In the early 1990s, when Governor Fob James was elected to his second term as Alabama's governor and Dr. Ed Richardson was appointed Alabama's State School Superintendent, the continued push for accountability in education in reference to teacher quality and student achievement became a top priority (Alabama State Department of Education). The teacher evaluation process, in tandem with student achievement, would no longer be ignored, due to the aforementioned account-ability law. The law supported the state board of education's resolution, and contained a legal and financial commitment to see the evaluation process come to fruition (Alabama State Department of Education). Also, during this time, because of financial inequities among school districts and proration, many school districts were struggling to both remain

financially solvent and increase student achievement. The governor and the state superintendent knew accountability measures for educators had to be put in place, not only for the purpose of increased achievement but to develop and enhance quality teachers and to regain public support for Alabama's public schools. The first step in undertaking this journey was to bring to fruition the evaluation plan with respect to the accountability law that mandates that all certified personnel be evaluated according to a statewide evaluation system or by one developed locally and predicated on state criteria. This was the official commencement for accountability in education via a solid teacher evaluation system thought to be the key to enhancing teachers, increasing student achievement, and regaining public trust in public education (Alabama State Department of Education).

Teacher evaluation is a critical area or factor in any effort to validate teaching and learning and the successes of schools (Stronge & Ostrander, 1997). In his overview of the process-product research, Brophy (1986, as cited in Lavely & Berger, 1996) observed, "The last 15 years have finally produced an orderly knowledge base linking teacher behavior to student achievement" (p. 2). There is valid research to indicate that teacher evaluation systems are instrumental to success in instruction and student achievement if teachers feel comfortable, positive, inclusive, and accepting about the instrument and process (Costa & Kallick, 1993; Glickman, 1992; Leithwood, 1992). Positive attitudes about the evaluation process are generally developed when teachers feel a sense of trust and security about the process, gather constructive feedback from their administrators, collaborate with other teachers, and feel as if they are growing and developing as better teachers because of this process (Frase, 1992). If the evaluation process is to be positive, there must be a partnership between the teacher and the evaluator aimed at a mutual

construction of understanding (Bryant & Currin, 1995). Teacher growth and professional development enhance attitude, morale, and performance, which ultimately impact student achievement (Rothberg & Fenner, 1991). In order for an evaluation system to be effective, teachers must be comfortable with it and feel good about it. Growth and development are best achieved in an environment marked by mutual respect and trust (Edwards, 1995).

One goal in the evaluation process is to help teachers develop individual talents and discover new ones in enhancing their own distinctive ways of interacting with students (Bryant & Currin, 1995). The most effective way to prevent a teacher from failing to become more competent is through a continued, open, honest, and clear system of communication, evaluation, and commendation (McGrath, 1995). An effective evaluation system, according to many teachers, centers around constructive feedback. Constructive feedback is fundamental to helping teachers improve instruction and achieve their goals of helping young people learn (Frase, 1992). In an effort to improve one's performance, according to Taylor (1994), one must acknowledge the need to improve, and there must be a pervasive attitude to want to improve and change by the individual. Central to the use of self-evaluation as a means of improving a teacher's performance is the concept that one must want to improve or change in order for an improvement or change to occur (Taylor). The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future has a central message on school reform and focuses on improvement of teachers as the key to success in school reform. This central message comes from several hundred studies of teaching, school, and reform initiatives that have resulted in the following analysis:

> What teaches know and do is one of the most important influences on what students learn.

> Recruiting, preparing, and retaining good teachers is the central strategy for improving our schools.
>
> School reform cannot succeed unless it focuses on creating the conditions in which teachers can teach and teach well. (Darling-Hammond, 1998, p. 6)

In a recent study on identifying factors responsible for teaching success, it was stated that it was important that teachers challenge children to learn, and this stemmed from teacher needs and attitudes. Teacher attitudes and needs, collectively, were considered the third most significant factor in this study in determining teacher success (Illmer, Snyder, Erbaugh, & Kurz, 1997).

In a study conducted by Long and Sparks (1997), instructional behaviors were noted to be of prime importance when considering both student interest and performance. Instructional behaviors such as organizing, planning, being enthusiastic, clearly explaining material presented, providing relevant examples, making fair assessments, involving students in activities, etc. were identified as successful teaching behaviors in a traditional evaluation system. Again, as manifested in the instructional behaviors, attitude clearly stood out as a major focal point in linking teacher success with student achievement (Long & Sparks).

A positive attitude toward assessment is important for teachers and for students. Positive feedback encourages students to take the next step in their learning (Wilcox & Schonberger, 1998). The literature review shows on a consistent basis that teacher attitudes toward the evaluation process have a strong link to student achievement. The literature also shows that if teachers are secure, comfortable, knowledgeable, and motivated as a result of the process, their efforts will benefit students (Stronge, 1997). On the other hand, if this process intimidates teachers, provides no competent leadership or

professional growth, and serves as a means of frustration, then the process will, indeed, be perfunctory, and the teachers and the students will gain little from it (Annuziata, 1997).

Statement of the Problem

Two recent studies were conducted on teacher attitudes towards the Professional Education Personnel Evaluation Program of Alabama (PEPE; Armstrong, 1999; Klucking, 1999). Armstrong's study examined the gender differences of teachers in respect to their perceptions of the PEPE. Klucking's study examined the teachers' initial perceptions of the PEPE's orientation program, preparation training, and overall system in general. Although these discussions have been completed, there is a need to continually assess the attitudes and perceptions of teachers regarding the state's evaluation system. Specifically, there is a need to determine whether teachers assigned to *alert*, *caution*, and *clear* schools have varying attitudes toward the PEPE. According to the Alabama State Department of Education (1999), Alabama is composed of 127 school districts responsible for providing public education to the children in this state. Currently, in the 2000-2001 school year, there are 32 schools on Academic Alert I, 29 schools on Academic Alert II, and 6 schools on Academic Alert III, which requires state intervention (Howell, Archibald, & Hansen, 2000; Richardson, 2000). In addition to the aforementioned schools, there are a host of schools statewide that are on Academic Caution, which is also a state of deficiency. In the state of Alabama, the highest level of proficiency is the Academic Clear category. In order to attain the Academic Clear status, the majority of students in the district or school must score at the 40th percentile or higher on standardized tests. If a school district or a school has the majority of its population scoring in the 39th percentile or lower, then that school

district or school is considered deficient or in the Academic Caution category according to state standards of successful achievement (Howell et al.; Richardson). A sound evaluation program coupled with an excellent professional development program is the key to enhancing teacher performance, attitude, and, ultimately, student achievement.

Purpose of the Study

This study explores the perceptions of early childhood and elementary teachers toward the PEPE as it relates to the schools' academic status. Specifically, the study will determine whether teachers from Academic Clear schools have significantly different perceptions than those teachers who are employed in Academic Caution and Alert schools. The study will also determine whether there are differences in the perceptions of teachers toward the PEPE based on the variable of grade level.

Hypotheses

1. There will be no significant difference in the perception of teachers regarding the PEPE based on the variable of their employment in schools categorized as Academic Clear, Caution, or Alert.

2. There will be no significant difference in the perceptions of teachers assigned to do instruction at the early childhood level (K-3) from those who teach Grades 4 and 5.

Research Questions

1. Are teachers' perceptions of the PEPE related to their schools' academic status (Clear, Caution, or Alert)?

2. Are teachers' perceptions of the PEPE related to their teaching level (early childhood or elementary)?

Assumptions

The following assumptions existed regarding the respondents of this study:

1. Participants in this study possessed at least B Certification.

2. All respondents provided honest answers to the items on the survey instrument.

3. An adequate number of participants responded to the questionnaire to allow the researcher to complete an analysis of data.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to K-5 teachers in K-5 schools, who were subject to the PEPE implemented by the Birmingham City School System. The generalizability of results of the study is limited to K-5 teachers in the Birmingham City School System.

Definitions of Terms

The following definitions of the PEPE Instrument are derived from the PEPE for Teacher Evaluation Manual.

Full evaluation: Full evaluation is the administration of all instruments and procedures included in the PEPE for a designated position.

Multi-year full evaluation: Multi-year full evaluation means the administration of all instruments and procedures included in the PEPE for a designated position and requires the extension of the professional development plan (PDP). For tenured teachers, a

minimum of two observations is required per evaluation cycle. A minimum of three observations is required annually for nontenured teachers.

Competencies: Competency statements are broad, immeasurable functions. There are eight competencies in the PEPE: preparation for instruction, presentation of organized instruction, assessment of student performance, classroom management, positive learning climate, communication, professional development and leadership, and performance of professional responsibilities.

Indicators: Indicators are subheads of the competencies and provide more detail in providing a clearer understanding of what is to be measured.

Definitional items: Definitional items contain explicit descriptions of behaviors and practices that are contained in each indicator.

Composite score: A composite score is the summation of scores achieved on competencies 1-8 for all tenured teachers. This score must be at least 20 in order to meet the acceptable performance standard set by the PEPE.

Data sources: Data sources are instruments utilized to measure the eight competencies. These sources include observation, structured interview, supervisor's review form, and the PDP.

Observation: Observation is the procedure used by evaluators that allows the evaluator to record a classroom lesson by scripting.

Structured interview: This interview can take two forms: a discussion between the evaluator and the teacher or a preparation of written responses to questions.

Supervisor's Review Form: This form is completed by the immediate supervisor and provides information for two competency areas: communication and performance of professional responsibilities.

Professional development plan (PDP): This source provides information about two indicators: professional knowledge and skills and leadership role in improving education.

Evaluator: The evaluator for the PEPE must go through a rigorous training program and achieve the following for certification: (a) score 80% correct on a knowledge test, (b) achieve reliability on two classroom observations and two structured interviews, (c) develop skills in developing a professional development plan and scoring the Evaluation Summary Report, and (d) complete and score the Supervisor's Review Form.

Teacher: A teacher is a professional educator whose responsibilities are to help students learn subject matter and skills that will contribute to their development as mature, able, and responsible members of society.

Code of Ethics: Every evaluator must adhere to the code of ethics as outlined in the PEPE in implementing the evaluation process objectively and fairly towards teachers.

Self-Assessment: This form is completed by the teacher for a personal assessment of skills and knowledge.

Unsatisfactory: This is a rating of 1 that indicates that the teacher's performance in this position is not acceptable and indicates that improvement must be made immediately.

Needs improvement: This is a rating of 2 that indicates that the teacher's performance sometimes, but not always, meets expectations in this position requirement. Performance improvement would be required to consistently meet standards.

Area of strength: This is a rating of 3 that indicates that the teacher consistently meets and sometimes exceeds expectations for performance in this position requirement. Performance can be improved in the area(s) indicated, but current practices are clearly acceptable.

Demonstrates excellence: This is a rating of 4 that indicates that the teacher does an outstanding job in this position requirement and no area of improvement is readily identifiable.

Preobservation conference: The preobservation conference is when the observer establishes a perspective on the setting, situation, or events to be observed as well as the participants in it. This conference is used for announced observations only.

Postobservation conference: The postobservation conference is conducted within 3 working days after each classroom observation. The purposes of this conference are to share results and to seek clarification of any events or practices that are puzzling to the evaluator.

Teacher Observation Analysis and Scoring Form: This form is used by the evaluator to assess all competencies, indicators, and descriptive items manifested by the teacher in a classroom observation setting.

Observation Supplement Form: This form is optional and is used during the scripting process to indicate the occurrence of various types of classroom actions or activities.

Observation Scripting Form: This is the form used by the evaluator to record all of his or her notes during the classroom observation. There are also categories on this form to record notes for oral or written structured interviews.

Announced observation: This observation is announced, thus giving teachers prior knowledge of when they will be observed.

Unannounced observation: This observation is unannounced, thus giving teachers no prior knowledge of when they may be observed.

Evaluation Summary Report: This is the instrument that the evaluator uses at the end of the process to record the scores of all data sources used to evaluate the teacher. The composite score is tabulated on this form as well as the indicator as to whether the tenured teacher met the evaluation standard or not.

These are crucial definitional terms that are part of the PEPE. In order for this evaluation system or process to be implemented effectively, these items must be clearly understood by teachers and administrators.

Organization of the Study

The study is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 includes the introduction, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, assumptions, limitations of the study, and definitions of terms. Chapter 2 includes a review of literature focusing on how perceptions of teacher evaluation are linked to teacher performance and student achievement. The specific topics to be covered in this chapter include teacher performance, teacher attitudes, teacher attitudes and performance linked to student achievement, and an explanation of the Current PEPE. A brief historical background of the development of the PEPE is also present. Chapter 3 presents information about the research design and methodology. Chapter 4 includes the perception survey analysis of

data. Chapter 5 includes a summary of the study, findings, conclusions, recommendations for practice, recommendations for further study, and implications.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Chapter 2 includes a review of literature focusing on teacher perceptions of teacher evaluation systems in reference to overall student achievement. Specific topics that will be covered are teacher performance, teacher attitudes, teacher attitudes and performance linked to student achievement, and an explanation of the current PEPE. A brief historical perspective of the PEPE will be discussed in terms of its origin and purpose.

Overview

Teacher evaluation, in terms of its construction and purpose, is indeed a national problem and, consequently, affects student achievement if it is not perceived as beneficial by teachers. Results from a replication of a study of teacher evaluation practices in the nation's 100 largest school districts indicate a large percentage of districts have begun to consider and implement means of controlling for adverse effects of evaluation context variables through adopting written policies and procedures for decision making (Loup, 1997). According to Annunziata (1997), teacher evaluation is viewed as a two-edged sword: one side purports the professional growth and the other side is poised above the practitioner demanding accountability for use in employment or licensure decisions. Teachers fear the evaluation process and this, combined with administrators' compelling

role to perform this task without thorough and meaningful feedback to teachers, makes the process perfunctory at best. In order for an evaluation system to be effective, it must be used in conjunction with an ongoing professional development program.

Teacher evaluation is a critical factor in any effort to validate teaching and learning and the successes of schools (Stronge & Ostrander, 1997). According to Van der Linde (1998), "the quality of the school is determined by teacher performance in the classroom more than by any other factor" (p. 332). Van der Linde also noted that supervisors play a key role in the monitoring and the facilitating of teachers in their tasks. It is imperative that teachers should be evaluated effectively and fairly in order to determine the areas where they need further development or improvement of their skills (Van der Linde). In conducting teacher evaluations, it is assumed that trademarks or characteristics of an excellent teacher are recognizable. In order for a teacher evaluation system to be credible and fair, stability and consistency of behavior must be evident or assumed (Stodolsky, 1984). Teacher evaluations serve both summative (employee decision making) and formative (clinical supervision model predicated on professional development of teachers) purposes. The common goal of all evaluations is to improve instruction, but the methodologies in doing so differ (Millman, 1981). An evaluation system must be understood and accepted in a positive light if, indeed, teachers and students are going to be beneficiaries of it (Stronge, 1997).

An evaluation system should be predicated on personnel standards (classroom management, teacher preparation, communication skills, etc.) of what an effective teacher should be (Sanders, 1997). When constructing or assessing evaluations, conditions of the environment, student composition, and psychometric and methodological aspects should

be linked to this process as well as to student achievement (McConney, Schalock, & Schalock, 1997). Van der Linde (1998) sees the Total Quality Management Program as the main focus and cause of a successful evaluation system and, ultimately, increased student achievement. In incorporating any evaluation system, inclusion of portfolios can have a tremendous impact on professional development and student achievement (Wolf, Lichtenstein, & Stevenson, 1997). According to Wolf et al., portfolios manifest true views of learning and teaching and give educators more insight and structure in enhancing their performance and, ultimately, the students' performance. If the evaluation system is going to be successful, there must be an emphasis on developing an effective and positive teacher in addition to achieving increased student achievement (Wolf et al.).

According to Mayo (1997), the total evaluation process must be designed to not only develop an effective and positive teacher, but also to increase student achievement through such an effective educator. Perception of, attitude toward, and comfort with the evaluation system and the rapport with the evaluator will enhance the chances of developing an effective and positive teacher and, as a result, increase student achievement (Mayo).

According to Lavely and Berger (1996), there is a state-of-the-art relationship between teachers' observation scores and students' academic achievement. Another major issue, nationwide, is the neglect or omission of the human element in the evaluation process. According to Wilson and Wood (1997), evaluation systems nationwide neglect the human element, which is key in enhancing student achievement. Also, according to Webb (1995), the traditional model of evaluation systems must include the human element in valuing the ways teachers and students use, hold, and construct knowledge if it is going

to be successful. Another ill or controversy that is centered around evaluation systems nationally is the accountability factor of linking the evaluation process to student achievement or student test scores (Webb).

There are pros and cons to the issue of linking the evaluation process to student achievement or student test scores. In respect to the negative aspect of this issue, it is clear that an effort to achieve success in enhancing student achievement through the evaluation process in the aforementioned manner presents a negative image of this process to teachers. Also, a negative consequence of linking teacher evaluations to student performance can be to discourage the creativity of teachers in terms of their teaching styles. According to the article "Should Student Test Scores Be Used to Evaluate Teachers," (1999), there is an agreement that, in order to be successful, teachers must be positive. As stated in the aforementioned article linking evaluation systems to test scores will force teachers to abandon units they know are valuable. They also see tests as being unable to measure intangibles such as love of the written or spoken word, communication, the inner warmth of participating in a successful cultural event, and the cooperative aspects of succeeding as a team or working together within and outside the classroom setting ("Should Students Test Scores"). According to the article "Should Students Test Scores," teachers state that these achievement tests are not true measurable instruments of a teacher's ability to produce or develop students in terms of being productive citizens, achieving success in working collaboratively to resolve issues, and performing critical thinking skills. It is obvious that teachers' negative views of the standardized tests are shared with the evaluation process when the two are linked

together. In this regard, teachers' negative attitudes will impact their performance and, ultimately, student achievement ("Should Students Test Scores").

According to Teven and McCroskey (1997), one assumption often made about teacher-student relationships is that the behavior patterns of teachers affect the behavior patterns of students. This assumption clearly manifests the importance of teacher attitude toward the evaluation system in impacting student achievement. According to Mayo (1997), supervision and the evaluation system have gone through many changes. Evaluation systems are now becoming more focused on professional development instead of just teacher competence. According to Bromley (1998), the evaluation of schools involves the creation of standards for assessing their effectiveness in developing the kind of workforce needed by the nation, and teacher competence is a key factor in this regard.

Based on recent evidence from the U. S. Department of Education, the financial situation of America's school is only average (or below average) for the 14 nations studied in the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES; 1996) report "Education in States and Nations." Overall, support for primary and secondary education, as a percentage of gross domestic product (GDP), places the U. S. 9th out of 14 nations. The United States is also 9th out of 14 in public expenditures per student as a percentage of GDP. In addition to this, America's schools must acknowledge and confront social conditions that are quite discouraging: "The percentage of American children 17 and younger living in poverty (21%) in 1991 exceeded all of the other 17 nations for which data are available" (Bromley, 1998, p. 1). Students in America are less engaged in studying outside of school than children in practically any other nation, as evidenced by the following: "The 29% who spend 2 hours or more doing homework daily ranks them below 14 other nations and

ahead of 4. They also rank high (5th out of 19) in the amount of time they spend watching television" (Bromley, p. 1). According to Bromley, in light of these disparaging statistics, schools and teachers have done a respectable job. Schools exist to serve the broad spectrum of social services and to provide educational opportunities to children.

According to Hirsch (1996), the readiness-to-learn principle is measured grade by grade. From the standpoint of effective policy, the readiness-to-learn principle must be an annual one, requiring yearly monitoring and compensatory learning for those who may have drifted below the readiness plateau for the upcoming grade. The policy implication must be the introduction of such grade-by-grade accountability and incentives for everyone concerned with schooling: parents, children, teachers, schools, and districts. Without clear and specific definitions of what, for example, readiness for second grade means, it is not possible to monitor and rectify deficits in a timely way (Hirsch). According to Stringfield (1998), who draws from the literature on high reliability organization, exceptional schools will likely have the following traits:

1. They will have clear goals and will not tolerate failure of people or equipment.
2. They will be alert to the unexpected and be prepared to adapt.
3. They will constantly monitor performance and act quickly to correct failures.
4. They will employ logical decision analysis.
5. They will recruit extensively and train constantly.
6. They will take performance evaluation seriously throughout the system.
7. They will strive to keep the confidence of others.
8. They will not cut corners in their pursuit of excellence. (p. 6)

All of these elements are closely linked with successful performance evaluations, and schools and teachers must subscribe to incorporate these traits. According to Darling-Hammond (1998), teacher evaluations must enhance teacher performance in conjunction with student achievement. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future,

developed by Darling-Hammond, emphasizes this need by pointing to teacher quality as the most critical determinant of student performance (Darling-Hammond).

According to Falk and Ort (1998), in order for students to have richer learning experiences and reach more challenging goals, school systems must develop the capacity of teachers via a long-range capacity approach that offers meaningful, intellectual, social and emotional engagement with ideas, with materials, and with colleagues both inside and outside the classroom. This must be done in lieu of the short-term training model, which research and experience have shown to have limitations (Falk & Ort). Teacher involvement with performance-based assessment is an area rich in potential for professional learning. In 1991, the state of New York launched a variety of initiatives to improve student learning (Falk & Ort). The agenda for change included articulating rigorous standards, building the capacities of teachers to use a range of strategies to help students achieve the standards, and designing and using new forms of assessment that better support and reflect what is being taught (Falk & Ort). The New York State Goals 2000 New Assessment Project, during the 1995-1996 school year, consisted of nine assessments in four disciplines administered to approximately 1,200 elementary, middle, and high school students by 500 teachers representing more than 100 districts across the state (Falk & Ort). One half of the teachers participated in the end of the year scoring conference, and although there were other objectives concerning assessments, the focus here was to scrutinize the professional development possibilities of a standards-based performance assessment system. In examining this component via scoring the students' work, several ideas emerged. The following ideas came from the scoring exercise:

1. Teachers began to learn about their teaching style, students' discipline, and New York State standards via collaboration with each other.

2. Working or networking with colleagues was considered the most valuable part of their experience.
3. Reviewing standards with colleagues helped teachers to understand state expectations for students and have a clear understanding as to how they had to modify their techniques to meet these standards as well as clarify how their views differed from or agreed with the state's. (Falk & Ort, 1998, p. 3)

Scoring the students' responses showed teachers how to relate the purpose of the standards to the students' work. The project deepened the teachers' knowledge of their disciplines, gave them a better understanding of methodologies and approaches students are embodied with in the learning process, and gave teachers tremendous insight into the learning processes of students. According to Falk and Ort (1998), performance assessments not only provide more direct and valid information about student progress than has ever been offered by traditional assessments, but they also yield information that is useful to teachers through a process that both validates and enhances teachers' knowledge. Performance assessments have the potential to powerfully link instruction, assessment, student learning, and teachers' professional development (Falk & Ort).

Compared to the New York State Goals 2000 New Assessment Project, the Kentucky Education Reform Act has limitations and problems when it comes to school accountability. According to the study conducted by Jones and Whitford (1997), the Kentucky Instructional Results Information System (KIRIS) turns the results of student performance assessments into a "school score" that the state uses to determine rewards or sanctions for teachers and administrators. It has become increasingly clear that this connection undermines the instructional benefits of student performance assessment and forces teachers to focus on whatever is thought to raise test scores rather than on instruction aimed at addressing individual student needs. The evolution of KIRIS was influenced by six elements: outcome definition, student assessment, local control of

curriculum, accountability index, expected rate of improvement, and rewards and sanctions. These goals were embedded into 75 "valued outcomes" upon which the KIRIS was predicated. The valued outcomes were modified after close observation and, over the course of time, the KIRIS testing became less open and performance-based because of low reliability based on a variety of responses and more judgment needed to score the variety in responses because of its open-endedness and performance assessments foci. Schools were being evaluated arbitrarily based on their comparisons with other schools and not individual progress. Because of the expectations of the Kentucky Education Reform Act, predicated on the belief that all students can learn at optimal levels, schools had to score 100 out of 140 points within 20 years to achieve the "proficient" level and meet state accountability standards. School administrators and teachers became very dissatisfied because they felt this was arbitrary. Rewards and sanctions would be based on schools reaching this level of proficiency. The effects of the KIRIS in light of high stakes accountability is not clear in terms of students' increased achievement, because other factors, such as teacher methodology modifications, school size, and test-taking skills are part of the formula of increased student achievement. A recent study of the KIRIS suggests that educators are focusing more on teaching successful test-taking skills to students rather than demonstrating and emphasizing improved learning. Some Kentucky educators argue that the KIRIS has essentially evolved into a system that is not "primarily performance-based" as the Kentucky Education Reform Act mandated (Jones & Whitford). Wiggins (1993) argues that, to use performance assessment to improve learning, a number of principles must be followed: assessment must flow from the immediate curriculum, students must know what the standards for performance are, and

feedback must be immediate and specific. A system devoted to aggregating student results in order to produce an annual accountability score for schools pays little attention to such principles. High stakes accountability has lessened the effects of the KIRIS in terms of being a performance-based assessment tool.

In summary, these are just some of the concerns associated with teacher evaluation systems nationwide that need to be addressed and remedied collaboratively by teachers and administrators in an effort to boost teacher attitude, performance, and, ultimately, student achievement.

Teacher Performance

Pasch et al. (1993) conducted a study for the purpose of getting urban teachers' perceptions as to what it takes to be successful in teaching in the urban setting. The study involved 90 teachers who were employed in school districts in Detroit, Cleveland, and Milwaukee. The end results of this study showed that the most frequent responses to successful teaching were categorized and prioritized as follows: (a) home, community, classroom, and school conditions, (b) individual needs of the learner, and (c) pedagogical aspects of the teacher in presenting the curriculum. According to Illmer et al. (1997), the AT&T Education Foundation's Teachers for Tomorrow Initiative was conducted for the purpose of improving teacher preparation of urban teachers via the university teacher preparation programs. The following questions were addressed in this study: (a) What factors do urban teachers identify as fundamental for successful teaching? and (b) How do these factors compare with those university student teachers and university educators identify as fundamental to successful urban teaching?

A Detroit AT&T Project study was conducted by Illmer et al. (1997). The participants consisted of 45 teachers, 18 student teachers, and 10 teacher education faculty. Sixty-two (85%) of the subjects were female, 39 (53%) were African American, 31 (43%) were Caucasian, and 3 (4%) were Asian American. The goal here was to analyze data in terms of what themes were recognized as critical and prioritized as key factors associated with successful urban teaching. There were 45 themes, and 41.2% of the responses accounted for the seven highest ranked themes. The most frequent theme, with 9.6% of the responses of all teachers, was knowledge of community and culture. The second most frequent theme, with 7.5% of the responses from experienced teaches only, was teachers' attitudes. The teachers felt that they had to bring a diligent attitude along with compassion and integrity in order to be successful in teaching. The third most frequent theme was that of being a positive motivator in challenging the students to achieve. The belief or attitude of teachers that all children can learn is an underlying measure here. The fourth most frequent theme was instructional style and teaching methods, which accounted for 5.9% of the responses. Teaching styles and methodologies are underlying factors here. The fifth most frequent theme was community resources. This accounted for 4.0% of the teachers' responses. The sixth most frequent theme was school climate, and it accounted for 3.6% of the teachers' responses. Some of the teachers believed that it was their role to improve the environment in an effort to increase student achievement. The seventh most frequent theme was subject matter, which accounted for 3.5% of the teachers' responses. The underlying factor here is that teachers who are experienced and successful are very competent and knowledgeable about the subject matter which they teach. These were, in essence, the responses (41.2%) by experienced

teachers to the first research question on what their perceptions were of the characteristics and factors one must have in order to be an effective teacher. The first research question of this study focused upon factors experienced urban teachers cited as fundamental for successful teaching in urban schools. The experienced teachers indicated that contextual, personal, and pedagogical factors have a direct impact and influence upon successful teaching in urban schools (Illmer et al., 1997).

The second research question in the study conducted by Illmer et al. (1997) focused on comparing factors experienced teachers identified as fundamental to urban teaching with those factors a group of student teachers and a group of urban teacher educators identified. In the study, both experienced teachers and teacher educators thought that instructional methods and techniques were more important than did the student teachers. This study supports the view that collegiality between experienced urban teachers and urban educators in enhancing improvement efforts for preparing pre-service teachers is beneficial. Traditionally, teacher evaluation has served two unequal purposes. Its primary purpose has been to determine a teacher's suitability for continued employment (Illmer et al.). Fewer educators have considered evaluation as a way to provide teachers with feedback on performance. Professional development, clearly the most beneficial purpose of evaluation, has less formal support in schools (Furtwengler, 1992; Rooney, 1993).

Searfoss and Enz (1996) conducted a study to determine perceptions of evaluations in holistic classrooms. The participants in the study were principals and teachers from seven districts in the central areas of the city of Phoenix, Arizona. The

students of the respective schools were from low socioeconomic, multilingual, and multicultural backgrounds.

The principals interviewed in the Searfoss and Enz (1996) study were female and representative of a variety of ethnic backgrounds and extreme variations in chronological age and experience in school administration. The principals were divided in that 10 had experience with constructivist practice and the other 10 had none or very little experience assessing this kind of instruction; however, they were familiar with it from a theoretical perspective. The results of the principals' responses created three patterns. First, all principals experienced in evaluating holistic instruction felt that the direct instruction instrument used in their districts clearly identified effective teachers. Secondly, even though these principals felt that this instrument accurately distinguished mediocre, average, and outstanding performances of teachers, they felt that the instrument was limited in capturing natural teacher-student interactions in the classroom settings. Thirdly, although the majority of the principals had a favorable opinion of holistic teachers and the techniques of this instruction, they were hesitant to change their current evaluation systems to accommodate holistic teachers and instruction. The principals were more concerned with teacher grievances, time management, and abiding by their districts' wishes to be consistent in evaluating everyone fairly to avoid litigation. They were less concerned with developing an evaluation process which stresses professional development. There were 36 teachers interviewed in this study who were trained in holistic, integrated practices, and their years of experience ranged from a minimum of 5 years to a maximum of 23 years. The teachers were in total agreement that direct instruction instruments, as opposed to holistic instruction, were not true assessments of

their teaching performance. When asked about their principals' understanding or knowledge of the holistic approach, almost half of the teachers said that their principals understand this practice from either a theoretical or practical perspective. The remaining teachers felt that their principals were not knowledgeable of the practice and that their principals' attitudes toward this practice were, in some cases, not supportive. The teachers basically presented traditional instruction when they were observed because of their perceived attitudes of their principals. In the cases where the principals were knowledgeable of this type of instruction, they asked their teachers to abandon this practice when they were formally observed and to use direct instruction instead. The ignorance and unsupportive attitudes of the principals angered and disappointed the teachers and made them feel unappreciated. The teachers also felt that the students were being dealt an injustice by not being allowed to interact freely in a discovery mode of learning. They also felt that the collaboration with their peers on holistic instruction and the efforts to enhance it were lost because of the attitudes of their principals. Indeed, the aspects of collegiality, professional development, and positive attitudes were being ignored, and this reinforced the concerns of teachers on teacher evaluation procedures (Searfoss & Enz).

In an effort to promote professional development, teachers must become an integral part of the assessment process along with the administrators (Costa & Kallick, 1993; Glickman, 1992; Leithwood, 1992). The results of the studies conducted by Costa and Kallick (1993), Glickman (1992), and Leithwood (1992) show a need for a collaborative evaluation process that gives teachers the opportunity to grow professionally together. Collegiality must be linked with in-service training and teacher evaluation

procedures. The comments made by administrators on evaluations, to teachers and the understanding of those comments by teachers in terms of professional growth, are meaningless and inconsistent at best, according to many teachers and principals. Also, in many instances, professional development programs do not coincide with what a teacher truly needs and what the administrator says she or he needs in developing professionally (Koehler, 1996).

Koehler (1996) went on to indicate that, in an effort to avoid this paradox, principal Al Cohen, at Caruso Junior High School in Deerfield, Illinois, set up a collegial and democratic approach to help develop professional growth for his teachers and a tool of evaluation, simultaneously. Cohen worked collectively with his teachers in identifying concerns, needs, and topics of the school. In addition to identifying their interests, the teachers were given the responsibility of identifying experts who could come in and train them in the areas of interest identified.

Teachers were assigned to groups with similar interests. After consultants had been identified collaboratively by Mr. Cohen and the teachers, the consultants were asked to meet with the respective groups of teachers at least three times during the school year. Between these meetings, the respective groups of teachers worked collegially to reinforce what the consultants had taught via in-service programs that were provided once or twice during the school year. After these interactions of small group meetings and collegial supervision, the administrators evaluated the teachers based on how they integrated what they had learned in their teaching. In this situation, the evaluation process of professional development via in-service supervision and evaluation has been formulated. The key to the success of this evaluation process is that the teachers were involved collaboratively and

have accepted the concept of administrative evaluation designed to determine whether the concepts have been integrated into their instructional repertoires (Koehler, 1996).

By placing a higher priority on teacher evaluation, administrators can have a greater impact on teacher performance and the quality of education (McGrath, 1995). Low teacher morale and lack of confidence toward schools are just two factors leading to teacher incompetence and poor performance. The most effective way to prevent a teacher from becoming incompetent is through a continued open, honest, and clear system of communication, evaluation, and commendation (McGrath). A structure for positive reinforcement for excellence and achievement must be in place. In an effort to see the benefits of professional growth in connection with teachers' performance, Danville Public Schools in Virginia decided to replace its conventional teacher evaluation system with such a plan (Edwards, 1995). Principals, teachers, and central office administrators met for several months to develop a plan that would enhance teacher growth. In their dialogue, the system members found fear, distrust, and bureaucracy as obstacles to teacher development and improvement (Edwards). They also discovered in their dialogue that teachers were totally dissatisfied with the current evaluation system because it did not improve teaching or student achievement (Edwards). The teachers, in essence, felt that the process was inept, fruitless, a meaningless ritual, and a waste of time (Edwards). The group, after many meetings, agreed upon the following four principles:

1. Growth and development are best achieved in an environment marked by mutual respect and trust.
2. Teachers are professionals and will make responsible decisions about their growth and development.
3. Teachers will provide a caring classroom environment for all students in an atmosphere that facilitates learning.
4. Reflection and analysis are essential for the professional growth of teaches and the successful practice of teaching. (Edwards, 1995, pp. 1-2)

The first step in the new plan was for each teacher to reflect about his or her performance and write a self-evaluation. Next, the teacher and principal met to review the narrative, at which time the teacher was to choose a particular growth plan with two options. The principal had the right to direct a teacher toward a particular plan, but a clear written rationale had to support this decision. After one year of implementing the growth plan, several impressive examples were observed:

1. An elementary teacher developed an individual growth plan where she asked her students for their views about what was of value to them from the curriculum and her teaching. The teacher incorporated the students' ideas in her planning.
2. A first-year teacher worked collaboratively with a mentor teacher in an effort to improve classroom management skills. As a result, the first-year teacher improved tremendously in classroom management, and the veteran teacher became satisfied and more enthusiastic as a result.
3. Many first-year and non-tenured teachers were excited about the structured growth component that focused on growth rather than ratings. This enhanced their attitudes and they felt more supported in their efforts towards professional development.
4. Last but not least, a disgruntled teacher assigned to intensive support made great improvement in classroom management and instructional areas. (Edwards, 1995, p. 3)

The Danville Public School System is beginning to move from assessing teachers' performance to assessing professional growth (Edwards). The belief here is that if administrators respect teachers and have confidence that they are capable of making professional choices about their growth, the students will reap the benefits and teachers will improve (Edwards, 1995).

Teacher Attitudes

According to Kulinna and Silverman (1999), it is critical that teachers feel they have some influence in the decision making of the development and implementation of

such a process if, indeed, they are going to feel good about it, develop professionally, and ultimately produce increased student achievement. For example, individual teachers have different beliefs regarding the relative merits of physical education, which, in turn, affect their performance in that area. Their performance will ultimately have an effect upon their students' attitudes and performances (Kulinna & Silverman).

According to Wolfhagen and Gijselaers (1997), there are four conditions linked with the success or the usefulness of evaluation results: (a) willingness to adopt a critical attitude, (b) willingness to analyze the existing situation, (c) opportunity to discuss and carry on a dialogue, and (d) availability of a plan of action. The emergence and evolution of attitudes, values, and beliefs of teacher training is of central importance to teacher education (Parker & Spink, 1997). In a study conducted by Huetinet and Munshin (1995), assessing computer visualization in teaching secondary mathematics (visualization math) was effective in helping teachers develop their skills and change their teaching behaviors because of the following areas: (a) collaboration on teacher input, (b) summative and formative assessment, and (c) professional development. These areas are key in enhancing performances and attitudes of teachers (Huetinet and Munshin). In a study entitled "Views of Teacher Evaluations From Novice and Expert Evaluators," conducted by Bryant and Currin (1995), the views of many critics, both past and present, on teacher evaluations were discussed. An example of one of the views that was supported by the conclusions of this study were those of Gitlin and Price (1992) who, in essence, stated that teachers should have a voice in the process where they could have some type of recourse against anarchical views of administrators and also be provided an atmosphere and opportunities where they could work together collaboratively in enhancing their growth and the process

as well. This type of collaboration is referred to as "horizontal evaluation" (Gitlin & Price). Wilhelm (as cited in Bryant & Currin, 1995), in an introduction to Cogan's work on supervision, wrote that the object "is to ripen up a genuine partnership in which there is no supervisor-subordinate relationship, no assumption to the supervisor 'teaching the teacher'" (p. 1). There is a movement towards learner-centered schools and teacher decision making and collaborative efforts in reference to problem solving, and this indicates a need for teachers to be empowered and motivated about this process if success is to occur (Cogan). The goal in the teacher evaluation process is to assist teachers in developing their skills, discovering new skills, and enhancing their abilities to interact with students (Bryant & Currin, 1995). This requires a different attitude on the part of administrators and should enhance the attitudes of teachers towards their profession if this is implemented effectively. Guba and Lincoln (1989) found the following flaws in the evaluation process based on the positive paradigm that could inhibit success:

1. Reification of managerialism occurs, in which the manager stands outside the process and makes judgments about the work of the teacher.
2. A manager-oriented evaluation system disempowers those being evaluated by affording them no voice in the analysis of their practice.
3. Manager silences teacher voice in the construction of experience.
4. Because teachers want to be successful in relation to a managerial-oriented system, they discount their views in an effort to work with the managerial system that they feel compelled to abide by in attaining a successful rating, but certainly not self-fulfillment in terms of their beliefs. (p. 2)

The participants in the study of novices and expert evaluators consisted of 12 administrators (6 novices and 6 experts). All of the administrators conducted observations and were interviewed on the same day to get their reflections on their observations. The novice and expert groups differed in their observations of teaching performances in the following areas:

1. Focus of attention. Experts put their focus on teacher behavior and novices put their focus on teacher, students, and classroom atmosphere conditions.

2. Recording of data. Experts scripted verbatim and captured great amounts of verbal detail. Novices were not as thorough, wrote less, and were less focused on the teachers, in this regard.

3. Suspension of judgment. Experts did not reach conclusions about the observation experiences until the post-conferences with the teachers were held. Novice evaluators drew conclusions during the observation experiences.

4. Definition of teacher-evaluator relationship. Experts saw their role as that of a partnership or facilitator to teachers, and novice evaluators saw their role strictly as that of a monitor (Bryant & Currin, 1995).

The study by Bryant and Currin (1995) shows that before real change occurs in schools as a result of a successful evaluation process, there needs to be a deeper understanding of the teacher evaluation process. The novice evaluators viewed themselves and teachers as separate entities in this process, which is termed vertical evaluation. The experts, on the other hand, viewed the experience as that of a partnership between themselves and the teachers in working together for success, which is termed horizontal evaluation. Senge (1990) states that if teachers are going to be intrinsically motivated, then the evaluation process must move in the direction of the views of the experts in the Bryant and Currin study. Stiggins and Duke (1998) wrote, "We do not need further refinements of traditional accountability-driven evaluation systems. He [McGreal] asserts as we do, that flexible, individualized teacher-centered evaluation is essential for professional development to occur" (p. 9). The experts in this study clearly indicate that

the evaluation process must be a mutual partnership between the teacher and the evaluator, aimed at a mutual construction of understanding (Bryant & Currin). This will clearly enhance attitudes about the process and will ultimately affect student achievement positively as a result.

In an effort to improve the evaluation process and her school, and give teachers input in improving and developing that process, Jan Rooney, principal at Pleasant Hill School in Palatine, Illinois, decided to meet with her teachers to be evaluated for that particular school year. The purpose of the meeting was to examine the current evaluation system's weaknesses and see how they could modify and improve it together so that teachers could grow professionally (Rooney, 1993). Some of the components of the new plan developed by the principal and teachers are listed below:

1. The initial planning meeting that was conducted was considered the pre-conference, thus eliminating individual pre-conferences and saving time.
2. All visits by the principal would be considered formal, and the principal was committed to visiting the classrooms quite often.
3. In lieu of formal observations, teachers agreed to visit each other. The principal agreed to substitute for the teachers in an effort to allow this to happen.
4. After visiting each other the teachers would meet, fulfilling the post-conference requirement, and the principal would be present as well. The principal's role was to facilitate the conversation in a formative way exclusive of summative or evaluative remarks.
5. The plan or procedure would be replicated the second semester and the teachers had a chance of observing or visiting the same individuals or different ones.
6. The final conference at the end of the year would be one where the principal and individual teachers would talk one-on-one. Both the principal and the teachers felt this was necessary.
7. Any teacher who wanted to go back to the old system could do so, but none of them did so.
8. The plan was scheduled to be assessed at the end of the year for changes or to see if they wanted to revert to the old system.
9. The year was a success, and the teachers gained tremendous insights into the teachings of others and became greatly involved in discussing instruction and working together. (pp. 2-3)

Rooney went on to indicate that, in its second year, the plan was even better, and together the teachers and principal learned even more. Rooney concluded from this experience that support and encouragement have a much more positive impact than criticism. Also, it is very clear that the change of attitude toward the system based on collaborative and democratic efforts between the teachers and principal has, indeed, enhanced the performance levels of the teachers. Rooney also clearly saw that she was no longer responsible for the teaching behavior of her teachers, but that they were responsible for their professional development both individually and collectively.

Working together and providing positive feedback can certainly enhance attitude, diligence, and productivity. The belief that workers want to do a good job and make a significant contribution has been widely espoused (Deming, 1986; Hackman & Oldman, 1980). The vast majority of teachers in training and in practice state that their number one motive for teaching is altruistic--to help others learn (Frase, 1992). The direct connection between educators' motivation to work and their job role is the key ingredient for expressing what Csikszentmihalyi (1990) called "autoletic" jobs, which deliver flow, the optimal experience. Workers find an inextricable, intrinsic motivation for the autoletic job (Frase). To keep this motivation vital, these jobs must provide variety, challenges, clear goals, and immediate feedback (Frase). Frequent classroom visitation and involvement in instruction can give administrators the tools they need in an effort to provide worthwhile and timely feedback to teachers in boosting motivation, attitude, and ultimately performance (Frase).

According to Frase (1992), successful supervision and evaluation programs are designed to capitalize on powerful internal motivators, resulting in improved performance

and higher personal satisfaction. A study by Rothberg and Fenner (1991), involving 230 teachers from schools in eight central Florida counties, was conducted at the University of Central Florida in Orlando. The study concerned the helpfulness of teacher assessment, adequacy of observation and feedback in fostering improvement, and typical procedures in teacher evaluation. Constant themes of designing more feedback, wanting professional objectives articulated, collegiality in terms of networking, and visiting other teachers' classrooms were quite clear. Teachers appear to have positive feelings regarding more observation and feedback, both collegial and supervisory, for the purpose of professional growth (Rothberg & Fenner). These elements, if implemented properly, can boost motivation and attitudes of teachers not only to learn more but to perform better (Rothberg & Fenner). The focus of evaluation efforts must be shifted from meeting the demands of the district office to fulfilling the needs of the classroom teacher (Brazer, 1991). This can enhance teacher attitudes and motivation as well. If an evaluation system is to be successful, teachers must be treated as professionals and partners in the decision-making aspects that affect the evaluation system (Taebel, 1990). Teachers are more likely to accept the process with a positive attitude if this takes place (Taebel, 1990).

Link Between Teacher Performance/Attitudes and Student Achievement

In his overview of process-product research, Brophy (1986, as cited in Lavely & Berger, 1996) observed that "the last 15 years have finally produced an orderly knowledge base linking teacher behavior to student achievement" (p. 2). Brophy and Good (1996) concluded that "teacher-proof curriculum" will not work, but current innovators will have to work through, not around, teachers to enhance student achievement. In an overview of

state-level public school teacher evaluation plans. Trentham, Cardin, Holbrook, and Hunt (1987) noted that some relationships had actually been reported, including in Arizona where significant positive correlations were observed between elementary teacher competency levels and student achievement, and in Florida where a Pearson correlation coefficient of .42 was found between a teacher assessment instrument and student achievement gains. There have been several studies conducted with student and beginning teachers linking teacher performance and student achievement (Lavely & Berger). Some of these studies are noted in the following paragraphs.

Carpie, Elliott, and Johnson (1980), correlated Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI) ratings on student teachers with achievement gains of their pupils and found that 75 of 154 correlations were positive.

Carpie, Tobin, and Bowell (1980), using 33 elementary student teachers, correlated TPAI ratings taken on two occasions with achievement gains of their pupils. On the first occasion 77 of 105 and on the second occasion 54 of 200 were significantly positively related to achievement.

In Oklahoma, in a study of 20 beginning teachers, those whose students had the highest achievement gains, were observed as effective behavior managers (McBee & Crawford, 1987). Of 26 teacher behaviors that correlated with gains in student achievement, 21 were positively related and 5 were negatively related. The positive correlation coefficient ranged from .41 to .69, with most in the .40s and .50s. The negative correlation coefficient ranged from -.42 to -.63. The conclusions here are that the most promising instruments are the TPAI, Teacher Assessment and Development System (TADS), and Florida Performance Measurement System (FPMS). The correlations

between observation performance ratings and knowledge achievement test scores were modest for student or beginning teachers except for the correlations for the teachers whose pupils had the highest achievement gains. These were more substantial (Lavely & Berger, 1996).

Schools cannot be effective, and instruction cannot work, without high quality classroom assessment (Stiggins, 1999). Ineffectiveness in schools most often arises from a lack of expertise, time, and resources needed to increase student achievement. Thus, it is evident that students and teachers control school quality (Stiggins). According to Wilcox and Schonberger (1998), a positive attitude has to accompany assessment if, indeed, assessment is going to be successful for teachers and learners. Positive feedback encourages and motivates students to take the next step in their learning. If we think of assessment as a part of the scaffolding to get us to the next level, it lessens our fears and increases our confidence (Wilcox & Schonberger, 1998). According to Airasian and Gullickson (1997), teachers must incorporate self-evaluations that involve decision making and self-improvement. Also, according to Wilcox and Schonberger, reflecting and questioning are helpful to teachers in making judgments about their knowledge, performance, and beliefs, and opportunities because collaboration and professional growth are essential to improving one's practice. Effective assessment can improve instruction and learning. Reflections on teaching (self-evaluation), input from students, and dialogue with colleagues (collegiality) often offer insight into more constructive ways to assess and learn. Assessment is a powerful tool and can help or hinder learning (Wilcox & Schonberger).

Because there is significant evidence that teachers' beliefs influence their instructional practice (Zollman & Mason, 1992), and that principals are critical players in restructuring reform initiatives (Hord & Hall, 1987), a major study was conducted by Futch and Stephens (1997) in the state of Georgia to measure the beliefs of public school mathematics teachers and administrators about the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Curriculum and Evaluation Standards for School Mathematics (NCTM). Inappropriate teaching practices are linked to inadequate teacher beliefs about mathematics (Ferrini-Mundy, 1996), and teachers' adherence to a particular set of beliefs may set limits on mathematical learning by students (Bauch, 1984). The question of whether there are consistent beliefs regarding the NCTM among public school teachers and administrators was assessed via the Standards Beliefs Instrument (Zollman & Mason). There was a concentrated effort in Georgia to reform mathematics using the NCTM. The survey included 172 administrators and 1,264 teachers. The following research questions were answered:

1. On which items, if any, do teachers agree with beliefs underlying NCTM Standards?
2. On which items, if any, do principals agree with beliefs underlying the NCTM Standards?
3. On which items, if any, do teachers and principals differ in their agreement with beliefs underlying the NCTM Standards?
4. On which items, if any, do teachers at different grade levels differ in their agreement with beliefs underlying the NCTM Standards? (Futch & Stephens, 1997, p. 61)

Teachers and principals showed strong agreement that students should share problem-solving approaches with fellow students, that math can be thought of as a language that must be meaningful if students are to communicate and apply math productivity, and that math should be integrated into the curriculum (Futch & Stephens,

1997). Teachers and principals further agreed that problem solving is a process whereby students can develop the belief that they have the power to control their own success in math: children should be encouraged to justify solutions. thinking and conjecturing in various ways: children should connect ideas both among and within areas of math: and a demonstration of a good reasoning should be more highly regarded than a student's ability to find correct answers (Futch & Stephens).

Teachers disagreed with the belief that children enter kindergarten knowledgeable of math concepts. Principals also disagreed with this belief to some extent. Teachers also disagreed. to some extent. that children should have calculators available to them. Principals. to some extent. disagreed with this as well. Both teachers and principals disagreed with the belief that decreased attention should be given to reading and writing numbers symbolically. that skill in computation should precede skill in word problems in the K-4 curriculum. and that the learning of mathematics is not a process of repeated practice and reinforcement (Futch & Stephens. 1997).

The middle school math teachers and their administrators were in agreement with NCTM standards regarding their beliefs about the collaborative nature of the learning process (Futch & Stephens. 1997). These beliefs appear to be compatible with the philosophical understandings of the nature and needs of middle grade students in the Georgia Model of the middle school (Futch & Stephens).

According to Wilson and Ireton (1997). attitudes are important in the evaluation process. In order for a teacher to be effective. positive. and accepting of such a tool. fear must be minimized or eliminated. Teacher evaluation is feared by every teacher. but especially by beginning teachers. Beginning teachers do not always know what to expect

when they are being evaluated for the first time. This is the reason there should always be a preconference that explains and familiarizes the new teacher with the standards to be used for an initial evaluation. This will enhance the chance of success for the novice teacher by soothing fears and providing a relaxing attitude to the evaluation process via simple communication in a facilitating and nonthreatening manner (Wilson & Ireton, 1997).

There has been much research in an effort to link teacher behavior with student achievement (Brophy & Good, 1996). Teacher behavior is a direct result of, among other things, teacher attitude and or perception. Differences in teacher attitude have been found to be related to differences in teaching behaviors (Nespor, 1985). Differences in attitude have been found to influence differences in student learning (Ramsey & Ransley, 1986). The Teaching Behaviors Questionnaire (TBQ) was developed to inventory attitudes regarding research-based effective teaching behavior (Marchant & Bowers, 1990). This instrument is helpful in providing inexperienced, experienced, and prospective teachers with extra knowledge and insights concerning their beliefs about what effective teaching behaviors are (Marchant & Bowers).

The TBQ was tested in two studies by Marchant and Bowers (1990). The first study consisted of a population of 300 teachers at elementary and secondary levels. Marchant and Bowers found that there were variations in scores based on the variables of grade and school levels, teaching experience, and gender.

The second study (Marchant & Bowers, 1990) involved 500 participants, including elementary and secondary principals and teachers, college education faculty, and undergraduate students. There was a significant difference in the TBQ scores among the

respective groups. The results indicate that continued research might lead to additional insights related to attitudes toward research-based effective teaching behaviors and other variables (Marchant & Bowers). The research also shows the TBQ would be a good tool for reflective teaching and could play a role in pre- and postservice teacher training (Shon, 1987). The instrument, indeed, can be a valuable resource for research in assisting school districts with identification of areas of weakness related to specific teaching behaviors, thus providing an avenue for determining needs assessments for professional development (Marchant & Bowers).

Aghadiuno (1996) conducted a study involving 460 secondary students and 25 secondary teachers in an effort to explain secondary student achievement in chemistry on the basis of student attitudes in general, as well as attitudes toward the subject. The implication in this study was very clear: teachers having positive attitudes were a major factor in students developing positive attitudes in general and toward the subject matter. The attitudes of teachers toward the subject influence student attitudes and, ultimately, affect student achievement (Aghadiuno). According to Taebel (1990), evaluation systems must be fair to all teachers if teacher attitudes, evaluation scores, and student performances are to be improved. For example, if music teachers are to be evaluated, a concerted effort must be made to get music teachers involved in developing an evaluation instrument that fairly and successfully evaluates competencies in the area of music. This new relationship must be founded on two propositions: (a) Teachers are professionals and (b) teachers are partners in all major decision affecting the evaluation process. Excellence cannot be legislated or mandated; it must be nurtured and acknowledged (Taebel).

Skechtman (1993) conducted a study involving 73 Israeli elementary school students assessed by school faculty as poorly adjusted and in need of counseling. The findings of the study indicated that those students who received counseling or therapy made significant progress in their interpersonal relationships, behavior, and achievement scores. These results were based on teacher evaluations of students' attitudes toward teachers, peers, and the students' current and potential academic status. The implication here is that attitude is critical in the success of teachers and students, individually and collectively (Skechtman).

Most studies suggest that the improvement of teachers in the areas of attitudes and professional development will affect student achievement. Even though there appears to be sufficient research linking teacher attitudes with student achievement, more research is recommended in this area (Marchant & Bowers, 1990).

Professional Education Personnel Evaluation Program of Alabama (PEPE)

The PEPE is the evaluation system that is currently being used in the state of Alabama to evaluate all certified educational personnel (Alabama State Department of Education, 1998). Although the PEPE is the sanctioned evaluation instrument for all certified personnel, for the purpose of this dissertation, only the teacher evaluation aspects of the PEPE will be discussed. From a historical perspective (Alabama State Department of Education), the PEPE was initiated in 1994, when the Alabama State Legislature and Alabama State Board of Education approved the accountability law, which required all certified personnel to be evaluated on a statewide evaluation system. All school districts in the state of Alabama must comply with this law. The law, in essence, requires all school

systems to use the PEPE as the official evaluation instrument or design another evaluation program, subject to approval by the Alabama State Board of Education, based on the standards and competencies of the PEPE. The Alabama State Board of Education adopted the Evaluation Accountability Law in accordance with the state accountability law (Alabama State Department of Education). After the passage of the accountability law, a statewide advisory committee was created in 1995 to formulate the competencies, indicators, standards, and professional development components for the PEPE. The committee consisted of elementary and secondary teachers, principals, counselors, superintendents, assistant superintendents, central office supervisors, Alabama Education Association representatives, university deans, state department administrators, consultants, and Parent-Teacher Association representatives. The committee met quarterly for 1 year, and field-tested and finalized the evaluation instrument in 1996. Training for administrators to become reliable and certified evaluators was set up and completed prior to the school year 1997, which was the target date for the PEPE to go into effect. The goal of the PEPE was to be both formative in developing teachers in an effort to boost student achievement and summative in making appropriate employment decisions regarding teachers (Alabama State Department of Education). Listed below are the standards and components of the PEPE:

1. The PEPE has a strong professional development program that focuses on the following: personal/professional, student achievement, weaknesses from full evaluation cycle, self-assessment, and leadership.

2. The PEPE consists of the following data sources for a full evaluation cycle: self-assessment, written/oral structured interview observations, supervisors review form, and a professional development plan.

3. Full evaluation cycle (nontenured personnel undergo this cycle for 3 consecutive years or until attainment of tenure).

4. Multiyear cycle (tenured personnel are assigned PDPs) to complete within 1 to 2 years with personal/professional and student achievement as the main goals. There must be a collaborative effort between the teacher and administrator in developing the PDPs.

5. The PEPE is predicated on a 3-year cycle, in which all teachers are designated to have at least one full evaluation during that period.

6. The standard that all tenured teachers must meet is a composite score of 20 out of a possible 32.

7. The PEPE measures eight main competencies: teacher preparation, student assessment, classroom management, positive climate, communication, professional development, professional responsibilities, and orientation of lesson.

8. The PEPE evaluators are certified and reliable in all of the aforementioned competencies.

9. Teachers can be evaluated only by certified PEPE evaluators.

10. All teachers are to receive a thorough orientation annually before undergoing the PEPE.

11. The PEPE has an appeals process applicable to procedural errors by evaluators only.

12. In addition to the PEPE Advisory Committee, there is a PEPE Summative Standards Setting Committee, whose job it is to seek concerns from teachers and administrators about the system in an effort to make it better and customer friendly. For the most part, this system addresses, favorably, the national concerns of professional development, quality feedback, collaboration linkage to test scores, and competence of evaluators that recent and current research single out as obstacles in developing a quality assessment program. This is the third year of operation of this system, and at the conclusion of this school year, the first cycle will have been completed; however, it must be noted that not all school districts in the state adopted the PEPE. Instead, 21 districts developed their own evaluation, based on the competencies of the PEPE. Currently, 106 school districts out of 127 use the PEPE as their official evaluation instrument. In concluding this segment on the PEPE, it is helpful to note several accomplishments, according to the State Department of Education, that have played a significant part in the development of the PEPE (Table 1). These accomplishments are listed in chronological order.

Table 1

Chronological Listing of the Development of the PEPE

Date	Accomplishment
April 1983	The publication of A Nation at Risk, which focused national attention on public education and provided the impetus for numerous educational movements across the nation.

Table 1 (Continued)

Date	Accomplishment
September 1983	The Alabama State Board of Education directed the State Superintendent of Education to conduct a thorough study of the state's elementary and secondary school programs and to report findings and recommendations to the Board. This led to the appointment of the State Department of Education's Committee on Excellence.
January 1984	A Plan for Excellence: Alabama's Public Schools, was presented to the State Board of Education by Dr. Wayne Teague, State Superintendent. The plan was utilized statewide for assessment and improvement purposes.
May 1985	The Alabama Performance-Based Career Incentive Program Act was passed and made legal by the Alabama Legislature and signed by the Governor of Alabama. Performance appraisal linked to career incentives were the primary factors in this law.
April 1987	The Alabama Performance-Based Career Incentive Act was repealed by the Alabama Legislature.
May-June, 1988	The State Superintendent of Education drafted 20 Accountability Resolutions concerning aspects of education in Alabama, including the evaluation process, where modifications and improvement were needed.
June 1988	The aforementioned Accountability Resolutions were presented to and approved by all state education groups.
July 1988	The Accountability Resolutions were adopted by the state, including the performance evaluation resolution requiring all certified personnel to be evaluated by a statewide instrument or one locally based on statewide criteria.
December 1988-September 1989	A task force representative of elementary and secondary administrators and teachers, central office school administrators, business, industry, parents, higher education, school boards, specialty organizations, and professional educators was appointed by the State Superintendent.

Table 1 (Continued)

Date	Accomplishment
October 1989	The state evaluation criteria was adopted by the State Board of Education.
November-December 1989	Orientation sessions were conducted for certified personnel and education groups statewide.
December 1989-September 1990	Training workshops were conducted by the State Department of Education for designated administrators selected by district superintendents to provide leadership in implementing the evaluation procedures in their respective districts.
February 1990	The State Board of Education amended the original evaluation resolution to provide more time for development and implementation. The Board approved January 1992 as the effective date for implementation of the administrator evaluation system and September 1992 for teacher specialty areas evaluation systems.
March 1990	The State Superintendent appointed a committee to serve as technical advisors in the evaluation program.
April 1990	The State Superintendent appointed a committee composed of practicing educators to serve as advisors to the State Department in the development and implementation of the Administrator Evaluation Program.
July-August 1990	The State Superintendent appointed the Alabama Steering Committee for Professional Education Staff Development to develop a comprehensive, pertinent, and perpetual professional development program directly connected with the PEPE.
Summer 1990	There were orientation sessions conducted regionally throughout the state for the purpose of giving administrators input.
October 1991	The training for evaluators of administrators statewide was delayed until October 1992.

Table 1 (Continued)

Date	Accomplishment
October 1992-December 1993	Consultants and the State Department of Education conducted state wide training in the proper administration of the Administrator Evaluation Systems.
September 1993-May 1994	The Professional Personnel Evaluation Administrator System was administered statewide.
April 1994	The State Superintendent appointed a Teacher Advisory Council composed of practicing educators to serve as advisors to the State Department of Education in pertinent matters relating to the creation and implementation of the teacher performance evaluation program.
July-August 1994	Trainers of field test evaluators were trained by the State Department of Education.
August 1994	The State Department of Education conducted training for local education agency coordinators in relation to orientation of teacher field test candidates.
September 1994	Local education agency designated field test evaluators were trained and arranged to be trained by the State Department of Education.
October 1994-March 1995	The State Department of Education, along with 43 local education agencies, field tested administration of the Teacher Performance Evaluation data sources and procedures.
March 1995	The data from the teacher performance evaluation instrument were collected from field test sites.
April 1995	Sessions were scheduled with field test participants to determine and or identify any necessary modifications to be made in the teacher performance data sources and procedures.
Summer 1995	Instruments and procedures were revised by the State Department of Education based on the aforementioned sessions and collected field test data.

Table 1 (Continued)

Date	Accomplishment
October 1995	The Teacher Advisory Council met to review the test data and provide recommendations.
January 1996	The Teacher Advisory Council met to review recommended changes to the Teacher Performance Evaluation System.
January 1997	Performance standards were recommended by the Teacher Advisory Council based on the field test data and analysis.
March-May 1997	Teacher evaluator trainers were trained.
August 1997	The teacher performance evaluation began statewide.
July 1998	The Teacher Advisory Council met to review the implementation of the program statewide after its first year. The council recommended no changes in the performance standard and suggested that it remain the same until completion of the first cycle. Procedural and manual changes were also reviewed based upon data and survey procedures from the field.

Summary

A review of the literature clearly shows an overwhelming desire by teachers to have a sound and bona fide PDP linked to the evaluation process, whereby they can receive quality feedback from colleagues and administrators, network with and visit other teachers' classrooms, be observed and evaluated by a competent administrator, and have evaluations linked to professional growth, not standardized test scores (Annunziata, 1994; Frase, 1992; Jones & Whitford 1997; Rooney, 1993). Teachers also felt the need to have input or a voice in the development and implementation of the evaluation process. This might serve to lessen their fears about the process, and they would be more accepting and

have positive attitudes about the process if it were inclusive and not exclusive of their views.

Based on the review of literature in this chapter, it is evident that the following factors must be manifested in the evaluation process if indeed success is to occur:

1. Benefit--Providing constructive feedback, in addition to encouraging collaborative planning by the evaluator, will enhance teachers' morale and professional development.

2. Fairness--Teachers must feel that the evaluation process is unbiased, objective, and ethical, thus enhancing their comfort levels.

3. Consistency--Teachers must know the expectations of the evaluator in terms of what constitutes quality teaching. All goals and objectives for professional development of teachers must be consistent with their strengths and weaknesses as identified and agreed upon by the teachers and administrators.

4. Adequacy--The evaluation process and the instrument must be adequate in structure in successfully validating successful teaching and learning.

5. Supervision--Administrators and or evaluators must be properly trained and certified under the most rigid standards to ensure competency in observing, supervising, and providing guidance to teachers through constructive feedback in both unilateral and collaborative ways. Competent supervision and collaborative leadership in enhancing professional development are the keys to a successful evaluation process, increased student achievement, and, ultimately, successful academic status of schools.

All of these aspects, if implemented properly, will enhance teacher attitude, motivation, and diligent performance. Ultimately, this will positively affect student achievement and academic status of schools.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study explores the perceptions of early childhood and elementary teachers toward the teacher evaluation system as it relates to the academic status of their schools. Specifically, the study will determine whether teachers from Academic Clear schools have significantly different perceptions from those teachers who are employed in Academic Caution and Alert schools. The study will also determine whether there are differences in the perceptions of teachers toward the PEPE based on the variable of grade structure.

Research Hypotheses

1. There will be no significant difference in the perception of teachers regarding the PEPE based on the variable of their employment in schools categorized as Academic Clear, Caution, or Alert.

2. There will be no significant difference in the perceptions of teachers assigned to do instruction at the early childhood level (K-3) from those who teach Grades 4 and 5.

Research Questions

1. Are teachers' perceptions of the PEPE related to their schools academic status (Clear, Caution, and Alert)?

2. Are the teachers' perceptions of the PEPE related to their teaching level (early childhood or elementary)?

Population

The population for the study was all K-5 elementary regular classroom teachers employed by the Birmingham City Schools who were participants in the PEPE. These professionals were involved in full and multi-year evaluation cycles. There were approximately 783 teachers in this population. According to Wunsch (1986), a sufficient sample for 783 respondents is 86. The sample was selected through the use of the following techniques: (a) names of all members of the population were identified, printed, and placed into a large basket; (b) names were randomly pulled from the baskets until 86 names had been selected; and (c) to ensure a sufficient sample, the researcher randomly selected 36 additional names.

Instrumentation

The instrument used to gather data for this study was developed by the researcher. The instrument consists of three specific sections. Section I of the instrument consists of 30 items. These items were based on five specific constructs. Six statements related to each of the five constructs. Section II of the instrument sought demographic information from the respondents. Information was provided in this section regarding the status (clear,

caution, alert) of the subject's school, grade level assignment, ethnic background, and gender. Section III of the instrument consists of a comment section for teachers to make comments that they felt were appropriate.

Items in Section I provided data regarding the respondents' perceptions towards the PEPE. Items in Section II were used to assist in responding to each of the research hypotheses and research questions. Items in Section III provided general information that brought clarity to those responses allowed from Section II of the instrument.

Scoring

Approximately half of the items were scaled so that the strongly agree category was the most positive and the strongly disagree category was the most negative. Once the data were entered, the negatively related items were reversed and a total score for each category was computed. There were six items in each construct, with 4 being the highest score and 1 being the lowest score. Therefore, the range was 6 to 24.

Validation of Instrument

The researcher established face validity of the instrument. This task was accomplished through the use of a panel of judges. Three judges were selected. These persons were selected based on the following standards: (a) each judge possessed at least a doctoral degree, (b) each judge had previously served as a public school principal, and (c) each judge was certified as an Alabama Certified Evaluator. A letter was secured from all judges that indicated the validity of the instrument.

Reliability of the Instrument

Reliability of the instrument was established through the use of the Cronbach Coefficient Alpha. The Cronbach Alpha was used to compute the internal consistency reliability of each construct. The scale procedure from SPSS (1999) was used to compute the Cronbach Alpha. The instrument was administered to at least 50 teachers who participated in the PEPE. All scores were averaged and totaled, and an Alpha Coefficient was computed. A reliability level of .90 was attained for the whole survey; however, the reliabilities ranged from .01 to .82 for the individual constructs. Because "Fairness" was only .01, further analysis for this construct was omitted. Reliabilities for the other constructs ranged from .61 to .82, and analyses of these constructs were conducted.

Data Collection

The data collection for this study consisted of a mailout of the "PEPE" Perception instrument to 122 randomly selected K-5 teachers in the Birmingham City School System. The mailing date was July 10, 2000.

If, within 10 days, a 70% return rate had not been attained, a second mailout was implemented. If a sufficient number of questionnaires had not been collected within 7 working days, a follow-up phone call was placed to the participants who had not responded.

Data Analysis

A number of methods were employed to analyze data collected for this study. These methods specifically consisted of the use of percentages and frequencies and

analysis of variance (ANOVA). ANOVA was completed to analyze the research hypotheses and provide responses to each research question. Percentages and frequencies were used to provide responses to each research question. The pertinent comments in the comment section were content analyzed to identify common elements of responses.

Limitations

The following limitations apply to this study:

1. The population and study participants were limited to one urban school district in Alabama; therefore, generalizations can only be drawn regarding this particular district.

2. The grade structure of the schools participating was limited to elementary units with a K-5 structure.

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

There were two objectives for this study. The first objective was to explore the perception of early childhood and elementary teachers toward the teacher evaluation system as it relates to their schools' status. Specifically, the study will determine whether teachers from Academic Clear schools have significantly different perceptions from teachers who are employed in Academic Caution and Alert schools. The second objective of the study was to determine whether there are differences in the perceptions of teachers toward the PEPE based on grade structure. This chapter includes a review of the findings from an analysis of 88 teachers in the Birmingham City School System.

Analysis of Quantitative Data

To answer Research Questions 1 and 2, the researcher developed a survey on the teachers' perceived impact of the PEPE as it relates to their schools' academic status. The following were included in the study: academic status of schools (Academic Clear, Caution, and Alert), and the grade levels of teachers in reference to their respective teaching assignments (early childhood and elementary). The survey consisted of 30 questions, six each for five constructs: benefit, fairness, consistency, adequacy, and supervision.

Face and Content Validity of Survey Instrument

A panel of three judges (one central office supervisor and two principals) were selected from the Birmingham City School System. Dr. Janeen Bell, Program Specialist for Visual Arts; Dr. Robert Palmatier, Principal at Glen Iris Elementary School; and Dr. Claudia Williams, Principal at Carver High School, were selected as the judges to validate the survey.

Each judge was mailed a letter requesting his or her input on the validity of the survey in judging teacher effectiveness and the evaluation process in general. All of the judges mailed their surveys back in a timely manner. The judges were all positive about this survey instrument being a valid and effective tool in enhancing the evaluation process and judging teacher effectiveness. Dr. Janeen Bell (Judge 1) stated, " I have examined your research instrument and I find that it is beneficial and fair to teachers and administrators, consistent and adequate in all components of the examination of the teacher evaluation process, and proper in its construction based on the PEPE."

Dr. Bob Palmatier (Judge 2) stated, "I believe the questionnaire does a good job of assessing teachers' opinions of the the PEPE instrument and process. The questions provide data on the three questions you pose (fairness, consistency, effectiveness). Thus, I believe your instrument is valid for determining teacher perceptions of the PEPE Program."

Dr. Claudia Williams (Judge 3) stated, "After careful study of your instrument, I find it to be a valid tool for measuring Birmingham City school teachers' perceptions of PEPE as it relates to their schools' academic status. The items are fair to both teachers and administrators. The questions are adequately structured and consistent in content and

purpose." The judges, as their comments reflect, were all very positive about this survey instrument being a valid and effective tool in enhancing the evaluation process and judging teacher effectiveness.

Data Collection

Permission to conduct the dissertation study was requested in writing from Dr. Johnny Brown, Superintendent of Birmingham City Schools. It was to include all K-5 regular classroom teachers in all K-5 elementary schools in the Birmingham City School System. Dr. Brown was very supportive and directed the researcher to Dr. Abbe Boring, Deputy Superintendent of Birmingham City Schools, to gain final approval to conduct this study.

Dr. Boring met with the researcher and discussed the instrument to be used, the number of teachers to be surveyed, the date of distribution of the surveys, and the manner in which these surveys would be delivered to the teachers. After successfully concluding this discussion, she gave approval on behalf of Dr. Brown to officially conduct this dissertation study in the Birmingham City School System. Surveys were mailed out to 122 teachers, who had been selected by random sample, in the Birmingham City School System.

The selection process for the random selection of teachers was in conCurrence with Wunsch (1986). The table reflected that 86 persons be surveyed from a population of 782. The sample size is representative of the teacher population in the Birmingham City School System who were evaluated during the first 3-year cycle of PEPE. Surveys were sent out to 122 teachers in the Birmingham City School System who were evaluated

during the first 3-year cycle of PEPE. Eighty-eight surveys were returned, resulting in a response rate of 72%. Twenty-six respondents left 38 questions blank on different areas of the PEPE Perception Survey Instrument. If someone omitted a response to an item, the assumption was that he or she did not agree or disagree with the item and thus he or she was neutral. In these cases, the missing items were recoded as 2.5. Table 2 illustrates the demographics of the respondents in this study.

Table 2

Demographics of Birmingham City School System by Percentage of Respondents

Variable	Level	Percentage
Gender	Female	87.5
	Male	12.5
Ethnic Background	African American	68.2
	Caucasian	30.7
	Other	1.1
Current Teaching Assignment	Early Childhood	63.6
	Elementary	34.6
Academic Status of School	Alert	18.5
	Caution	29.6
	Clear	51.9

Reliability and Validity of Scales

Table 3 presents the results of the reliability analysis.

Table 3

Reliability Analysis

Area	Participants (N)	Items (N)	Alpha
Whole survey	88	30	.90
Benefit	88	6	.61
Fairness	88	6	.01
Consistency	88	6	.82
Adequacy	88	6	.67
Supervision	88	6	.71

As mentioned earlier, the score of 2.5 was inserted for items for which respondents did not check on the PEPE Perception Survey Instrument. Twenty-six respondents left 38 questions blank on different areas of the PEPE Perception Survey Instrument. If someone omitted a response to an item, the assumption was that he or she did not agree or disagree with the item and thus he or she was neutral. In these cases, the missing items were recoded as 2.5.

According to Table 3, the alpha coefficient (internal consistency) for the constructs of benefit, consistency, adequacy, and supervision seem to be fairly reliable, with consistency and supervision being the most reliable of the five constructs. The alpha coefficient for the fairness construct indicates that the survey is not reliable based on participants' actual responses to the items. The total survey (30 items), including all constructs collectively, is indeed reliable with an alpha coefficient of .90 and meets the reliability standard of .70 or higher that was set for the total survey instrument.

The first section of the survey was a series of Likert-type items based on five constructs (benefit, fairness, consistency, adequacy, and supervision) in measuring teachers' perceptions of PEPE as it relates to their schools' academic status. The responses to the five constructs are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Analysis of Scales

Benefit. Six questions were in the section labeled Beneficial. This section was to measure how helpful this instrument and process is to teachers, administrators, and, ultimately, students.

Responses to item 1, "The full cycle professional development component is quite beneficial in constructing goals for improvement," indicate that 8.0% strongly disagree, 27.3% disagree, 53.4% agree, 10.2% strongly agree, and 1.1% are neutral. This shows that 63.6% of the teachers agreed that the PEPE Evaluation Process is helpful to teachers and administrators in constructing goals for improvement.

Item 2, "The multi-cycle professional development component of PEPE is quite beneficial in developing leadership qualities in enhancing professional growth and student achievement," received the following responses: 9.1% strongly disagree, 34.1% disagree, 46.6% agree, 8.0% strongly agree, and 2.3% are neutral. These results show that 54.6% of the teachers agreed that PEPE is helpful in enhancing professional development and student achievement.

Survey item 3, "The PEPE process discourages collaboration between teachers and administrators in goal setting," received the following responses: 2.3% strongly disagree, 27.3% disagree, 58.0% agree, 11.4% strongly agree, and 1.2% are neutral. The

results show that 69.4% of the teachers agreed that PEPE discourages collaboration between teachers and administrators in goal setting.

The fourth survey item, "The competencies and indicators that PEPE is predicated on are not relevant to personal qualities that characterize effective teachers," received the following responses: 12.5% strongly disagree 30.7% disagree, 47.7% agree, 6.8% strongly agree, and 2.3% are neutral. These results indicate that 54.5% of the teachers surveyed agreed that the competencies and indicators measured are not relevant to the qualities that characterize effective teachers.

The fifth survey item, "The PDP is not instrumental in increasing student achievement," received the following responses: 6.8% strongly disagree, 50.0% disagree, 34.1% agree, 5.7% strongly agree, and 3.4% are neutral. The results indicate that 56.8% of the teachers disagreed that the PDP is not instrumental in increasing student achievement.

The final question in the benefit category, "Principals are properly trained to be instructional leaders through PEPE," found that 11.4% strongly disagree, 36.4% disagree, 39.8% agree, 11.4% strongly agree, and 1.2% are neutral. Results of item six indicate that the majority (51.2%) of the teachers agreed that principals are properly trained to be instructional leaders through PEPE, but 47.8% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that principals are properly trained to be instructional leaders through PEPE. A summary of these results is shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Individual Items in the Benefit Scale

Item		N	M	SD	Corrected item-total correlation
1.	The full cycle professional development component of PEPE is quite beneficial in constructing goals for improvement.	88	2.665	.768	.512
2.	The multi-cycle professional development component of PEPE is quite beneficial in developing leadership qualities in enhancing personal growth and student achievement.	88	2.545	.768	.486
3.	The PEPE process discourages collaboration between teachers and administrators in goal setting.	88	2.790	.664	.292
4.	The competencies and indicators that PEPE is predicated on are not relevant to personal qualities that characterize effective teachers.	88	2.500	.799	.179
5.	The PDP is not instructional in increasing student achievement.	88	2.403	.698	.389
6.	Principals are not properly trained to be instructional leaders through PEPE.	88	2.517	.842	.250

Fairness. Six items were constructed and compiled for the section concerning fairness. The responses to item 7, "PEPE should be used primarily as a formative tool in the evaluation process." received the following results: 8.0% strongly disagree, 13.6% disagree, 67.0% agree, 9.1% strongly agree, and 2.3% are neutral. The results showed that 76.1% of respondents agreed that PEPE should be used primarily as a formative tool.

Survey item 8, "PEPE should be used primarily as a summative tool in reference to termination of teachers in the evaluation process," found 3.4% strongly disagree, 18.2% disagree, 51.1% agree 25.0% strongly agree, and 2.3% are neutral. These results reflect that a majority (76.1%) of the teachers surveyed agreed with this instrument being used

primarily as a summative tool in reference to terminating teachers in the evaluation process.

"The composite score of 20 is a fair minimum standard for tenured teachers." was the ninth survey item in the fairness category. The results for this item were as follows: 1.1% strongly disagree, 19.3% disagree, 69.3% agree, 4.5% strongly agree, 5.7% are neutral. These findings showed that 73.8 % of respondents agreed that the composite score of 20 is a fair minimum standard.

Survey item 10, "The appeals process in allowing teachers to refute their scores only if a procedural error is committed by the administrator is unfair." found that 18.2% strongly disagree, 50.0% disagree, 25.0% agree, 1.1% strongly agree, and 5.7% are neutral. These results indicate that 68.2% of the respondents disagreed that the appeals process is unfair.

Survey item 11, "The self-assessment instrument is an excellent tool to be used for an honest critique of oneself." found that 4.5% strongly disagree, 21.6% disagree, 53.4% agree, 18.2% strongly agree, and 2.3% are neutral. These findings show that 71.6% of the respondents agreed that the self-assessment tool is an excellent instrument to be used to honestly critique oneself.

Findings of survey item 12, "The data sources used in PEPE are fair in assessing the abilities of a teacher," were 10.2% strongly disagree, 36.4% disagree, 46.6% agree, 3.4% strongly agree, and 3.4% are neutral. These findings show that 50% of the teachers surveyed agreed that the data sources used in PEPE are fair, but 46.6% of the respondents disagreed that these data sources are fair. A summary of these results is shown in Table 5.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Individual Items in the Fairness Scale

Item	N	M	SD	Corrected item-total correlation
7. PEPE should be used primarily as a formative tool in the evaluation process.	88	2.784	.714	.166
8. PEPE should be used as a summative tool in reference to termination of teachers in the evaluation process.	88	2.989	.762	-.571
9. The composite score of 20 is a fair minimum standard for tenured teachers.	88	2.801	.512	.186
10. The appeals process in allowing teachers to refute their scores only if a procedural error is committed by the administrator is unfair.	88	2.119	.695	.110
11. The self-assessment instrument is an excellent tool to be used for an honest critique of oneself.	88	2.864	.757	.134
12. The data sources used in PEPE are fair in assessing the abilities of a teacher.	88	2.449	.719	.339

Because the fairness scale was not reliable, analyses of the total fairness variable (sum of items 7-12) are not reported. A fairness scale item analysis was done and it revealed that item 8 was functioning poorly in the scale (see Table 4). In part, the item is negatively related to the other five constructs. If the item were omitted from the construct, the reliability of the scale would increase from .01 to .54. Because the reliability was so low, this scale was omitted from further analysis.

Consistency. The third construct, consistency, contains six items used to measure teacher perceptions of how consistent this instrument is in the overall evaluation process. Responses to survey item 13, " PEPE provides an avenue through the structured interview process where teachers and administrators can have constructive dialogue in enhancing

teacher effectiveness and student achievement," were 10.2% strongly disagree, 20.5% disagree, 56.8% agree, 11.4% strongly agree, and 1.1% neutral. These findings showed that over half (68.2%) of the respondents agreed that the structured interview allows for constructive dialogue in enhancing teacher effectiveness and student achievement.

Survey item 14, "The structured interview component of PEPE is inadequate in allowing teachers to plan long term and effectively," revealed that 4.5% strongly disagree, 45.5% disagree, 45.5% agree, and 1.2% strongly agree. These findings indicate that 50% of respondents surveyed disagreed that the structured interview is inadequate, while 47.7% agreed that it is inadequate in allowing teachers to effective plan long term.

"The data sources (observation, structured interview, PDP, and supervisor's review form) used in PEPE are inconsistent in assessing the abilities of a teacher," was survey item 15. The results were 8.0% strongly disagree, 40.9% disagree, 45.5% agree, 4.5% strongly agree, and 1.1% neutral. These findings indicate that 50% of the teachers agreed that the data sources in PEPE are inconsistent in assessing the abilities of a teacher, but over one-third (48.9%) disagreed that the data sources were inconsistent in assessing the abilities of a teacher.

Survey item 16, "The data sources (observation, structured interview, PDP ,and supervisor's review form) used in PEPE are clear in assessing the abilities of a teacher," found that 8.0% strongly disagree, 40.9% disagree, 47.7% agree, and 3.4% strongly agree. This data showed that the majority (51.1%) of teachers agreed that the data sources are clear in assessing the abilities of a teacher, but (48.9%) disagreed that they are clear in assessing the abilities of a teacher.

Survey item 17, "The PEPE data sources (observation, structured interview, PDP, and supervisor's review form) are thorough and complete in developing teachers to their fullest potential." showed that 9.1% strongly disagree, 56.8% disagree, 29.5% agree, 3.4% strongly disagree, and 1.1% are neutral. These findings indicate that 65.9% of the teachers disagreed that the data sources are thorough and complete in fully developing them as teachers.

Survey item 18, "The data sources (observation, structured interview, PDP, and supervisor's review form) used in the PEPE process do not complement each other," found that 2.3% strongly disagree, 36.4% disagree, 56.8% agree, 2.3% strongly agree, and 2.3% are neutral. These findings show 59.1% of the teachers agreed that the data sources in the PEPE process do not complement each other. Table 6 includes a summary of these results.

Adequacy. The fourth construct of this survey, adequacy, consisted of six items. Survey item 19, "Evaluators are inconsistent in rating teachers," showed that 15.9% strongly disagree, 36.4% disagree, 44.3% agree, 1.1% strongly agree, and 2.3% are neutral. These findings indicate that the majority (52.3%) of teachers disagreed that evaluators are inconsistent in rating teachers, but over one third (45.4%) of the respondents agreed that the evaluators are inconsistent in rating teachers.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for Individual Items in the Consistency Scale

Item	N	M	SD	Corrected item-total correlation
13. PEPE provides an avenue through the structured interview process where teachers and administrators can have constructive dialogue in enhancing teacher effectiveness and student achievement.	88	2.699	.804	.579
14. The structured interview component of PEPE is inadequate in allowing teachers to plan long-term and effectively.	88	2.449	.597	.551
15. The data sources (observation, structured interview, PDP, and supervisors review form) used in PEPE are inconsistent in assessing the abilities of a teacher.	88	2.472	.709	.576
16. The data sources (observation, structured interview, PDP, and supervisors review form) used in PEPE are clear in assessing the abilities of a teacher.	88	2.466	.694	.618
17. The PEPE data sources (observation, structured interview, PDP, and supervisors review form) are thorough and complete in developing teachers to their full potential.	88	2.278	.673	.613
18. The data sources (observation, structured interview, PDP, and supervisors review form) used in PEPE process do not complement each other.	88	2.602	.573	.605

"Evaluators are consistent in determining which teachers are placed on the full and multi-year cycles," survey item 20, revealed that 5.7% strongly disagree, 23.9% disagreed, 58.0% agree, 3.4% strongly agree, and 9.1% are neutral. These data reflected that 61.4% of teachers agreed that evaluators are consistent in determining which cycle teachers are to be placed.

Survey item 21, "The Evaluation Summary Report provides constructive feedback in enhancing professional development for teachers," found that 5.7% strongly disagree,

25.0% disagree, 61.4% agree, and 6.8% strongly agree. These results showed that 61.4% of the respondents agreed that the Evaluation Summary Report provides constructive feedback in enhancing professional development.

Survey item 22, "The PDP with proper supervision and guidance is not instrumental in enhancing teacher performance," found that 1.1% strongly disagree, 23.9% disagree, 63.6% agree, and 11.4% strongly agree. These findings show that 75% of respondents agreed that with proper supervision and guidance, the PDP is instrumental in enhancing teacher performance.

Item 23, "The PDP with proper supervision and guidance is not instrumental in increasing student achievement," revealed that 6.8% strongly disagree, 40.9% disagree, 45.5% agree, and 6.8% strongly agree. These findings indicate that 52.3% of the respondents agreed that the PDP with proper supervision and guidance is instrumental in increasing student achievement, but 47.7% of the respondents disagreed that the PDP is not instrumental in increasing student achievement.

Survey item 24 "The PEPE instrument does not promote collaboration between teachers and principals," found that 5.7% strongly disagree, 29.5% disagree, 52.3% agree, 9.1% strongly agree, and 3.4% are neutral. These data indicate that the majority (61.4%) of the respondents agreed that the PEPE instrument does not promote collaboration between teachers and principals. Table 7 includes a summary of these results.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for Individual Items in the Adequacy Scale

Item	N	M	SD	Corrected item-total correlation
19. Evaluators are inconsistent in rating teachers.	88	2.318	.747	.332
20. Evaluators are consistent in determining which teachers are placed on full and multi-year cycles.	88	2.636	.628	.057
21. The Evaluation Summary Report Provides constructive feedback in enhancing professional development for teachers.	88	2.699	.680	.555
22. The PDP, with proper supervision and guidance is instrumental in enhancing teacher performance.	88	2.852	.617	.467
23. The PDP, with proper supervision and guidance is not instrumental in increasing student achievement.	88	2.523	.727	.468
24. The PEPE instrument does not promote collaboration between teachers and principals.	88	2.665	.718	.561

Supervision. The final construct in this portion of the survey is "supervision," and it is composed of six items.

Survey item 25, "The PEPE instrument provides principals with the knowledge to provide constructive feedback to teachers," indicated that 2.3% strongly disagree, 25.0% disagree, 65.9% agree and 6.8% strongly agree. These results show that 72.7% of the respondents agreed that the PEPE instrument provides principals with knowledge to provide constructive feedback to teachers.

"Teachers are not adequately trained in PEPE Orientation Sessions," item 26, revealed that 19.3% strongly disagree, 42.0% disagree, 33.0% agree, 3.4% strongly agree and 1.1 are neutral. These findings show that 61.3% of the respondents disagreed that

they are not adequately trained in the PEPE orientation session. Thirty-seven point four percent of the respondents agreed that they are not adequately trained in the PEPE Orientation Session.

Survey item 27. "Principals are properly trained to be instructional leaders through PEPE," found that 12.5% strongly disagree, 30.7% disagree, 46.6% agree 4.5% strongly agree, and 5.7% are neutral. These results show that 51.1% of the respondents agreed that principals are properly trained to be instructional leaders. Forty-three point two percent of the respondents disagreed that principals' are properly trained to be instructional leaders.

Survey item 28. "Data sources (observation, structured interview, PDP, and supervisors review form) are matched appropriately with the eight competencies they measure," show that 3.4% strongly disagree, 28.4% disagree, 65.9% agree, 1.1% strongly agree, and 1.1% are neutral. These results show that 67% of the respondents agreed that the data sources are matched appropriately with the eight competencies they measure.

Item 29. "The PEPE process is adequate in that it allows administrators the flexibility of having quality one-on-one consultation with teachers," showed that 6.8% strongly disagree, 26.1% disagree, 63.6% agree, and 3.4% strongly agree. These findings show that 67% of the teachers agreed that the PEPE process allows administrators to have the flexibility of having one-on-one consultation with teachers.

Survey item 30. "The PEPE process is ineffective because of the excessive amount of paperwork required of all administrators," responses were 28.4% strongly disagree, 33.0% disagree, 34.1% agree, 3.4% strongly agree, and 1.1% are neutral. These findings show that 61.4% of the respondents disagreed that the PEPE process is ineffective

because of the excessive amount of paperwork required of administrators. Table 8 includes a summary of these results.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for Individual Items in the Supervision Scale

Item	N	M	SD	Corrected item-total correlation
25. The PEPE instrument provides principals with the knowledge to provide constructive feedback to teachers.	88	2.773	.601	.498
26. Teachers are not adequately trained in PEPE orientation sessions.	88	2.210	.790	.380
27. Principals are properly trained to be instructional leaders.	88	2.460	.763	.332
28. Data sources (observation, structured interview, PDP, and supervisors review form) are matched appropriately with the eight competencies they measure.	88	2.653	.564	.605
29. The PEPE process is adequate in that it allows administrators the flexibility of having quality-one-on-one consultations with teachers.	88	2.636	.554	.508
30. The PEPE process is ineffective because of the excessive amount of paperwork required of administrators.	88	2.131	.869	.448

Group Comparisons

The general purpose of this study was to analyze how variables such as academic status of school (Academic Clear, Caution, and Alert) and grade level taught by teachers (early childhood and elementary) were related to the perceptions in reference to teachers' perceptions of PEPE and how student achievement is related in this regard. Therefore, in an effort to fulfill this purpose, the variables (academic status of school, and grade level) and the constructs (benefit, fairness, consistency, adequacy, and supervision) of the survey

were analyzed using ANOVA to determine whether there were any significant differences among them. The findings are shown in the following tables. Table 9 summarizes the perceived benefits of teachers based on the academic status of their schools.

Table 9

ANOVA Summary Comparing Perceived Benefits Over the Three Levels of Academic Status

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p
Between groups	14.121	2	7.061	1.003	.371
Within groups	598.322	85	7.039		
Total	612.443	87			

According to ANOVA ($p = .371$), no significant difference exists among teachers in reference to the academic status of their schools being on Clear, Caution, or Alert status and their perceptions regarding PEPE in the benefit construct (Table 9). Table 10 provides a further description of the results through a presentation of percentages and frequencies.

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics Regarding Teachers' Perceptions of the Benefit Construct

Academic status benefit	N	%	M	SD
Clear	47	53.4	15.4895	2.7907
Caution	25	28.4	14.8800	2.7168
Alert	16	18.1	16.0625	2.0484
Total	88	100.0	46.4219	

Table 11

ANOVA Summary Comparing the Perceived Consistencies Over the Three Levels of Academic Status

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p
Between groups	23.584	2	11.792	1.359	.263
Within groups	737.814	85	8.680		
Total	761.398	87			

Statistical findings ($p = .263$) revealed no significant difference among the academic status of schools being on Academic Clear, Caution, or Alert status and their teachers' perceptions regarding PEPE in the consistency construct (Table 11). Table 12 provides a further description of the results through a presentation of percentages and frequencies.

Table 12

Descriptive Statistics Regarding Teachers' Perceptions of the Consistency Construct

Academic status consistencies	N	%	M	SD
Clear	47	53.4	14.7447	3.1448
Caution	25	28.4	14.6800	3.0100
Alert	16	18.1	16.0625	2.0887
Total	88	100.0	45.4872	

Table 13

ANOVA Summary Comparing the Perceived Adequacies Over the Three Levels of Academic Status

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p
Between groups	16.407	2	8.203	1.281	.283
Within groups	544.309	85	6.404		
Total	560.716	87			

Statistical findings ($p = .283$) reveal no significant difference among the academic status of schools in terms of being on Academic Clear, Caution, or Alert status and their teachers' perceptions regarding PEPE in the adequacy construct (Table 13). Table 14 provides a further description of the results through a presentation of percentages and frequencies.

Table 14

Descriptive Statistics Regarding Teachers' Perceptions of the Adequacy Construct

Academic status adequacies	N	%	M	SD
Clear	47	53.4	15.9043	2.5615
Caution	25	28.4	15.0200	2.5596
Alert	16	18.1	16.1250	2.3840
Total	88	100.0	46.0493	

Table 15

ANOVA Summary Comparing the Perceived Supervision Over the Three Levels of Academic Status

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p
Between groups	21.294	2	10.647	1.412	.249
Within groups	641.069	85	7.542		
Total	662.364	87			

Statistical findings ($p = .249$) reveal no significant difference between the academic status of schools in terms of being on Academic Clear, Caution, or Alert status and their teachers' perceptions towards PEPE in the supervision construct (Table 15). Table 16 provides a further description of the results through a presentation of percentages and frequencies.

Table 16

Descriptive Statistics Regarding Teachers' Perceptions of the Supervision Construct

Academic status supervision	N	%	M	SD
Clear	47	53.4	15/0957	2.7438
Caution	25	28.4	14.1000	2.8940
Alert	16	18.1	15.3750	2.5000
Total	88	100.0	44.5707	

Table 17

ANOVA Summary Comparing Perceived Benefits Between the Two Grade Levels

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p
Between groups	30.804	1	30.804	4.555	.036
Within groups	581.640	86	6.763		
Total	612.443	87			

The statistical analysis revealed a significant difference ($p = .036$) between elementary and early childhood teachers; however, the difference in grade levels accounted for only 5.0% of the perceived benefit. These data show that elementary teachers view PEPE more positively than early childhood teachers (Table 17). Table 18 provides a further description of the results through a presentation of percentages and frequencies.

Table 18

Summary of Descriptive Statistics Regarding Group Comparisons Between Early Childhood and Elementary Teachers for the Benefit Construct

Group	N	%	M	SD
Early childhood	56	64.0	14.9732	2.3730
Elementary	32	36.0	16.2031	2.9617
Total	88	100.0	31.1763	

Table 19

ANOVA Summary Comparing the Perceived Consistencies Between the Two Grade Levels

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p
Between groups	11.183	1	11.183	1.282	.261
Within groups	750.214	86	8.723		
Total	761.398	87			

The statistical findings ($p = .261$) reveal no significant difference between the grade level variable of teachers regarding their perceptions of PEPE in the "consistency" construct (Table 19). Table 20 provides a further description of the results through a presentation of percentages and frequencies.

Table 20

Summary of Descriptive Statistics Regarding Group Comparisons Between Early Childhood and Elementary Teachers for the Consistency Construct

Group	N	%	M	SD
Early childhood	56	64.0	14.6964	2.7809
Elementary	32	36.0	15/4375	3.2373
Total	88	100.0	30.1339	

Table 21

ANOVA Summary Comparing the Perceived Adequacies Between the Two Grade Levels

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p
Between groups	2.283	1	2.283	.352	.555
Within groups	558.433	86	6.493		
Total	560.716	87			

Statistical findings ($p = .555$) reveal no significant difference between the grade level variable of teachers teaching in early childhood or elementary grades and their perceptions regarding PEPE in the adequacy construct (Table 21). Table 22 provides a further description of the results through a presentation of percentages and frequencies.

Table 22

Summary of Descriptive Statistics Regarding Group Comparisons Between Early Childhood and Elementary Teachers for the Adequacy Construct

Group	N	%	M	SD
Early childhood	56	64.0	15.5714	2.5324
Elementary	32	36.0	15.9063	2.5761
Total	88	100.0	31.4777	

Table 23

ANOVA Summary Comparing the Perceived Supervision Between the Two Grade Levels

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p
Between groups	4.306	1	4.306	.563	.455
Within groups	658.058	86	7.652		
Total	662.364	87			

Statistical findings ($p = .455$) reveal no significant difference between the academic status of schools in terms of being on Academic Clear, Caution, or Alert and their teachers' perceptions towards PEPE in the supervision construct (Table 23).

Based on the aforementioned constructs in reference to ANOVA, the findings reveal that there are significant differences between early childhood teachers and elementary teachers based on their perceptions of PEPE in the benefitconstruct. Elementary teachers' perceptions were much more favorable in regards to this construct than early childhood teachers. In reference to the academic status variable there were no significant differences in the perceptions of teachers, thus concluding that teacher perceptions towards PEPE were just as positive in Alert and Caution schools as they were in Clear schools. These findings reveal that perceptions of teachers towards PEPE do not significantly impact the academic status of schools.

Eighty-eight respondents of 122 returned their surveys, resulting in a 72% return rate. A description of the characteristics of the respondents is shown in Table 2. Table 24 provides a further description of the results through a presentation of percentages and frequencies.

Table 24

Summary of Descriptive Statistics Regarding Group Comparisons Between Early Childhood and Elementary Teachers' for the Supervision Construct

Group	N	%	M	SD
Early childhood	56	64.0	14.6964	2.7231
Elementary	32	36.0	15.1563	2.8411
Total	88	100.0	29.8537	

Qualitative Data Analysis of the Comment Section

The third part of the PEPE Perception Survey contained a comment section for respondents to make any comments they felt were appropriate. The responses were content analyzed qualitatively and grouped into categories (Table 24). Table 25 illustrates the respondents' comments in reference to emerging categories, number of comments, and percentage of comments.

Table 25

Respondents' Qualitative Emerging Themes Analysis

Category	Number of comments	Percentage of comments
Adequacy	2	5.7
Benefit	2	5.7
Inadequacy	12	34.3
Poor supervision	5	14.3
Principals' skill	4	11.4
Time management	6	17.1
Unfairness	4	11.4

Based on the qualitative findings illustrated in Table 25, the content analysis seems to reveal, from the teachers' perceptions, a major problem with the structure of PEPE in terms of it being "inadequate." The respondents view it as inadequate, unfair, and ineffective in judging them as effective teachers and enhancing their professional development.

Secondly, time management seems to be an emerging theme that is critical in regards to the teachers' perceptions of PEPE. They feel that the overwhelming amount of paperwork required of administrators' effects their ability to properly concentrate and fairly evaluate teachers' lessons during observations. The respondents also felt that the administrators provided less one-on-one consultation with teachers in developing them to their fullest potential. Also, they felt that teachers were overwhelmed in preparing for the full-cycle evaluation, and the time used by them to prepare for this process took away from time spent learning and being taught.

The third emerging theme was poor supervision, which was perceived by 14.3% of the respondents. The respondents' perceptions here centered around principals' inability to clearly explain the process to their teachers in a nonthreatening manner in orientation sessions and throughout the year.

The fourth emerging theme was unfairness, which was perceived by 11.4% of the respondents. The respondents felt that the system was unfair in that certain aspects of the teaching process were evaluated unfairly because of unannounced observations and principals from different schools conducting evaluations. The views here, were that the administrators used this process as an intimidation measure to terminate teachers, but the

administrators' lack of knowledge of this process, as perceived by the respondents, makes this an unfair process.

The fifth emerging theme was principals' skill in conducting the PEPE process, and it comprised 11.4% of the respondents as well. The perception here was that administrators were not competent in evaluating teachers because of their lack of skill in conducting the PEPE process and their inability to clearly and properly explain this process to their teachers in gaining full acceptance and understanding.

The last emerging themes from the content analysis of the respondents' comments in regard to their perceptions of the PEPE process were in regard to the adequacy and benefit components of the process. The adequacy category comprised 5.7% of the respondents. The respondents in this particular category feel that PEPE is adequate in providing constructive feedback, is a good system overall, and the principals are good at conveying this process to the teachers.

The benefit category also comprised 5.7% of the respondents. The findings here revealed that the respondents felt that the PEPE process was helpful in assisting the teachers in setting goals for all children as well as in providing constructive feedback to teachers.

In summary, the qualitative findings show overall there were more negative comments than positive comments by 2 to 1, with the most significant category (also by 2 to 1) being teachers' perceptions of the PEPE process being inadequate.

Summary

The research questions and hypotheses, as to whether teacher perceptions of PEPE are different based on academic status and its impact on student achievement and grade structure, have been answered using frequencies and ANOVA.

According to the results of ANOVA, there was only one significant difference among the five constructs and that was the "benefit" construct at .036 (see Table 17). The data reflect a more positive or favorable rating toward the "beneficial" construct of PEPE for elementary teachers than for early childhood teachers.

Hypothesis 2, which stated that there will be no significant difference in the perceptions of early childhood and elementary teachers regarding PEPE based on grade level, was correct in four out of the five constructs surveyed from the PEPE Perception Survey. There was a significant difference of .036 noted in the "benefit" construct. This means that there is a 4% chance that this result would occur again in a similar random sample survey of this type with the same number of respondents. The findings reflect a less positive rating by the early childhood teachers compared to the elementary teachers rating in regards to the questions in the benefit construct. The following narrative illustrates the significant findings in the benefit construct.

The range of the survey is 6 to 24. The mean for the early childhood teachers is 14.9732, and the mean for the elementary teachers is 16.2031. The range for the early childhood teachers is from 10 to 19, and the range for the elementary teachers is 11 to 23. Specifically, 50% of the early childhood teachers were in the 13 to 17 range, 25% were in the 10 to 13 range, and 12% were in the 16 to 19 range. The findings specifically reflect

that 50% of the elementary teachers were in the 16 to 18 range. 25% were in the 12 to 15 range. and 25% were in the 18 to 22 range.

In summary. based on the quantitative and qualitative findings. there are differences and similarities in terms of how early childhood and elementary teachers perceive the PEPE. The quantitative findings a reveal that there are no significant differences in the perceptions of teachers based on the academic status of their respective schools; thus. their perceptions do not have a significant impact on the academic status of their respective schools. The quantitative findings also reveal that there are no significant differences. based on the grade level variable in four out of the five constucts on the survey. There is one significant difference reported from the quantitative findings and that is in the beneficial category of the grade level variable at .036. This. in essence. revealed that elementary teachers perceived PEPE more positively than early childhood teachers in reference to the benefits attained from this process. From a qualitative standpoint. the findings in this study. based on content analysis of emerging categories. show that the majority of the respondents. by a margin of 2 to 1. view the PEPE process as inadequate and negative overall. Only 5.7% of the respondents viewed PEPE as a process that provides benefits to teachers.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

There were two purposes of this study. The first purpose was to analyze the perceptions of teachers from Academic Clear, Caution, and Alert schools in the Birmingham City School System and to examine how those perceptions in turn affect the academic status of their respective schools. The goal was to see whether teacher perceptions of PEPE were different based on the academic status variable in respect to their schools.

The second purpose was to analyze the perceptions of teachers regarding PEPE as it related to their particular grade level. The goal was to examine whether there were significant differences in the teacher perceptions of PEPE based on the variable of the grade structure in which they teach, and whether this had a significant impact on the academic status of their respective schools.

Summary of Findings

Quantitative

The PEPE Perception Survey was composed of five constructs (benefit, fairness, consistency, adequacy, and supervision) with six questions relating to each construct. The reliability level of each construct was measured individually and collectively. Also, each construct was measured using ANOVA and percentages via a Likert-type scale based on a

range of 6 (minimum) to 24 (maximum) and ANOVA to determine the perceptions of teachers towards PEPE. The reliability levels of the individual constructs range from .61 to .82, excluding the fairness construct, which had a reliability of only .01. For this reason, it was not used for further analysis. Since the fairness scale was not reliable, an item analysis was performed on the fairness scale, and it revealed that item 8 was deficient. This suggests that this item should be worded differently or recoded. The item, if recoded, had the potential to increase the reliability of the scale to .5410. The reliability analysis of the whole survey was .90, which indicates that the survey is very reliable.

The ANOVA analysis revealed that the only significant difference ($p = .036$) occurred in the grade level variable of the benefit construct; however, the variance of the dependent variable between the grade levels accounted for only 5% of the perceived benefit. These findings, in essence, revealed that elementary teachers viewed the PEPE process in terms of its benefits to teachers more positively than did early childhood teachers. The items in each construct were measured in percentages, and the results are illustrated below.

Benefit Category

In the benefit construct of the PEPE Perception Survey Instrument, a majority (63.6%) of the respondents surveyed agreed that the PEPE process is helpful to teachers and administrators in constructing goals for improvement. They (54.6%) also agreed that PEPE is beneficial in enhancing professional development and student achievement. A majority (69.4%) of the respondents agreed that PEPE discourages collaboration between teachers and administrators in goal setting. They (54.5%) also agreed that the

competencies and indicators measured are not relevant to the personal qualities that characterize a great teacher. In reference to the professional development plan being very instrumental in increasing student achievement, half (54.5%) of the respondents disagreed that the PDP is not instrumental in increasing student achievement. The final question in the "benefit" construct revealed that the majority (51.2%) of the respondents agreed that the principals were properly trained to be instructional leaders through PEPE, but 47.8% of the respondents disagreed that they are properly trained to be instructional leaders.

Fairness Category

In the second construct (fairness) of the PEPE Perception Survey, 76.1% of the respondents agreed that PEPE should be used primarily as a formative tool. A majority (76.1%) of the respondents agreed that PEPE should be used primarily as a summative tool in reference to termination of teachers in the evaluation process. A majority (73.8%) of the respondents agreed that the composite score of 20 is a fair minimum standard for tenured teachers. In reference to the appeals process, half (68.2%) of the teachers surveyed disagreed that the appeals process is unfair.

The findings for the last two items in this construct reveal that 71.6% of the respondents agreed that the self-assessment tool is an excellent instrument to honestly critique oneself. Also, the findings reveal that 50% of the respondents surveyed agreed that the data sources used in PEPE are fair in assessing the abilities of a teacher, while 46.6% disagreed that the data sources are fair in assessing the abilities of a teacher.

Consistency Category

In the third construct (consistency), 68.2% of respondents agreed that PEPE provides an avenue through the structured interview process where teachers and administrators can have constructive dialogue in enhancing teacher effectiveness and student achievement. In reference to the structured interview being inadequate, 50% of respondents disagreed that the structured interview is inadequate in allowing teachers to plan effectively on a long-term basis. Forty-seven point seven percent of respondents surveyed agreed that the structured interview is inadequate in allowing teachers to plan effectively on a long-term basis. Fifty percent of the respondents surveyed agreed that the data sources used in PEPE are inconsistent in assessing the abilities of a teacher, but over one-third (48.9%) of the respondents disagreed that the data sources are inconsistent in assessing the abilities of a teacher. In reference to the data sources being clear in assessing the abilities of a teacher, 51.1% of the respondents agreed with this premise, but 48.9% disagreed that the data sources are clear in assessing the abilities of a teacher. The majority of the respondents (65.9%) disagreed that the data sources are thorough and complete in fully developing teachers. The majority of the respondents (59.1%) agreed that the data sources do not complement each other.

Adequacy Category

The fourth construct (adequacy) showed that the majority (52.3%) of the teachers disagreed that evaluators are inconsistent in evaluating teachers, but over one-third (45.4%) of the respondents agreed that evaluators are consistent in evaluating teachers. The majority (61.4%) of the teachers agreed that the evaluators are consistent in their

placement of teachers on full and multi-year evaluation cycles. The majority of the respondents (61.4%) agreed that the Evaluation Summary Report provides constructive feedback in enhancing professional development for teachers. The majority of the teachers (75%) agreed that the PDP, with proper guidance and supervision, is instrumental in enhancing professional development. In reference to the PDP being instrumental in increasing student achievement, the majority (52.3%) of the respondents agreed with this statement, but a significant number of respondents (47.7%) disagreed that the PDP is instrumental in increasing student achievement. A majority (61.4%) of the teachers surveyed agreed that the PEPE process does not promote collaboration between teachers and principals. In reference to the PEPE instrument providing principals with knowledge to provide constructive feedback to teachers, a majority (72.7%) of the teachers surveyed agreed.

Supervision Category

The final construct of this survey pertains to the supervision aspect of the evaluation process. In regard to teachers feeling adequately trained in the PEPE orientation sessions, 61.3% disagreed that they are adequately trained in the orientation sessions, but 37.4% agreed that they are adequately trained in their PEPE Orientation Sessions. A majority percentage (51.1%) of respondents agreed that principals are properly trained to be instructional leaders through PEPE, while 43.2% of the respondents disagreed that principals are properly trained to be instructional leaders through PEPE. A majority (67%) of the teachers agreed that the data sources used in PEPE are appropriately matched with the competencies they measure. A majority percentage of the

respondents (67%) agreed that the PEPE process allows the principal to have one-on-one consultation time with teachers. A majority percentage (61.4%) of the respondents disagreed that the PEPE process is ineffective because of the excessive amount of paperwork required of administrators.

The aforementioned findings for each of the constructs indicate concerns in the use of PEPE in the following areas: (a) discouragement of collaboration between teachers and administrators, (b) irrelevancy of competencies and indicators in measuring qualities of an effective teacher, (c) inadequacy of structured interview, (d) lack of thoroughness and completeness of data sources in fully developing teachers, (e) lack of clarity of data sources in assessing the abilities of teachers, (f) unfairness of data sources in the evaluation of teachers, (g) inconsistency of evaluators in rating teachers, (h) perception that PDP is not instrumental in increasing student achievement, and (i) teachers' perception of evaluators' lack of skill in conducting the evaluation process.

Qualitative

The emerging themes that resulted from the content data analysis of the comment section were (a) inadequacy of the evaluation process, (b) poor time management, (c) poor supervision, (d) unfairness of the evaluation process, (e) principals' lack of skill in executing the evaluation process, and (f) benefits derived from the evaluation process. Five constructs that came from the research literature were used to build the survey instrument: benefit, fairness, consistency, adequacy, and supervision. Additionally, the researcher provided an open-ended comment section from which qualitative data were obtained.

The five survey constructs (benefit, fairness, consistency, adequacy, and supervision) are related to the seven qualitative themes (inadequacy, time management, poor supervision, unfairness, principals' skill in conducting the evaluation process, adequacy, and benefit). Table 26 illustrates the relevant patterns between the survey constructs and the qualitative themes.

Table 26

Summary Table Comparing Survey Constructs and Qualitative Themes

Survey construct	Qualitative theme
Benefit	Benefit
Fairness	Unfairness
Consistency	Inadequacy--principals' lack of skill in conducting the evaluation
Adequacy	Adequacy
Supervision	Time management, poor supervision

The benefit construct of the perception survey revealed a significant difference (p = .036) between early childhood and elementary teachers. Early childhood teachers viewed PEPE as more negative in terms of providing benefits to them than did elementary teachers. The negative benefits were related to goal setting and collaboration. According to item 3 in the PEPE Perception Survey, 64.9% of the respondents felt that PEPE discourages collaboration and goal setting between teachers and administrators. Also, item 24 revealed that the majority (61.4%) of the respondents agreed that the PEPE instrument does not promote collaboration between teachers and principals. The qualitative analysis

revealed that only 5.7% of the respondents felt that the PEPE process is valuable in assisting teachers in goal setting and providing constructive feedback.

The fairness construct revealed that a majority of the teachers, ranging from 68% to 76%, felt that PEPE is fair in reference to the appeals process, the composite score, and utilization of the instrument as a summative tool. The qualitative analysis revealed that 11.4% of the respondents saw this instrument as being unfair. The concerns here stemmed from the lack of skill of the evaluator to effectively evaluate teachers and from the use of this process as an intimidation measure.

The consistency construct from the perception survey revealed that 65.9% of the teachers felt that the data sources used in PEPE are not thorough and complete in fully developing them as teachers. The survey also revealed that 59.1% of the teachers felt that the data sources used in PEPE do not complement each other and over one-third of the respondents felt that evaluators were inconsistent in rating teachers. The qualitative analysis revealed that 34.3% of the teachers view the evaluation process (PEPE) as being inadequate and ineffective in judging them as effective teachers and in enhancing their professional development. The qualitative findings also reveal that 11.4% of the teachers perceived administrators as being incompetent in evaluating teachers because of the administrators' lack of skill in conducting the evaluation process and their inability to explain clearly and properly this process to their teachers.

The supervision construct from the perception survey revealed that 61.3% of the respondents felt they were adequately trained in the orientation session, and 42.3% of the respondents felt that principals were not properly trained via PEPE to be instructional leaders. The supervision theme in the qualitative analysis refers to concerns by 11.4% of

the respondents that principals are unable to clearly explain and conduct the evaluation process in a nonthreatening manner. The qualitative findings also reveal that 14.3% of the teachers felt that the lack of effective "time management" on the part of the administrators resulted in less one-on-one consultation time with teachers. This, in effect, was viewed by teachers as an obstacle to reaching their full potential.

The adequacy construct from the perception survey revealed that a majority (52.3%) of teachers felt that evaluators are inconsistent in evaluating teachers, and 64.4% of the teachers felt that the Evaluation Summary Report provides constructive feedback in enhancing professional development for teachers. The adequacy theme in the qualitative analysis shows that 5.7% of the respondents perceived PEPE as being adequate in providing constructive feedback and as a good system overall. The qualitative theme in reference to time management showed that 17.1% of the respondents viewed PEPE as an obstacle in providing benefits to teachers in reference to communication, collaboration, and professional development.

The qualitative theme in reference to principals' lack of skill in conducting the evaluation process revealed that 11.4% of the respondents viewed this as an obstacle to supervision because of their perceptions of the evaluator's inability to explain and convey this process to teachers.

In reference to inadequacy of the evaluation process, respondents view it as inadequate, unfair, and ineffective in judging them as effective teachers and in enhancing their professional development.

Time management was perceived by 17.1% of the respondents as a great concern. They stated that the overwhelming amount of paperwork required of administrators

effects their ability to properly concentrate and fairly evaluate teachers' lessons during observations. The respondents also felt that the administrators provided less one-on-one consultation with teachers in developing them to their fullest potential. Also, they felt that teachers were overwhelmed in preparing for the full-cycle evaluation, and the time used by them to prepare for this process takes away from the time spent teaching.

Poor supervision on the part of administrators was another critical concern. The respondents' (14.3%) concerns here centered around the principals' inability to clearly explain and conduct the evaluation process in a nonthreatening manner in orientation sessions and throughout the year.

Another area that teachers perceived as a critical factor in the evaluation process was the unfairness of the evaluation process. The respondents (11.4%) felt that the system was unfair in that certain aspects of the teaching process are evaluated unfairly because of having unannounced observations and principals from different schools conducting evaluations. The views here were that the administrators use this process as an intimidation measure to terminate teachers.

A final critical area of concern of respondents concerning PEPE is their perception of the principals' lack of skill in conducting the evaluation process. The perceptions here were that administrators were not competent in evaluating teachers because of their lack of knowledge of PEPE and their inability to clearly and properly explain this process to their teachers.

There were two areas of the PEPE Evaluation process that a small percentage of the respondents felt were positive: adequacy and benefit. In reference to adequacy, these particular respondents stated that PEPE is adequate in providing constructive feedback.

that it is a good system overall, and that the principals are good at conveying this process to the teachers.

In regard to the benefits derived from the PEPE Evaluation Process, these respondents felt that the PEPE process was helpful in assisting the teachers in setting goals for all children as well as providing constructive feedback to teachers.

In summary, the qualitative findings show that, overall there were more negative comments than positive comments, by a ratio of 2 to 1, with the most significant category being teachers' perceptions of the PEPE process as being inadequate.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn from this study:

1. There is no difference in the perceptions of teachers towards PEPE based on school status (Alert, Caution, Clear). Based on the findings of this study, teachers felt that the collaborative aspect of the evaluation process was lacking. The study revealed that 69.4% of the respondents felt that PEPE discourages collaboration and goal setting between teachers and administrators. According to Kulianna and Silverman (1999), in the evaluation process, it is critical that teachers feel they should collaborate with decision makers and have an influence in the decision making about the development and implementation of such a process if, indeed, they are going to feel good about it, develop professionally, and ultimately produce increased student achievement.

Another aspect of the evaluation process that supports this conclusion was focused upon by Wolfhagen and Gijselaers (1997) who state that the opportunity to discuss and

carry on a dialogue and engage in collaboration is very important in the development and implementation of evaluation systems.

The findings of Gitlin and Price (1992) also support this conclusion. These authors stated that teachers should have a voice in the process where they could have some type of recourse against anarchical views of administrators and also be provided an atmosphere and opportunities where they could work together collaboratively in enhancing their growth and the process as well (Gitlin & Price).

2. An examination of qualitative results related to the benefits consturct revealed that early childhood teachers did not perceive collaboration as positively as their elementary counterparts. In addition to the perception survey indicating a weakness in the area of collaboration, there were also qualitative concerns in this area. In the qualitative analysis, 33% of the respondents viewed PEPE as an obstacle to teachers in reference to one-on-one communication with administrators, collaboration in goal setting, and provisions of professional growth in developing them to their fullest potential as teachers. This conclusion is corroborated by the findings of Deming (1986) and Hackman and Oldham (1980). These authors noted that working together and providing positive feedback certainly enhances attitude, diligence, productivity, and benefits the total organization (Deming, 1986; Hackman & Oldham). The belief that workers want to do a good job and make a significant contribution has been widely espoused (Frase, 1992). Frase's work posited that workers can benefit from immediate feedback regarding their performances. Frequent classroom visitation and involvement in instruction can give administrators the tools they need in an effort to provide worthwhile and timely feedback (Frase). Csikszentmihalyi (1990) noted that these kinds of actions result in autolectic jobs.

Autolectic jobs result in optimal experience. The autolectic work environment boosts motivation, attitude, and ultimately performance. This conclusion, although drawn from quantitative analysis, was supported by an analysis of the comment section of the survey instrument. More early childhood teachers provided negative comments regarding PEPE than did elementary teachers. The qualitative component of the analysis revealed that some early childhood teachers strongly supported the negative perceptions found in the quantitative analysis. These teachers expressed views that the process was inadequate, unfair, and ineffective.

3. Based on this study, teachers' perceived that collaboration is a key element that must be present if evaluation systems are going to be successful. Based upon the data compiled through the survey and qualitative data, teachers did not feel they experienced collaboration and input with administrators in developing the evaluation process and setting goals for professional development. Item 24 in the PEPE Perception Survey revealed that 61.4% of the respondents agreed that the PEPE instrument does not promote collaboration between teachers and administrators. The qualitative findings revealed that 17.1% of the respondents felt that because of excessive paperwork and poor time management, administrators are unable to give them the proper attention to fully develop their capacities as teachers. Costa and Collick (1993), Glickman (1992), and Leithwood (1992) noted that in an effort to promote professional development, teachers must become an integral part of the assessment process along with the administrators. A study done by Searfoss and Enz (1996) supports this conclusion as well. The results of this study revealed a need for a collaborative evaluation process that gives teachers the opportunity to grow professionally together. This conclusion also supports the findings of

Koehler (1996). These authors stated that collegiality or collegial activities in supervision must be connected or linked with in-service training and teacher evaluation procedures. Koehler's study showed that the comments made by administrators on evaluations to teachers and the understanding of those comments by teachers in terms of professional growth were meaningless and inconsistent according to many teachers and principals. Also, Koehler revealed that in many instances, professional development programs do not coincide with what a teacher truly needs and what the administrator says she or he needs in developing professionally.

This conclusion was also supported by the findings of Rooney (1993) in her efforts to improve the evaluation process at her school and give teachers input in improving and developing that process. According to Rooney, it is very clear that the change of attitude toward the system based on collaborative and democratic efforts by the teachers and principal has indeed enhanced the performance levels of the teachers.

Discussion

This study revealed that, overall, teachers were positive about PEPE, but there were some concerns noted as well. Teachers' perceptions about the PEPE process showed concerns in the areas of collaboration, goal setting, data sources in measuring teacher abilities, clarity of the measurement process, and the thoroughness and completeness of the data sources in developing teachers. Concerns also stemmed from perceptions that the evaluators' skill in rating teachers was inconsistent, and from the inability of the evaluator to conduct and convey clearly this process to teachers.

In an effort to successfully improve this process, there should be a focus on teacher input in the process, consistent training for teachers and administrators, and collaboration and communication in goal setting between teachers and administrators. From both quantitative and qualitative perspectives, this study revealed concerns in terms of the adequacy and collaboration of this process and skill of the participants conducting this process.

Recommendations for Practice

1. The evaluation process should foster collaboration between teachers and administrators on a regular basis.

2. The Birmingham Board of Education should have professional development and teacher evaluation training for teachers and administrators as high priorities in the development of The Birmingham City Schools Staff Development Academy.

3. The Birmingham Board of Education should implement, every 3 years, evaluator training for administrators to test evaluator reliability and knowledge skills in regard to the Current evaluation system.

4. The evaluation process should provide training for teachers and administrators on an annual basis.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. A study should be done on a statewide basis to compare teachers' perceptions of PEPE.

2. A study should be conducted to compare principals' perceptions of PEPE on a statewide basis.

3. A study should be conducted to elicit the concerns of superintendents, central office administrators, principals, and teachers regarding PEPE.

4. A study should be done to elicit principals' knowledge and expectations of PEPE.

5. A study should be conducted to elicit teachers' knowledge and expectations of PEPE.

6. A study should be done to compare teachers' PEPE Evaluation Composite Scores with their perceptions of PEPE.

Implications for Educational Decision Makers

After completing this study, some very candid concerns of teachers concerning the evaluation process were revealed in the review of literature and the survey findings. It is apparent that teachers will accept the evaluation process as long as they understand the process, have input, feel that they are a part of the evaluation process, and feel that their evaluator is skillful in presenting and conducting the evaluation process in a nonthreatening manner, that their evaluator provides constructive feedback and is fair and patient in implementing this process. In order for any evaluation process to be successful, competent leadership, collaboration, communication, and professional growth must be the key ingredients. After contemplating the aforementioned concerns of this study, it is clear that these concerns arise from perceived weaknesses in one or more of these key ingredients. In the Birmingham City School System, administrators must be aware of the

concerns of teachers, and efforts must be made to make the evaluation system more inclusive and collaborative, while encouraging professional development. Professional development of teachers in conjunction with the evaluation system needs to be a priority annually. In doing this, the Birmingham City School System will aid itself in investing in and maintaining excellent personnel, which will ultimately enhance the academic status of its schools and the school system overall.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Aghadiuno, M. (1995). A causal model of secondary students' achievement in chemistry. Research in Science and Technological Education, 13, 123-134.

Airasian, P., & Gullickson, A. (1997). Teacher self-evaluation tool kit. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Alabama State Department of Education. (1998). Professional educational personnel evaluation program of Alabama. Montgomery, AL: Author.

Alabama State Department of Education. (1999). Alabama educational directory. Montgomery, AL: Author.

Annuziata , J. (1997). Professional and staff development: Staff development. Educational Administration Abstracts, 34, 75-78.

Armstrong, S. P. (1999). Marion county school system teachers' perceptions of the PEPE (PEPE) gender differences. (Doctoral Dissertation University of Alabama 1999). Dissertation Abstracts International, 60, 1837A.

Bauch, P. A. (1984, April). The impact of teachers' instructional beliefs on their teaching: Implications for research and practice. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Bromley, D. (1998). Expectations, incentives, and performance in America's schools. Adedalus, 127, 41, 67.

Brophy, J., & Good, T. (1996). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Third handbook of research on teaching (pp. 1-5). New York: Macmillan.

Bryant, M., & Currin, D. (1995). Views of teacher evaluation from novice and expert evaluators. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 10, 250-262.

Carpie, W., Elliott, C. D., & Johnson, C. E. (1980). Relating pupil achievement gains to ratings of secondary students' performance. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Carpie, W., Tobin, K. G., & Bowell, M. (1980). Using pupil achievement to validate ratings of student teacher performance. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Cogan, M. (1973). Clinical supervision. Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin.

Costa, A. L., & Kallick, B. (1993). Through the lens of a critical friend. Educational Leadership, 51(2), 49-51.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). Flow: The psychology of optimal experience. New York: Harper Perennial.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Teachers and teaching: Testing policy hypotheses from a national commission report. Educational Researcher, 27, 5-15.

Deming, W. E. (1986). Out of crisis. Cambridge, MA: MIT Center for Advanced Engineering.

Edwards, M. (1995). Growth is the name of the game. Educational Leadership, 52, 72-75.

Falk, B., & Ort, S. (1998). Sitting down to score: Teacher learning through assessment. Phi Delta Kappan, 78, 276-282.

Ferrini-Mundy, J. (1996). Mathematics teachers' attitudes and beliefs: Implications for in-service education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Frase, L. (1992). Constructive feedback on teaching is missing. Education, 11, 176-182.

Furtwengler, C. B. (1992). How to observe cooperative learning classrooms. Educational Leadership, 49(5), 8-12.

Futch, L., & Stephens, J., Jr. (1997). The beliefs of Georgia teachers and principals regarding the NCTM standards: A representative view using the standards' belief instrument. School Science & Mathematics, 97, 242-248.

Gitlin, A., & Price, K. (1992). Teacher empowerment and the development of voice. In C. Clickman (Ed.), Supervision in transition (pp. 61-74). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Glickman, C. (Ed.). (1992). Supervision in transition: 1992 ASCD yearbook. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1989). Fourth generation evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hackman, R., & Oldham, G. (1980). Work redesign. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.

Herman, J. (1992). What research tells us about good assessment. Educational Leadership, 49, 74-78.

Hirsch, E. (1996). The schools we need: Why we don't have them. New York: Doubleday.

Hord, S. M., & Hall, G. E. (1987). Three images: What principals do in curriculum implementation. Curriculum Inquiry, 17, 55-87.

Howell, V., Archibald, J., & Hansen, J. (2000, March 3). State schools make grade. Birmingham News, pp. 1A, 10A.

Huetinct, L., & Munshin, S. (1995). Eight methods to evaluate and support reform in the secondary-level mathematics classroom. Evaluation Review, 19, 646-663.

Illmer, S., Snyder, J., Erbaugh, S., & Kurz, K. (1997). Urban educators' perceptions of successful teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 48, 379-385.

Jones, K., & Whitford, L. (1997). Kentucky's conflicting reform principles: High stakes school accountability and student performance assessment. Phi Delta Kappan, 78, 276-282.

Klucking, G. (1999). Teachers' perceptions of the initial uses of the PEPE. (Doctoral Dissertation Auburn University 1999). Dissertation Abstracts International, 60, 38578.

Koehler, M. (1996). When collegiality doesn't work. Clearinghouse, 69, 167-169.

Kulinna, P., & Silverman, S. (1999). The development and validation of scores on a measure of teachers' attitudes toward teaching physical activity and fitness. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 59, 507-518.

Lavely, C., & Berger, N. (1996). Contemporary process-product teacher evaluation research relationships. Journal of Instructional Psychology, 23, 293-297.

Leithwood, K. A. (1992). The move toward transformational leadership. Educational Leadership, 49, 59-62.

Long, J., & Sparks, W. (1997). Behaviors perceived as facilitating or inhibiting the teacher-learning process. Journal of Instructional Psychology, 24, 196-202.

Loup, K. (1997). Teacher performance evaluation. Educational Administration Abstracts, 32, 337.

Marchant, G., & Bowers, N. (1990). An attitude inventory for research-based effective teaching behaviors. Educational & Psychological Measurement, 50, 167-175.

Mayo, R. W. (1997). Trends in teacher evaluation. Clearing House, 70, 269-271.

McBee, M. M., & Crawford, J. (1987). The impact of Oklahoma teacher competency legislation on entry year teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

McConney, A., & Schalock, M., Schalock, H. (1999). Performance and program evaluation: teacher performance evaluation. Educational Administration Abstracts, 34, 83-85.

McGrath, M. (1995). Effective evaluation. Thrust for Educational Leadership, 24, 36-40.

Millman, J. (1981). Handling of teacher evaluation. Educational Administration Abstracts, 32, 338.

Nespor, J. K. (1985). The role of belief of practice of teaching: Final report of the teacher beliefs study. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 270 446)

Parker, J., & Spink, E. (1997). Becoming science teachers: An evaluation of the initial stages of primary teacher training. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 22, 17-32.

Pasch, S., Pasch, M., Johnson, R., Ilmer, S., Snyder, J., Stapleton, E., Hamilton, A., & Mooradian, F. (1993). Reflections of urban education: A tale of three cities. In M. J. O'Hair & S. J. Odell (Eds.), Diversity and teaching: Teacher education yearbook (pp. 9-30). New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Ramsay, W., & Ransley, W. (1986). A method of analysis for determining dimensions of teaching style. Teaching and Teacher Education, 2, 69-79.

Richardson, E. (2000, June 5). Schools produce "incredible" results on Stanford 9. Alabama Education News, p. 3.

Rooney, J. (1993). Teacher evaluation: No more "super vision." Educational Leadership, 51, 43-45.

Rothberg, R., & Fenner, M. (1991). Teacher perceptions of teacher assessment. Clearing House, 64, 272-275.

Sanders, J. (1997). Performance and program evaluation: Teacher performance evaluation. Educational Administration Abstracts, 34, 85.

Schon, D. A. (1987). Education, the reflective practitioner. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Searfoss, L., & Enz, B. J. (1996). Can teacher evaluation reflect holistic instruction? Educational Leadership, 53, 38-42.

Senge, P. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. New York: Doubleday.

Should student test scores be used to evaluate teachers? (1999) NEA Today, 17, 43-44.

Skechtman, Z. (1993). School adjustment and small-group therapy: An Israeli study. Journal of Counseling & Development, 72, 77-82.

SPSS. (1999). Statistical package for the social sciences base 10.0 users guide. Chicago: Author.

Stiggins, R. (1999). Student confidence, and school success. Phi Delta Kappan, 81, 191-199.

Stiggins, R., & Duke, D. (1998). The case for commitment to teacher growth. Buffalo, NY: State University of New York Press.

Stodolsky, S. (1984). Teacher evaluation: The limits of looking. Educational Researcher, 13, 11-17.

Stringfield, S. (1998). Underlying the chaos: Factors explaining exemplary U.S. elementary schools and the case for high reliability organizations. London: Routledge.

Stronge, J. (1997). Performance and program evaluation. Educational Administration Abstracts, 34, 86-88.

Stronge, J., & Ostrander, L. P. (1997). Performance and program evaluation: Teacher performance evaluation. Educational Administration Abstracts, 34, 86.

Taebel, D. (1990). Is evaluation fair to music educators? Music Educators Journal, 20, 67-79.

Taylor, L. (1994). Reflecting on teaching: The benefits of self-evaluation. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 19, 109-121.

Teven, J. J., & McCroskey, J. C. (1997). Teacher performance evaluation. Educational Administration Abstracts, 32, 338.

Trentham, L., Cardin, D., Holbrook, M., & Hunt, N. (1987). State-wide teacher evaluation plans: Status of implementation and research. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, Washington, D.C.

Van der Linde, C. (1998). Clinical supervision in teacher evaluation: A pivotal factor in the quality management of education. Education, 119, 328-336.

Webb, K. (1995). Performance and program evaluation. Educational Administration Abstracts, 31, 490.

Wiggins, G. (1993). Assessing student performance: Exploring the purpose and limits of testing. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wilcox, B., & Schonberger, L. (1998). Changing attitudes on assessment. Reading Teacher, 52, 294-298.

Wilson, B., & Ireton, E. (1997). Beginning teacher fears. Education, 117, 396-402.

Wilson, B., & Wood, J. (1997). Evaluation methods. Performance evaluation. Teacher performance. Educational Administration Abstracts, 32, 338.

Wolf, K., Lichtenstein, G., & Stevenson, C. (1997). Performance and program evaluation: teacher performance evaluation. Educational Administration Abstracts, 34, 88.

Wolfhagen, H., & Gijselaers, W. (1997). Improving clinical education through evaluation. Medical Teacher, 19, 99-104.

Wunsch, D. (1986, February). Action research in business education. Business Education Forum, 31-36.

Zollman, A., & Mason, E. (1992). Standards' belief instrument (SBI): Teachers' beliefs about the NCTM standards. School Science and Mathematics, 92, 359-363.

APPENDIX A: SURVEY

Section I

Directions: Please indicate for Items 1-30 whether you strongly disagree (SD), disagree (D), agree (A), or strongly agree (SA) by placing an X in the appropriate category.

Statement	SD	D	A	SA
1. The full cycle professional development component of PEPE is quite beneficial in assessing weaknesses and constructing goals for improvement.				
2. The multi-cycle professional development component of PEPE is quite beneficial in developing leadership qualities in enhancing personal growth and student achievement.				
3. The PEPE process discourages collaboration between teachers and administrators in goal setting.				
4. The competencies and indicators that PEPE is predicated on are not relevant to personal qualities that characterize effective teachers.				
5. The PDP is not instrumental in increasing student achievement.				
6. Principals are properly trained to be instructional leaders through PEPE.				
7. PEPE should be used primarily as a formative tool in the evaluation process.				
8. PEPE should be used as a summative tool in reference to termination of teachers in the evaluation process.				
9. The composite score of 20 is a fair minimum standard for tenured teachers.				
10. The appeals process in allowing teaches to refute their scores only if a procedural error is committed by the administrator is unfair.				
11. The self-assessment instrument is an excellent tool to be used for an honest critique of oneself.				
Statement	SD	D	A	SA

Statement	SD	D	A	SA
12. The data sources used in PEPE are fair in assessing the abilities of a teacher.				
13. PEPE provides an avenue through the structured interview process where teachers and administrators can have constructive dialogue in enhancing teacher effectiveness and student achievement.				
14. The structured interview component of PEPE is inadequate in allowing teachers to plan and assess long-term and effectively.				
15. The data sources (observation, structured interview, PDP, and Supervisors Review Form) used in PEPE are inconsistent in assessing the abilities of a teacher.				
16. The data sources (observation, structured interview, PDP, and Supervisors Review Form) used in PEPE are clear assessing the abilities of a teacher.				
17. The PEPE data sources (observation, structured interview, PDP, and Supervisors Review Form) are thorough and complete in developing teachers to their fullest potential.				
18. The data sources (observation, structured interview, PDP, and Supervisors Review Form) used in the PEPE process do not complement each other.				
19. Evaluators are inconsistent in rating teachers.				
20. Evaluators are consistent in determining which teachers are placed on full and multi-year cycles.				
21. The Evaluation Summary Report provides constructive feedback in enhancing professional development for teachers.				
22. The PDP, with proper supervision and guidance, is instrumental in enhancing teacher performance.				
23. The PDP, with proper supervision and guidance, is not instrumental in increasing student achievement.				
24. The PEPE instrument does not promote collaboration between teachers and principals.				

25. The PEPE instrument provides principals with the knowledge to provide constructive feedback to teachers.				
26. Teachers are not adequately trained in PEPE orientation sessions.				
27. Principals are properly trained to be instructional leaders through PEPE.				
28. Data sources (observation, structured interview, PDP, and Supervisors Review Form) are matched appropriately with the eight competencies they measure.				
29. The PEPE process is adequate in that it allows administrators the flexibility of having quality one-on-one consultations with teachers.				
30. The PEPE process is ineffective because of the excessive amount of paperwork required of administrators.				

PEPE (PEPE)
Doctoral Perception Survey

Section II--Demographics

Directions--Please circle the appropriate response below as it pertains to you and your school.

1. Gender
   a.) Male
   b.) Female

2. Ethnic Background
   a.) Caucasian
   b.) African American
   c.) Hispanic
   d.) Asian American
   e.) 0ther

3. Current Teaching Assignment
   a.) Kindergarten
   b.) First Grade
   c.) Second Grade
   d.) Third Grade
   e.) Fourth Grade
   f.) Fifth Grade

4. Academic Status of School
   a.) Clear
   b.) Caution
   c.) Alert

Section III

Open-Ended Questions

Directions: Please respond concisely and honestly to the following questions.

1. Do you feel that the PEPE (PEPE) enhances teacher performance? Please explain.

2. Do you feel that the PEPE (PEPE) is consistently implemented among all teachers?

3. If you had the authority, would you mandate the continuation of this program?

APPENDIX B: LETTERS TO SUPERINTENDENT AND PARTICIPANTS

Douglas Ragland
215 Gardens Place
Birmingham, Alabama 35216

June 8, 2000

Dr. Johnny E. Brown, Superintendent
Birmingham City School System

Dear Dr. Brown:

I am writing this letter seeking your permission to conduct my dissertation study in the Birmingham City School System. My dissertation is entitled "Birmingham City School Teachers' Perceptions of the PEPE (PEPE) and the Resulting Impact on Student Achievement." Your approval concerning this project is greatly appreciated. My target date to complete this study is October 20, 2000.

Teachers will be selected through random sampling for this research. The names of all participants will be confidential. No person or school will be disclosed.

I feel this study will be beneficial to the Birmingham City School System in that it will complement our efforts in working towards our goals of enhancing professional development, teacher quality, and student achievement.

I welcome any questions, comments, or suggestions that you may have.

I want to thank you in advance for affording me the opportunity to conduct this research study in the Birmingham City School System during the Fall of the 2000-2001 school year.

Respectfully,

Douglas Ragland

Douglas Ragland
215 Gardens Place
Birmingham, Alabama 35216

July 10, 2000

Dear Participant:

I am presently working on my dissertation at The University of Alabama in Birmingham and Tuscaloosa in the Joint Doctoral Program. I am conducting research on Birmingham City School System teachers' perceptions of the Personnel Evaluation Program of Alabama (PEPE). I am asking you to please take the time and complete the survey instrument honestly and candidly. Your responses will be kept confidential.

Please return the survey in the enclosed addressed envelope within the next few days. I feel the results of this study will be beneficial to educators, students, and policy makers.

Please feel free to express to me any questions, concerns, or suggestions you may have. Thank you very much for your cooperation in completing the survey instrument.

Respectfully,

Douglas Ragland
K-5 Personnel Coordinator

Enclosure

APPENDIX C: LETTERS OF VALIDATION FOR PEPE PERCEPTION SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Memorandum

To: Douglas Ragland
Doctoral Candidate, Educational Leadership
University of Alabama at Birmingham

From: Jeanine Clements Bell, Ed.D.
Program Specialist, Visual Arts

Re: Validity of Research Instrument

Date: August 8, 2000

I have examined your research instrument and I find that it is:

1. Beneficial and fair to teachers and administrators.
2. Consistent and adequate in all components of the examination of the teacher evaluation process.
3. Proper in its construction based on the Professional Education Personnel Evaluation Program in Alabama.

I base this endorsement on the fact that I served in the principalship in Birmingham City Schools for five years, I am a trained PEPE evaluator, and I hold a doctorate degree in Educational Leadership.

Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

DR. BOB PALMATIER
PRINCIPAL

TELEPHONE 581-5165

August 28, 2000

Mr. Doug Ragland, Personnel Specialist
Human Resources

Dear Doug:

Thank you for the opportunity to review your research document. I believe the questionnaire does a good job of assessing teachers opinions of the PEPE instrument and process. The questions provide data on the three questions you pose (fairness, consistency, effectiveness). Thus, I believe your instrument is valid for determining teacher perceptions of the PEPE Program.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Palmatier

Robert A. Palmatier, Ph.D.
Principal

G. W. Washington Carver High School
2316 7th Avenue North
Birmingham, AL 35203

August 29, 2000

Mr. Douglas Ragland
Birmingham Board of Education

Dear Doug:

After careful study of your instrument, I find it be a valid tool for measuring Birmingham City School System teachers' perception of PEPE and it's impact on student achievement. The items are fair to both teachers and administrators. The questions are adequately structured and consistent in content and purpose.

The first six items address the perceptions of benefits or lack of benefits of the PEPE. The items are clear, unbiased and designed to elicit responses that will provide the data they are designed to elicit.

Items 7-12 address the perception of fairness. Again, the items are clear in structure and design. They are fair to all participants in the PEPE process. They address the use of results as well as the standards for usage which are the ultimate measures of fairness.

Items 13-18 address the perception of consistency. The items are clear and focused on all steps in the PEPE process. Each item is designed to address the process as a whole and not a designated step. I feel this type of structure enhances the quality of the data that will be revealed.

Items 19-24 addresses the perception of adequacy of the PEPE instrument. The items address issues of collaboration, student achievement, and enhancing teacher performance. All of these issues are vital indicators of adequacy. The items are consistent in purpose and design.

Items 25-30 address perception of supervision. These items, too, are clear and concise in structure and design.

In closing, it is my opinion that your instrument will reveal data that will prove beneficial to all who must participate in the PEPE process in Birmingham. I feel the clear, unbiased, consistent structure of your items will provide the kind of data that will add much to the validation as well as the invalidation of the many conversations and concerns of administrators and teachers concerning PEPE in our school system.

Best regards,
Claudia J. Williams

APPENDIX D: RESPONDENTS' COMMENTS

Respondents' Individual Narrative Comments

The following comments are quoted from the teachers surveyed concerning the adequacy of the PEPE Evaluation process.

"I feel that PEPE is a good system"

"I do feel that my principal is good at doing the evaluation."

"I do feel it is necessary to minimize the amount of paperwork for the principals."

"I do agree the PEPE system is adequate in providing constructive feedback."

Another category that was quite prevalent in the comment section was the perceptions of teachers that the evaluation system is inadequate. The following comments reflect the inadequacy of the evaluation system from the viewpoints of some of the respondents surveyed.

"Must be a better way to evaluate teachers."

"Coming in a teacher's classroom 3 or 4 times yearly is not, to me, an effective means of judging my competence as a teacher for an entire year."

"I was trained for PEPE while I was working on my Ed.S. at UAB. I did not think it would work then and I still don't."

"Ideally, the PEPE system is well comprised of the tenets of education that one would look for in an excellent teacher. The process of collaboration between teacher and administrator should allow for true evaluation and goal setting."

"The PEPE requires so much paperwork and documentation that it actually detracts from classroom time and professional development and planning opportunities."

"Some of your questions were worded in a way that made them difficult to answer. I have been instructed by my principal to teach a 45-minute lesson with an introduction, lesson, student practice, and wrap-up. This is not appropriate for kindergarten students whose attention span is less than 20 minutes."

"Principals do not spend enough time in the classroom to actually see the true performance of a teacher. It also allows them to be too opinionated. The composite score should show improvement and not remain the same."

"After reviewing my results, I found that some inconsistencies resulted. During the planned observation, I made special efforts to include certain categories and was not given proper credit. I feel that during unplanned observations, that evaluators miss certain aspects of the lesson and are marking categories blindly. Evaluators are given certain time limits to go by and if they are bombarded by an excessive amount of paperwork and teachers to evaluate."

"PEPE is better than other evaluations Birmingham has used, but it still is very susceptible."

"The idea of what PEPE is meant to do is great. But in actuality, it fosters hours--maybe days--taken away from the students. Some teachers take class time to prepare to perform--and I do mean perform--to seek higher scores. Those receiving low scores do not feel 'helped.' There seems to be a mode of inadequacy--and if it does not change--'you're out of here!'"

"It would be great if principals from other schools observe teachers, talk with other [principals] as to what they observed. Then the principal informs teachers of improvements needed. PEPE is time consuming. Principals cannot stay on schedule because of other duties in the school. Principals sometimes leave important facts out of written evaluations. Many teachers may use important quality time to prepare for PEPE. The time could be used to help students. The principal is forced by the PEPE program to write suggestions for improving a teacher's performance. Some improvements may not be necessary."

"Principals who are doing their jobs are very aware of a teacher's effectiveness without using the excessively time-consuming PEPE instrument. It does not open dialogue between teachers and principals because we are being scored and our job depends on the score. Even if a principal knows you are fulfilling objectives in reality, if it is not stated using the right terminology, he or she is unable to score it. The time spent on PEPE by both teachers and principals could be much better spent with the students. I think sitting down together and setting goals and evaluating your performance is helpful when not done in the context of determining a score relating to keeping your job. The instrument itself is extremely redundant and not comprehensive in evaluating all aspects of effective teaching."

"I am glad I am not a principal so that I don't have to do the amount of paperwork that the PEPE system requires. I feel that it does get the principal in the classroom to see what is being taught and how. I also feel that good tenured teachers should only to be fully evaluated once every 5 to 7 years."

The last emerging category from the respondents' comment section was their perception of this process having poor supervision. The following comments reflect the respondents' views in this area.

"I prefer the old method of teacher evaluation. I feel we understand what is going on better. However, I feel if I truly understood the process, I could benefit from PEPE. I don't understand PEPE."

"The fact that some principals are knowledgeable concerning the assessment procedure and others are woefully inadequate makes the testing procedure unfair."

"It was somewhat difficult to evaluate the PEPE process. Trainers should work with new hired from day one in understanding this evaluation instrument."

"My main problem with PEPE is that the principals tell you exactly what they want to be evaluated. I feel that there are many more areas that are important to a good teacher than what they are doing to prepare for the SAT. Also, why have an announced visit. Even the worst teacher can prepare a good lesson for an announced visit. The good thing about PEPE is that it does promote teacher/principal interaction!"

"I do not believe that teachers have received sufficient training on PEPE. In my opinion, many good teachers are being categorized as average. Perhaps there is a need for another category. In what I have read about PEPE, not one of the principals I have had knew how to effectively use it, therefore, it was a complete turn-off from the beginning."

The following comments reflect the respondents' perceptions of PEPE being unfair.

"Regardless of its intent, PEPE is a deliberate, hurtful, paper and verbal mistreatment of Birmingham city teachers."

"Because of the evaluator's choice of tactics, PEPE is an intimidating control that hangs over the teacher's head."

PEPE poses a serious health hazard to those thinking I may lose my job because of principals' cruelty during rating. Should I say more?"

As I agree the PEPE system is adequate in providing constructive feedback, the inconsistencies between school to school and system to system are extremely abundant.

"I also saw personality conflicts reflected in grading evaluations among my co-workers, although I did not personally experience this."

"After reviewing my results, I found some inconsistencies resulted."

"During the planned observation, I made special efforts to include certain categories and was not given proper credit. I feel that during unplanned observations, that evaluators miss certain aspects of the lesson and are marking categories blindly. Evaluators are given certain time limits to go by and if they are bombarded by an excessive amount of paperwork and teachers to evaluate."

"They sometimes have principals from other schools to come in and observe teachers to help. I do not think this is fair because that visiting evaluator does not know that teacher or that teacher's teaching styles."

"The fact that some principals are knowledgeable concerning the assessment procedure and others are woefully inadequate makes the testing procedure unfair."

The following comments reflect the beneficial aspects of PEPE by respondents surveyed.

"In long-range planning, PEPE helps to guide the teacher and set the goals for all students, even the reluctant learner. I agree the PEPE system is adequate in providing constructive feedback."

The following comments reflect the respondents' perceptions regarding PEPE in the area of time management.

"The PEPE system is thorough, but it is too lengthy."

"The idea of what PEPE is meant to do is great. But in actuality, it fosters hours--maybe days--taken away from the students. Some teachers take class time to prepare to perform--and I do mean perform--to seek higher scores."

"PEPE is time consuming. Principals cannot stay on schedule because of other duties in the school. Principals sometimes leave important facts out of written evaluations. Many teacher may use important quality time to prepare for PEPE. The time could be used to help students."

"I am glad I am not a principal so that I don't have to do the amount of paperwork that the PEPE system requires. I feel that it does get the principal in the classroom to see what is being taught and how. I also feel that good tenured teachers should only have to be fully evaluated once every 5 to 7 years."

"The PEPE requires so much paperwork and documentation that it actually detracts from classroom time and professional development and planning opportunities."

"Too time consuming for principals and teachers."

The last emerging category from the comment section was in regards to the principals' knowledge of the PEPE process.

> "The fact that some principals are knowledgeable concerning the assessment procedure and others are woefully inadequate makes the testing procedure unfair. In what I have read about PEPE, not one of the principals I have had knew how to effectively use it, therefore, it was a complete turn-off from the beginning."

> "I don't understand PEPE."

> "I prefer the old method of teacher evaluation. I feel we understand what is going on better. However, I feel if I truly understood the process, I could benefit from PEPE."

GRADUATE SCHOOL
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA AT BIRMINGHAM
DISSERTATION APPROVAL FORM
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Name of Candidate Douglas Lee Ragland

Graduate Program Educational Leadership

Title of Dissertation Birmingham City School System Teachers' Perceptions of the Professional Education Personnel Evaluation Program of Alabama as it Relates to Their Schools' Academic Status

I certify that I have read this document and examined the student regarding its content. In my opinion, this dissertation conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is adequate in scope and quality, and the attainments of this student are such that he may be recommended for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Dissertation Committee:

Name		Signature
Harold L. Bishop	**Co-Chair**	
David L. Dagley	**Co-Chair**	
William D. Rogan		
James E. McLean		
Claudia J. Williams		

Director of Graduate Program

Dean, UAB Graduate School

Date 1/4/01