

ATTITUDES OF CORE FRENCH TEACHERS
IN NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR TO THE
TEACHER EVALUATION PROCESS:
IMPLICATIONS FOR CHANGE

CENTRE FOR NEWFOUNDLAND STUDIES

**TOTAL OF 10 PAGES ONLY
MAY BE XEROXED**

(Without Author's Permission)

MAXWELL JOSEPH SYMONDS



Attitudes of Core French Teachers
in Newfoundland and Labrador to the
Teacher Evaluation Process: Implications
for Change

by

Maxwell Joseph Symonds

A thesis submitted to the
School of Graduate Studies
in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Education

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Memorial University of Newfoundland

September, 1993

St. John's

Newfoundland



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Author: Author's Name

Author: Author's Name

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-86614-4

Canada

ABSTRACT

This thesis deals with the attitudes of core French teachers in Newfoundland and Labrador to the teacher evaluation process. It was partially initiated in response to an apparent problem that many core French teachers were having with the current teacher evaluation process in the province.

The instrument at the centre of this thesis is a questionnaire that was distributed to core French teachers in the province. The questionnaire covered eight major components of the teacher evaluation process: purposes, criteria, sources, pre-conference, post-conference, evaluators, characteristics of the evaluators, and organizational context. This questionnaire was designed as a means to elicit not only current practices for these components from the perspective of core French teachers, but also preferred practices.

The analysis of the results of the questionnaire included the frequency of responses and the mean response for each item. In addition, the data for the entire population was cross-tabulated with the following independent variables: gender, years of teaching, type of

school, and community population.

The findings revealed differences between present and preferred practices. Core French teachers wanted, for example, more process criteria, such as presentation behaviours and school-related behaviours, to be used in judging their teaching effectiveness. The findings also revealed some anomalies in the evaluation practices for core French teachers in the province. One such anomaly was that elementary school teachers indicated that the daily plan book/lesson plans was a source of data presently practised, in addition to the sources identified in common with the general population.

From a comparison of these findings with the current literature on teacher evaluation, some differences, similarities, and patterns were drawn. For instance, the summative purposes were not as predominant in present practices as indicated in the literature and the respondents expressed a desire for more sources of data, such as self-evaluation, which was consistent with the literature.

Based on the foregoing comparison, recommendations and suggestions for improvement were made. One recommendation involved the need for in-service to further educate both core French teachers and evaluators about the merits of peer evaluation and parent input as sources of data.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The solid advice and positive encouragement from Professor Joan Netten and the computer programming skills of Michelle Shapter were greatly appreciated.

Barbara Coish deserves a very special thank-you for the time and effort that she put into the typing of this thesis.

A note of appreciation is directed to the French coordinators for each school board in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador. It was through their co-operation that a list of core French teachers in this province was developed.

A final thank-you is extended to the 102 core French teachers who took the time to complete and return the questionnaire.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
List of Tables	x
Chapter One	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Background to the study	1
1.3 General design of the study	7
1.4 Significance of the study	8
1.5 Limitations of the study	8
1.6 Definition of terms	8
Chapter Two	10
2.1 Introduction	10
2.2 External and internal forces affecting teacher evaluation	10
2.3 Definitions of evaluation	16
2.4 Purposes of evaluation	17
2.5 Criteria	21
2.6 Sources of data	23
2.7 Contemporary models and common trends	24
2.8 Conclusion	27
Chapter Three	29
3.1 Introduction	29
3.2 The sample	30
3.3 General design of the instrument	32
3.4 Pre-testing of the instrument	36
3.5 Conclusion	39
Chapter Four	41
4.1 Introduction	41
4.2 Purposes of teacher evaluation	45
4.2.1 Present practices	46
4.2.2 Summary of present practices	48
4.2.3 Preferred practices	48
4.2.4 Summary of preferred practices	50

	Page
4.3 Criteria to judge effective teaching	51
4.3.1 Present practices	51
4.3.2 Summary of present practices	55
4.3.3 Preferred practices	55
4.3.4 Summary of preferred practices	59
4.4 Sources used to obtain information about a teacher's effectiveness	60
4.4.1 Present practices	60
4.4.2 Summary of present practices	64
4.4.3 Preferred practices	64
4.4.4 Summary of preferred practices	68
4.5 Characteristics and objectives of the pre-conference	69
4.5.1 Present practices	69
4.5.2 Summary of present practices	72
4.5.3 Preferred practices	72
4.5.4 Summary of preferred practices	74
4.6 Characteristics and objectives of the post-conference	74
4.6.1 Present practices	74
4.6.2 Summary of present practices	78
4.6.3 Preferred practices	79
4.6.4 Summary of preferred practices	81
4.7 Evaluators involved in the teacher evaluation process	82
4.7.1 Present practices	82
4.7.2 Summary of present practices	84
4.7.3 Preferred practices.....	85
4.7.4 Summary of preferred practices	87
4.8 Characteristics of the evaluator(s)	88
4.8.1 Present practices	88
4.8.2 Summary of present practices	92
4.8.3 Preferred practices	93
4.8.4 Summary of preferred practices	96
4.9 Organizational context of teacher evaluation	96
4.9.1 Present practices	97
4.9.2 Summary of present practices	99
4.9.3 Preferred practices	99
4.9.4 Summary of preferred practices	101
4.10 Conclusion	101

	Page
Chapter Five	108
5.1 Introduction	108
5.2 Present and preferred practices in teacher evaluation for core French teachers	108
5.3 Recommendations and suggestions	121
5.4 Recommendations for further research	125
5.5 Conclusion	125
Bibliography	127
Appendices	132
Appendix 1 Sample letter to French co-ordinators	132
Appendix 2 Written permission from the Avalon Consolidated School Board	133
Appendix 3 Proposed letter of consent	134
Appendix 4 Proposed questionnaire	135
Appendix 5 Revised letter of consent	143
Appendix 6 Revised questionnaire	144
Appendix 7 Sample letter to superintendents	152
Appendix 8 Cross-tabulations of present practices for purposes by independent variables	153
Appendix 9 Cross-tabulations of preferred practices for purposes by independent variables	156
Appendix 10 Cross-tabulations of present practices for criteria by independent variables	159
Appendix 11 Cross-tabulations of preferred practices for criteria by independent variables	165

	Page
Appendix 12	Cross-tabulations of present practices for sources by independent variables 171
Appendix 13	Cross-tabulations of preferred practices for sources by independent variables 177
Appendix 14	Cross-tabulations of present practices for pre-conference by independent variables 183
Appendix 15	Cross-tabulations of preferred practices for pre-conference by independent variables 188
Appendix 16	Cross-tabulations of present practices for post-conference by independent variables 193
Appendix 17	Cross-tabulations of preferred practices for post-conference by independent variables 198
Appendix 18	Cross-tabulations of present practices for evaluators by independent variables 203
Appendix 19	Cross-tabulations of preferred practices for evaluators by independent variables 208
Appendix 20	Cross-tabulations of present practices for characteristics of the evaluator(s) by independent variables 213
Appendix 21	Cross-tabulations of preferred practices for characteristics of the evaluator(s) by independent variables 218

	Page
Appendix 22	Cross-tabulations of present practices for organizational context by independent variables 223
Appendix 23	Cross-tabulations of preferred practices for organizational context by independent variables 226

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
3.1	Reliability analysis for questionnaire	38
4.1	Frequency of background information by entire population	42
4.2	Frequency of use for present practices of purposes for teacher evaluation by entire population	46
4.3	Frequency of use for preferred practices of purposes for teacher evaluation by entire population	48
4.4	Frequency of use for present practices of criteria for teacher evaluation by entire population	52
4.5	Frequency of use for preferred practices of criteria for teacher evaluation by entire population	56
4.6	Frequency of use for present practices of sources for teacher evaluation by entire population	61
4.7	Frequency of use for preferred practices of sources for teacher evaluation by entire population	65
4.8	Frequency of use for present practices of pre-conference for teacher evaluation by entire population	70

Table		Page
4.9	Frequency of use for preferred practices of pre-conference for teacher evaluation by entire population	73
4.10	Frequency of use for present practices of post-conference for teacher evaluation by entire population	75
4.11	Frequency of use for preferred practices of post-conference for teacher evaluation by entire population	80
4.12	Frequency of use for present practices of evaluators for teacher evaluation by entire population	83
4.13	Frequency of use for preferred practices of evaluators for teacher evaluation by entire population	85
4.14	Frequency of use for present practices of characteristics of the evaluator(s) for teacher evaluation by entire population	89
4.15	Frequency of use for preferred practices of characteristics of the evaluator(s) for teacher evaluation by entire population	94
4.16	Frequency of use for present practices of organizational context for teacher evaluation by entire population	97

Table		Page
4.17	Frequency of use for preferred practices of organizational context for teacher evaluation by entire population	100
4.18	Summary of present practices for items with means of 4.00 or above by entire population	102
4.19	Summary of preferred practices for items with means of 4.00 or above by entire population	103

Chapter One

1.1 Introduction

This thesis deals with the teacher evaluation process from the perspective of core French teachers in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador. The focus is not only on the process as it is currently practised in the province but also on suggestions for improvement in the teacher evaluation process in order to make it more effective for core French teachers.

1.2 Background to the study

Research in the area of teacher evaluation as it pertains to teachers of core French appears to be non-existent. For the most part, the literature deals with teacher evaluation from an all-encompassing point of view, without regard for a teacher's subject area, role, or grade level. However, there exists some research related to the evaluation of specific teaching groups: Special Education (Craft-Tripp, 1990; Warger and Aldinger, 1987; Katims and Henderson, 1990); tenured teachers (Depasquale, Jr., 1990); department heads (Evaluation Bulletin, 1980); guidance counselors (Gorton and Ohlemacher, 1987); resource teachers (Haycock, 1991; McLelland, 1988); and English teachers (Pannwitt, 1986; Watson, 1978).

In addition to the void in the literature on teacher evaluation with respect to teachers of French, there generally appears to be a problem for many core French teachers with the present teacher evaluation process in Newfoundland and Labrador. Although several factors are at the root of the problem, the following seem to stand out more so than others: the variation in teacher evaluation from one school to another under the same jurisdiction and even from one school board to the next; aspects of teacher evaluation that have proven successful in theory but not so much in practice; and present practices in teacher evaluation which are making the process ineffective. It should be noted that, according to the research, these factors are commonplace in many teacher evaluation systems across Canada and the United States. Consequently, it is this author's assumption that they would apply to core French teachers in Newfoundland and Labrador as well.

There exists plenty of evidence of variation in the evaluation of core French teachers. Three examples in this area are the concept of due process, the techniques of data collection, and the frequency of classroom observations. Occasions have arisen where individual core French teachers have not been fully informed of both the evaluation process

and the observation criteria and have not been granted a post-observation conference. These, according to Macy (1988), represent some of the rights that are essential and critical to due process to which each and every teacher is legally entitled. This practice may explain why no school board in Newfoundland and Labrador has ever won a case where it has tried to dismiss a teacher for being incompetent, even though there appeared to be strong grounds for incompetency (Hickman, 1992).

The teaching effectiveness of some core French teachers has been judged on data collected from only one source, namely classroom observation. For others, this same judgment is based on data collected from other sources such as self-evaluation and peer assessment, in addition to classroom observation. Unfortunately, for those who have found themselves in the former category, data collected only from one source tends to be insufficient in providing a complete picture of their teaching effectiveness (Duke and Stiggins, 1986).

Classroom observation for some core French teachers could represent four or five visits by each evaluator during the period of evaluation. On the other hand, some are observed on only one occasion, or at the most two. Too few

classroom observations represents a serious problem to the teacher. Usually data which has been based on one or two classroom visits is unreliable as an indicator of his/her routine instructional behaviour (Hickman, 1988).

With regard to the second factor that is creating a problem for many core French teachers in the area of teacher evaluation, there are numerous aspects of the evaluation process which appear to be possible in theory but are almost never accomplished in practice. The co-existence of summative and formative evaluation and teacher involvement in the development of teacher evaluation systems are two aspects of teacher evaluation that clearly represent the issue at hand.

Duke and Stiggins (1986), Popham (1988), and countless other researchers in the field identify two, equally important, purposes of teacher evaluation. The first, which is identified as summative evaluation, serves the goal of teacher and school board accountability. The second, formative evaluation, is to help teachers to grow effectively in a professional capacity. However, in almost all teacher evaluation programs of school boards in Newfoundland and Labrador, these two very different and conflicting roles are completed simultaneously by the same

person using the same tools which often results in counter-productivity, confusion, and wasted time (Popham, 1988). Popham (1988) cites the dual-function of the principal to make his case in point. The principal is probably more interested in improving a core French teacher's instructional skills. However, his other duty to evaluate the teacher summatively prevents the latter from revealing his/her own deficits. This same teacher's evaluation is further damaged because the principal may be so concerned with formative evaluation that (s)he fails to reach an honest judgment about the core French teacher's overall performance.

Herbert and McNergney (1989), Parkinson (1991), Bradley (1990), Ritchie (1990), Burger and Bumbarger (1991), and Hickman (1992), through their own individual research, have advocated the importance of involving the teacher more in the development and implementation of teacher evaluation. Although this is definitely a step in the right direction, very few core French teachers in Newfoundland and Labrador, if any, can presently really consider themselves as partners in a process where they are the major role players. In this province, teacher evaluation policies are, for the most part, unilaterally produced by the school boards.

Recognition of the rights of the core French teacher with respect to both the purpose and the process of teacher evaluation is remarkably rare.

As to the third factor, the treatment of teacher evaluation as an isolated task and the poor training of evaluators represent two of the many current practices in teacher evaluation which would seem to be very self-defeating. Although the teacher evaluation policies of many school boards in Newfoundland and Labrador adhere to the primary purposes of summative and formative evaluation, there is a general impression among some core French teachers that the sole purpose of teacher evaluation is one of accountability. Thus, in treating teacher evaluation as an isolated task, they are likely to develop a decrease in their satisfaction and skill development and an increase in their levels of anxiety and alienation (Davis, 1989).

Research suggests that evaluators can be extremely untrained, unreliable, and may be biased in their interpretation of teachers' actions (Ritchie, 1990; Cressman, 1987). Such attitudes, which seem to be echoed by many core French teachers in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador, are very destructive to the teacher evaluation process. In this province, there is not so much a reluctance

on the part of evaluators to evaluate teachers, but a tremendous cry on their part for school boards to give them the proper training so that they can earn the respect of teachers (Hickman, 1992).

Both the void in the literature on teacher evaluation and especially the problems that core French teachers generally appear to be having with the present teacher evaluation process in Newfoundland and Labrador necessitated, from this researcher's point of view, a study of the teacher evaluation process as it pertains to core French teachers in this province.

1.3 General design of the study

The instrument at the centre of this study is a questionnaire that was distributed to full-time core French teachers or those teaching French at least eighty percent of the time in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador. The questionnaire was designed not only to discover the current and preferred practices in teacher evaluation from the perspective of the core French teacher, but also to compare present practices with what should be practised. All of this data was then related to the review of the literature on teacher evaluation in Canada and the United States from 1986 to 1992. Similarities, differences, and patterns between the

results from the questionnaire and what the research depicts as ideal practices were sought.

1.4 Significance of the study

The results of the study were used to judge the effectiveness of current practices in teacher evaluation from the perspective of core French teachers. This judgment assisted in giving directions for improvement, such as in-service, in order to make the teacher evaluation process more effective for core French teachers in this province.

1.5 Limitations of the study

The study was limited to full-time core French teachers in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador. It could, however, serve as a guideline for further study of the teacher evaluation process for core French teachers across the country and for other subject teachers here and elsewhere.

1.6 Definition of terms

There are some terms employed in this thesis which need to be clarified. Core French is the study of the French language in elementary, intermediate, and secondary schools during a regularly scheduled time period. In Newfoundland and Labrador, the recommended entry point for the core

French Program is Grade 4. The Program is organized sequentially from Grade 4 to Grade 12 and uses an approved-set of materials as the primary instructional resource. Students should acquire a basic vocabulary, some knowledge of grammatical structure, and skills in listening, speaking, reading, and writing (Department of Education, 1992).

A core French teacher for this study is a teacher who teaches core French full-time or at least 80 percent of the time.

A school board refers mainly to board personnel such as the superintendent, the assistant superintendents, and the co-ordinators. They are viewed as the major decision-makers. There is one reference in the review of the literature to school board members. They are not the same as the board personnel. They are, for the most part, elected by the public during school board elections. The school board personnel is, in fact, accountable to the board members.

Chapter Two

2.1 Introduction

Although the literature pertaining to teacher evaluation is simply overwhelming, the purpose of this review, in addition to presenting a synopsis of related current issues and trends, is to establish guidelines by which an appropriate questionnaire can be developed and its results evaluated. This task will be accomplished by examining the following major components of teacher evaluation: the effects of external and internal forces; definitions; purposes; criteria; sources of data; and contemporary models and common trends. It is hoped that a review of the related literature from 1986 to 1992, both in Canada and the United States, will cover the claims, concerns, and issues for each of these major components in a very thorough and reflective manner.

2.2 External and internal forces affecting teacher evaluation

Teacher evaluation has been, and will continue to be, affected by forces from both inside and outside the educational framework. The literature on teacher evaluation has identified six extremely strong forces. Public opinion, school board composition, economic restraints, legal constraints, collective bargaining, and government legislation are individually and collectively having a

profound effect on teacher evaluation.

In 1982, the Ontario public was surveyed to find out its general attitudes toward education in that province. In response to the question, "How satisfied are you with the current situation in Ontario elementary and high schools with regard to the school system in general?", about 36 percent of the respondents were generally satisfied, while 64 percent were either dissatisfied or uncertain. Since the completion of this survey, general satisfaction with the school system has decreased across all social background distinctions, as have the differences between specific groups (Livingstone, Hart and Davis, 1988).

The power of public opinion is producing changes in the demand for accountability through evaluation. Society is shifting from an industrial, labor orientation to a more educated, informed one where such traits as a global economy, decentralization, and networking are distinctive (Naisbitt, cited in Burger, 1987). Ingram (cited in Burger, 1987) examined societal pressures for change in the province of Alberta and observed the following as potential social forces in that province: the increased diversity in school jurisdictions and school programming; concerns for justice, tolerance and excellence; accountability; and involvement.

The composition of school boards is putting pressure on the boards, themselves, to bring accountability to education. At present, many school board members are professional and business people who have had their own personal contact with evaluation which is tied, in many instances, to salary and promotion (Hickman, 1992).

With less and less public funds destined for education, educators have to get used to a shortage of financial resources with the resulting competition for public dollars (Wickstrom, 1987). In Newfoundland and Labrador, where 16.1 percent of the total budget for 1989-90 was spent on education, the current economic outlook does not offer much hope that provincial revenues will increase significantly in the short term (The Royal Commission Report, 1992). Despite requests by the education system for more resources and by the public for higher performance, education spending is, however, not likely to increase. Such demands and restraints are bound to make educators reconsider how they deliver programs and services in this province and to raise questions about the value received for the education dollars spent.

Coupled with these economic realities is the changing relationship between the courts and teacher evaluation.

There is a trend in American state and federal law, pertaining to teacher evaluation, toward increased federal jurisdiction as constitutional issues and the application of federal antidiscrimination laws tend to expand (Rebell, 1990). An increase in federal jurisdiction will result in more courts looking over the shoulders of school evaluators and will likely make judicial scrutiny more probing (Rebell, 1990).

Failed legal proceedings taken by school boards against teachers, who, in the opinion of the former, were incompetent, are forcing the designing and implementation of systems for teacher evaluation by American and Canadian school districts that will be able to pass the test of due process (Spence, 1987; Macy, 1988). In the province of Newfoundland and Labrador, for example, no school board has ever won a case where it has tried to dismiss a teacher for being incompetent, even though there appeared to be strong grounds for incompetency (Hickman, 1992). The reason that these teacher terminations are almost invariably overturned is related to the failure to provide adequate due process. In particular, the sources of data and the data itself were not based on proper procedures and facts (Macy, 1988).

The Canadian legal system views a teacher's dismissal as not only the loss of a job but also the loss of the means of earning a living for which the teacher has trained extensively (Spence, 1987). Therefore, inherent in the system for teacher evaluation should be steps to allow for due process. Macy (1988, pp. 54-55) depicts six components that are essential and critical to due process. These include the right to:

1. be fully aware of the evaluation process.
2. be fully aware of the observation criteria.
3. have a post-observation conference.
4. have follow-up observation visitations.
5. have follow-up reports.

In addition to these economic and legal constraints, the process of collective bargaining has also had an important effect on evaluation policies. In a study of collective bargaining effects on evaluation in Newfoundland schools, Williams (1987) discovered that there was a real fear that more emphasis would be placed on rating teachers to cover legal angles than on actually improving the teacher's performance. The study also revealed a trend to centralize evaluation so that the procedures were followed consistently in all schools. This trend to more centralization in teacher evaluation is evident in the present collective agreement between the Government of

Newfoundland and Labrador, the Newfoundland and Labrador School Trustee's Association, and the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. Article 14, albeit in a brief manner, deals with teacher evaluation from the perspective of purpose, definition, and procedure (Provincial Collective Agreement, 1991 to 1993).

The concept of teacher evaluation has been affected by some provincial and state legislatures as well. For example, in the United States, according to the National Education Association Data-Search (1988), some state departments either order or prefer that a single model be used for teacher evaluation. In Canada, action taken by the governments of Ontario and Alberta illustrate the extent of legislative involvement in these provinces in the evaluation process. The Ministry paper in 1987 on "Performance Appraisal as it Applies to Certificated Education Staff in Ontario" placed a great deal of emphasis on evaluation across that province. Since January, 1985, all school jurisdictions in Alberta have to have in place teacher evaluation policies approved by the Minister of Education. Local policies in that province should be in accordance with government policy and yet reflect local needs for the teacher evaluation process in each school system

(Townsend, 1987).

It seems apparent, in times of economic restraint and growing public concern for accountability, that teacher evaluation procedures are being forced to change to reflect the needs of society.

2.3 Definitions of evaluation

In the literature, both American and Canadian, teacher evaluation has been defined in different ways. Dagley and Orso (1991) separate the concept of teacher evaluation into two camps: evaluation and supervision. These writers define evaluation as "the administrative task of judging the effectiveness and quality of teaching, often to determine the future employment status of the teacher" (p. 73). In this definition, evaluation is viewed as summative or "judgemental". Supervision as defined by Dagley and Orso(1991) is "a developmental process that includes efforts designed to improve the instructional behaviour of the individual teacher" (p. 73). In this definition, supervision is expressed as being equal to the concept of formative evaluation.

A more encompassing definition is espoused by Hickman (1992):

Evaluation is the systematic process of judging the worth, desirability, effectiveness, or adequacy of something according to definite criteria and purpose. The judgement is based upon a careful comparison of observation data with criteria standards. (Class notes)

This definition describes evaluation as not just a policy or procedure, but stresses that it is a thorough process which is based on clear and reasonable standards.

In a comprehensive study of the development and use of evaluation of certificated education staff in Ontario school boards, Lawton et al. (1986) found that many school boards define evaluation by indicating the difference between expressions such as formative and summative evaluation, administrative and non-administrative, supervision and evaluation, and classroom and comprehensive. Certainly such differences in defining evaluation require that an effort be made to standardize the terms used. Standardization is extremely important because of the sensitive legal implications of the process and of the frustration caused by the ambiguity in these definitions (Lawton et al., 1986).

2.4 Purposes of evaluation

There are many sources in the literature regarding the primary and specific purposes of evaluation. American literature identifies numerous objectives that can be

realized through an evaluation that is carried out professionally and with competence:

1. The identification of the strengths and weaknesses of a particular teacher or groups of teachers (Campbell, 1987).
2. The implementation of professional growth activities (Campbell, 1987).
3. "...the selection of the best qualified teachers for new positions and the retention of the most needed in old" (Stake, 1989, p. 13).
4. The establishment of open communication between teacher and evaluator (Campbell, 1987).
5. The administration decisions of tenure or dismissal (Campbell, 1987).
6. The aspect of teacher accountability (Duke and Stiggins, 1986).
7. The improvement of instruction by promoting professional development of teachers (Duke and Stiggins, 1986).
8. The overall improvement of the school (Duke and Stiggins, 1986).
9. The reward of merit (Stake, 1989).

According to the literature, the two purposes common to evaluation policies in Canadian school systems are formative and summative. The first of these is to help teachers grow effectively in a professional capacity. The second serves the goal of teacher and school board accountability. The latter of these may be used to facilitate administrative decision making in such matters as certification, tenure, promotion, demotion, staff reduction, staff allocation, reduction or increase of teaching load, validation of teacher selection process, and dismissal (Mbeo, 1991).

However, notwithstanding the effort by policy-makers to clarify the purposes of teacher evaluation policies, misunderstanding is widely spread among Canadian teachers and administrators as to the actual intentions of the policies. In research carried out by Lawton et al. (1986), it was discovered that, although an examination of school board policies pointed to improvement of instruction as the primary purpose of teacher evaluation, 76 percent of Ontario teachers appear to believe that the main purpose of the evaluation process they most recently encountered was simply to satisfy regulations which specified that each teacher should be evaluated periodically. Burger (1987) found that the most common response of teachers, principals and

superintendents in Alberta, vis-à-vis the purpose of teacher evaluation, was to demonstrate accountability to the public. Duke and Stiggins (1986) perceived, as well, that American school boards have a tendency of placing greater emphasis on the summative component of teacher evaluation. These writers noted that this places limitations on any school board's ability to meet the growth needs of individual teachers and thus to enhance school improvement.

To provide a possible solution for the problem of misunderstandings regarding the purpose of teacher evaluation, Wentzell (1991) argued that it is paramount that evaluators clearly define their purposes in planning the evaluation of professionals. If evaluation is intended to eliminate the incompetent, then that must be stated. If it is not indicated, it will be assumed. If elimination of incompetence is not the purpose, then it should be specified that the purpose is to enhance professional growth and remediation where necessary.

Furthermore, the establishment of purposes is not an isolated task in the development of an evaluation system. The goals and objectives of the school and school system should dictate the purposes of teacher evaluation. An increase in satisfaction and skill development and reduction

of the levels of anxiety and alienation occur when teacher evaluation is perceived within the focus of attaining school goals (Davis, 1989). Finally, teacher evaluation means nothing unless teachers can say at the end of the process that the focus was on student learning (Hickman, 1992).

2.5 Criteria

Considerable work has been done in determining precisely the criteria which characterize an effective interaction between teacher and student resulting in student gains (Manatt, 1987). The three types of criteria which have been associated with teacher effectiveness in varying degrees, according to Mitzel (1987), are:

Presage - Refers to those teacher characteristics present before the teacher enters the classroom. They include traits and background the teacher brings to the job such as attitude toward the students, university achievement, and personal characteristics.

Process - Those aspects of teacher and student behaviour that are worthwhile in their own right. These include such variables as methods of instruction and student-teacher interaction.

Product - These depend upon a set of objectives established by the teacher and evaluator designed to

emphasize learning outcomes. These outcomes would include, amongst others, student performance and student attitude.

In order to develop an effective teacher evaluation program, however, two important elements of evaluation criteria must be considered. Firstly, no one set of criteria that adequately suits all teaching situations can be established. According to Hunter (1987), something is needed beyond a superficial indicator of teacher quality which looks at information of diverse types relating to diverse situations deriving from diverse sources. Since effective teaching behaviours vary for different grades, levels, subject areas, types of students, and instructional goals, it is difficult, if not impossible, to adopt a single set of broad criteria. Even if a single set of broad criteria is adopted, according to Thorson, Miller and Bellon (1987), the operational indicators must become differentiated for specific applications. Secondly, everyone involved must possess a basic knowledge of the factors that characterize effective teaching and an expertise in identifying them. This knowledge must be shared by both the evaluators and the teachers. Both parties must believe in the validity of these characteristics as indicators of effective teaching (Babiuk, 1988).

2.6 Sources of Data

The literature refers to many sources from which data may be used during the evaluation process to promote the professional growth of teachers. Among the most frequently cited are classroom observation, peer assessment, self-assessments, classroom records, pupil surveys, and parent responses.

Despite the number of identified sources, two areas of concern need to be addressed in the successful development and implementation of any teacher evaluation policy. Firstly, "any one source alone is insufficient because it fails to provide a complete picture of how the teacher: (a) prepares for, (b) presents and (c) evaluates the impact of instruction" (Duke and Stiggins, 1986, p. 28). Secondly, there are specific concerns relating to each of the previously identified sources of data. For example, Duke and Stiggins (1986) state that "classroom observations of only one or two hours of performance may satisfy state laws and contractual obligations but they do not supply the information needed to promote improvement in competent teachers" (p. 29). Freiberg (1987), has suggested that classroom visitations, if conducted properly, should offer greater potential when used in a formative system of

feedback especially if teachers are given the necessary support through staff development programs. Regarding peer assessments, Freiberg (1987) contends that although feedback can be very helpful, it is rarely used in most schools. The writer states that "many teachers fear their feedback to colleagues will be used in salary and promotional decisions" (p. 86).

2.7 Contemporary models and common trends

A review of the literature since 1986 on teacher evaluation reveals an overwhelming number of teacher evaluation models. In addition to those models that are developed, the literature also makes mention of others in the developmental stage. The theory/model most often emerging, especially in the American literature, centres around clinical supervision. Wareing (1990) states that since the publication of clinical supervision models by Goldhammer (1969) and Cogan (1973), there has been virtually universal acceptance of them throughout the United States. Other models such as the Integrated Supervision Model (Dagley and Orso, 1991), the Side Model (Wareing, 1990), and the Evaluation Model (Depasqual, Jr., 1990) seem to have a standardized systematic sequence of steps reflective of the clinical supervision approach. These steps include the

planning conference, observation, analysis of data, strategy, and post-teaching conference.

Models appearing in Canadian literature are the Etobicoke Model (Parkinson, 1991), the Medicine Hat School District Model (Townsend, 1987), the Halifax District School Board Model (Gorman, 1990), and the Support and Supervision Model of the Pictou District School Board in Nova Scotia (MacDonald, 1986). Within Newfoundland, the model found in the literature is the Critical Components Model developed by Hickman (1988). There appears to be considerable variation in these models with regard to the approach employed, from clinical supervision to open-ended or collaborative.

Everton (1989), responding to the models in American school boards, contends that the process is often destroyed by the inclusion of poor supervisory training, the use of inappropriate rating scale checklists, the lack of time and money, and other factors that effect the evaluator's information for making judgements.

Hunter (1987), in addressing issues related to a model developed by that writer, stated that many supervisors and administrators have failed to recognize that what appears to be a single conceptualization is really complex in application and that many leaders are inadequately trained.

Herbert and McNergney (1989) point out that research indicates teachers prefer a collaborative approach rather than a supervisor-centred one. The trend for the 1990's, it seems, is involving the teacher more in how evaluation/supervision is implemented.

In Canada, this collaborative approach has also been echoed. Within Ontario, research has consistently advocated that teachers, as professionals, should take primary responsibility for their own professional development. Furthermore, professional development activities need to be customized to the individual teacher (Parkinson, 1991). In Manitoba, Bradley (1990) has advocated such involvement by teachers in evaluation design as discussed by Parkinson. Bradley (1990) also maintains that, unfortunately, teachers and their local associations do not always participate in the development of evaluation policies which are unilaterally produced by school boards. British Columbia, Ritchie (1990) asserts, is becoming a leader in the use of the professional accountability model which increases the authority of teachers over teachers. Burger and Bumbarger (1991) found in their study of 30 randomly selected Alberta school systems that improvement of instruction was identified as a major policy goal in all the models and

policy documents. However, notably rare was recognition of the rights of the teacher with respect to both purpose and process of evaluation.

2.8 Conclusion

It seems apparent that the evaluation of teachers is still undergoing considerable development in many states and provinces of North America. School boards and districts are attempting to respond to the increasing demands of society, yet respect the rights of their teachers. It is therefore not surprising that relations appear to be strained.

Despite this turmoil, the literature clearly identifies major characteristics, strengths, and shortcomings of the teacher evaluation process. This triad will form the basis of the questionnaire designed to elicit the view-points of core French teachers on teacher evaluation in Newfoundland and Labrador.

In addition, the review of the literature has indicated that there are certain agreed-upon characteristics and trends which are necessary in order for effective evaluation to take place. These factors include a teacher's right to due process, the careful comparison of observation data with criteria standards when judging a teacher's effectiveness, the focus of teacher evaluation on school goals and student

learning, the adjustment of criteria to suit a particular teaching situation, the use of multiple sources of data, the systematic sequence of steps in the evaluation process, the appropriate training of evaluators, and the increased involvement of teachers in the development and implementation of evaluation policies.

This study of the teacher evaluation process as it pertains to core French teachers in Newfoundland and Labrador will not only determine the characteristics and trends of present evaluation practices in this province, but also the extent to which they conform to the major guidelines for effective teacher evaluation.

Chapter Three

3.1 Introduction

The goals of this study on the attitudes of core French teachers in Newfoundland and Labrador to the teacher evaluation process included identifying present evaluation practices, drawing conclusions on the effectiveness of the process, and making suggestions for improvement. To effectively accomplish these goals, the views of core French teachers naturally had to be elicited.

In making the decision as to what means would be the most effective in conducting this elicitation, two principal factors were considered. Firstly, core French teachers in this province were widely distributed geographically. Secondly, it was felt that there was a need to afford them the time necessary to reflect on the many components of the teacher evaluation process.

Due primarily to these two factors, it was decided to conduct this elicitation through a questionnaire that would be distributed to core French teachers for completion. However, before any distribution of this instrument, certain decisions had to be made and certain procedures had to be followed. These involved the sample of the population and the design and pre-testing of the questionnaire.

3.2 The sample

The target group for this study was core French teachers in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Since most teachers of French in the province also have responsibility for other curriculum areas, a French teacher was arbitrarily defined as one who taught French at least eighty percent of the time. One would assume that a list of these teachers might exist. However, this was not the case. Instead, an official at the Department of Education, French Programs Division, did provide a list of French co-ordinators, one for each school board in the province. From this starting point, a letter, complete with a corresponding address, requesting a list of the target group in each school board, was personally mailed to each French co-ordinator (Appendix 1). (S)he was provided with a self-addressed stamped envelope for the return of the appropriate list. In return for his/her assistance, each co-ordinator was offered the opportunity to receive a copy of the compiled list upon request.

Within a short period of time, each French co-ordinator provided his/her list of core French teachers who fitted the definition. However, it should be noted that the majority of the co-ordinators underlined the fact that there were many

other teachers of core French in their school district whose names were not included because they were teaching core French less than eighty percent of the time. Further research could involve this latter group. In addition, one of the co-ordinators stated that permission had to be granted from her school board before any questionnaire could be distributed to any of its teaching force. In this particular case, permission was requested and received (Appendix 2).

From the information provided by the French co-ordinators, a list of 243 core French teachers was developed. The list included their names and their complete school address. From this target group, thirty teachers were selected for the pre-testing process in the following manner: five were asked to complete the questionnaire and to make suggestions for improvement; and twenty-five teachers, randomly selected from six different school boards in eastern Newfoundland, were mailed a copy of the questionnaire in order to judge the questionnaire's degree of reliability. The remaining 213 members of the target group were sent a copy of the revised questionnaire for completion, personally addressed to each of them.

3.3 General design of the instrument

The questionnaire, before pre-testing, was an eight-page document consisting of two distinct parts (Appendix 4). Part One surveyed some background information on each teacher. The information requested - age, sex, years teaching, type of school, and community population - served as independent variables by which the data in Part Two of the questionnaire could be broken down for further analysis. These particular variables were chosen in order to verify if certain observed trends and characteristics in the teacher evaluation process varied according to the teacher's age and sex, the number of years (s)he has been teaching, or the type of school in which (s)he is teaching, whether it be high school versus elementary or rural versus urban. Part Two of the questionnaire surveyed both current and preferred practices in the teacher evaluation process. A section for comments was provided for respondents at the end of the questionnaire.

Part Two represented the questionnaire's core. This part was subdivided into eight major components of the teacher evaluation process - purposes, criteria, sources of data, pre-conference, post-conference, evaluators, evaluator's characteristics, and organizational context.

These components emanated from the review of the literature on teacher evaluation in both Canada and the United States from 1986 to 1992. They were carefully selected to be representative of the major issues and concerns that were addressed in the review. In addition, each of the components was accompanied by a series of items which served to be a logical expansion of each component. In Component A, Purposes of teacher evaluation, items one and three addressed the summative nature of teacher evaluation, while items two and four addressed the formative aspect. In Component B, Criteria to judge effective teaching, items one, four, six, and eight served as examples of presage criteria, while items two, five, seven, nine, and ten were examples of the different types of process criteria. Item three was an example of the product type. The twelve sources in Sources of data for documentation, Component C, represented all of the possible sources suggested in the literature on teacher evaluation. Items one and two in Component D, Characteristics and objectives of the pre-conference for classroom observation and in Component E, Characteristics and objectives of the post-conference for classroom observation were the ideal characteristics of both the pre-and post-conference suggested in the literature on

evaluation, while the remainder of the items were possible pre-and post-conference goals. The eight evaluators in Component F, The evaluators involved in the teacher evaluation process, were reflective of the possible evaluators, who according to the literature, have evaluated teachers at various times. The characteristics in Component G, Characteristics of the evaluator(s), except for item 3, were suggested as ideal characteristics of an effective evaluator. In the final component, Component H, The organizational context of teacher evaluation, each of the four items was identified as a specific role that school boards have played in the teacher evaluation process.

To complete the questionnaire, each core French teacher was asked to rate each item in its respective component on the five-point rating scale. Each item was rated twice - once for the way it was a reflection of present practice in the teacher's school district and then as a reflection of how (s)he would prefer to see it practised in his/her own school district. On the rating scale, five represented a practice which was always followed; four, a practice sometimes followed; three, rarely followed; and two, never followed. The number one was used to designate the category 'don't know'. The rating for each item as to present and

preferred practices was identical.

To ensure that each target member reasonably understood the questionnaire and took the time to complete it, specific measures were carried out. The envelope containing a copy of the questionnaire was not just simply addressed to the core French teacher(s) of a particular school, but was personally addressed to each teacher. Along with the questionnaire, a separate letter was enclosed. This accompanying letter (Appendix 3) included a description of the purpose of the study, a guarantee of anonymity, and a request form for each teacher if (s)he was interested in receiving a copy of the results. In addition, each teacher, including the 30 teachers involved in the pre-testing of the questionnaire, was provided with a self-addressed stamped envelope for the questionnaire's return. As well, great care was taken in the actual layout of the questionnaire. The number of pages was kept to eight, using both sides of four sheets of paper. This was achieved by the side by side placement of the ratings for present and preferred practices. Part Two of the questionnaire was preceded by appropriate directions with important words underlined. Explicatives were added to many items for rating to enhance understanding. In addition, the rating scale was repeated at the top of each successive page

of Part Two in order to prevent any unnecessary delay in the completion of the questionnaire.

3.4 Pre-testing of the instrument

Before the proposed questionnaire (Appendix 4) was distributed to the 25 members of the target group in order to carry out a reliability check, it was decided to pre-test the questionnaire for its design.

The comments from the five core French teachers, who were asked not only to complete the questionnaire, but to comment, as well, on the questionnaire's design, produced some minor changes to the original questionnaire (Appendix 6). It was suggested that there may be several members of the target group who, possibly because they have not been evaluated in a long time, might frequently end up selecting the '1 - don't know' or not completing the questionnaire at all. To encourage this particular group to think about the items posed or to complete the questionnaire, the following items were added to Part One: Background information: the last occurrence of being formally evaluated; and the teaching status when last evaluated. Furthermore, there was concern of having had to refer back to the preceding page for items of components that carried over to the next page. Specifically, when this occurred such as with Component F,

The evaluator (s) involved in the teacher evaluation process, one was forced to backtrack to identify the appropriate heading to which the items belonged. To eliminate such necessity, the heading of any component, that had items for rating carried over to the following page, would itself be carried over, in a limited version, to the next page, accompanied with the word 'continued'. There appeared, as well, some difficulty in understanding some of the items in certain components and some of the component headings. As a result, the headings for Components C, D, E, and G, were reworded. Item six of Component D, item three of Component E, and items one and six of Component G were extended to provide further explanation. All the items of Component G were slightly rewritten to include the subject pronoun, 'they'. As well, to establish in advance what would be considered as a reasonable amount of time that an evaluator should spend in a teacher's classroom (item nine, Component G), an additional item was added to Part One of the questionnaire. Finally, item five of Component C, Sources to obtain information about a teacher's effectiveness, was divided into two separate items with additional wording added, thus creating a total of thirteen sources to obtain information, instead of the original

twelve.

In addition to the changes in the questionnaire's design, directives from the Ethics Review Committee for the Faculty of Education forced changes in the letter of consent which accompanied the questionnaire. Statements that the thesis proposal had been approved by the Supervisor, that the study met the ethical guidelines of the Faculty, and that respondents were free to refrain from answering any questions they wish to omit were all added (Appendix 5).

Subsequently, the revised letter of consent and questionnaire were mailed to twenty-five core French teachers to pre-test the questionnaire for its reliability. Using the responses of the fifteen teachers who returned the completed questionnaire, a reliability analysis was conducted using the present scale, the preferred scale, and the full scale, The results, shown in Table 3.1, revealed an extremely high reliability rating in each case.

TABLE 3.1. Reliability Analysis for Questionnaire

	<u>Scale</u>	<u>Coefficient</u>
1.	Present	.9276
2.	Preferred	.9273
3.	Full	.9525

In addition, any statements in the comment section at the end of the questionnaire were studied. The comments that were mentioned were just personal reflections on the teacher evaluation process, which were basically covered in the questionnaire, rather than any concerns with the questionnaire's design. With this in mind, combined with the excellent reliability rating, it was decided that further changes to the questionnaire were unnecessary. Consequently, it was mailed to the remaining 213 members of the target group for completion. As a matter of common courtesy and as a means to permit each core French teacher to complete the questionnaire with reduced interference, a sample of the letter of consent and questionnaire was also mailed to all superintendents. As well, they received an accompanying letter which stressed that if they had any concerns or questions, they were asked to either contact the Investigator or the Supervisor (Appendix 7).

3.5 Conclusion

A great deal of time and effort were spent in organizing the sample and in designing and pre-testing the questionnaire. These steps were necessary in order to ensure that any discovery of current and preferred practices in teacher evaluation from the perspective of core French

teachers and any comparison of present practices with what should be practised were indeed valid. In addition, they were equally essential in order to provide an effective opportunity to identify similarities, differences, and patterns between the results from the questionnaire and what the research depicted as ideal practices.

For the data received from respondents, the following analysis was conducted: frequencies of responses; average response; observed versus expected responses; and differences in responses by independent variables. The results of these analyses will be presented in Chapter Four.

Chapter Four

4.1 Introduction

Out of the 213 questionnaires that were mailed to core French teachers, 102 were completed and returned. This produced a return rate of almost forty-eight percent, which, for an opened-ended questionnaire of this type, was quite respectable.

As to some background information on the respondents, the questionnaire asked them to identify their gender, age, years teaching, and the type of school and the population of the community where they worked. In addition, they were asked to indicate when and under what status they were last evaluated. Finally, they were asked to identify what they considered to be a reasonable amount of time that an evaluator should spend observing their teaching.

From the data in Table 4.1, it may be seen that there was an equal number of male and female respondents. More than 1/3 of them were over 40 years old. Almost the same number were younger than 30, while 29 percent were between the ages of 21 and 40.

The largest group, more than 40 percent, had fewer than 10 years of teaching experience. The others were almost evenly divided between 11 to 20 years teaching and greater than 20.

More respondents taught in a high, central high, or

all-grade school than in a junior high or elementary school.

TABLE 4.1. Frequency of Background Information by
Entire Population (N=107)

Variable	Item	Percent of Respondents
1. Sex	Male	50.0 (51)*
	Female	50.0 (51)
		Missing cases - 0
2. Age	20 to 30	34.3 (35)
	31 to 40	29.4 (30)
	+40	36.3 (37)
		Missing cases - 0
3. Years teaching	<10	43.1 (44)
	11 to 20	29.4 (30)
	>20	27.5 (28)
		Missing cases - 0
4. Type of school	High	23.2 (22)
	Central High	21.1 (20)
	Junior High	11.6 (11)
	All-Grade	30.5 (29)
	Elementary	13.7 (13)
		Missing cases - 7
5. Community population	<5000	66.3 (67)
	>5000	27.7 (28)
	Metro St. John's	5.9 (6)
		Missing cases - 1
6. Occurrence of last evaluation	Past 2 years	42.2 (43)
	3 to 5 years ago	30.4 (31)
	>5 years ago	16.7 (17)
	>10 years ago	10.8 (11)
		Missing cases - 0
7. Status, last evaluated	Probationary teacher	46.1 (47)
	Tenured teacher	53.9 (55)
		Missing cases - 0
8. Reasonable amount of time	1 hour or less	11.9 (12)
	2 to 3 hours	53.5 (54)
	4 to 5 hours	21.8 (22)
	>5 hours	12.9 (13)

* Number of respondents

Over 2/3 of the respondents taught in a school located in a community with a population less than 5,000.

As to when their last formal teacher evaluation occurred, almost 3/4 of the population indicated within the last 5 years. Forty-six percent of respondents were

probationary teachers when last evaluated, while more than 1/2 were tenured teachers.

A majority (56 percent) of respondents preferred to be observed teaching for 2 to 3 hours. Four to 5 hours was the choice of about 1/5 (22 percent) of the respondents.

To summarize this background information, the respondents were typical core French teachers. They were either male or female, under 40 years of age, and teaching for 20 years or less. They taught in a school with higher grade levels (high, central high, or all-grade) located in a community with a population of less than 5,000. They were formally evaluated within the past five years either as a probationary or tenured teacher. They considered more than 2, but less than 5 hours as a reasonable amount of time that an evaluator should spend observing their teaching.

In Part Two of the questionnaire, the respondents were asked to rate a series of items which could be used as criteria to evaluate present and preferred practices. These items were representative of eight major components of the teacher evaluation process. The components, in order of appearance, were purposes, criteria, sources, pre-conference, post-conference, evaluators, characteristics of the evaluators, and organizational context of teacher evaluation.

The analysis of the data received included frequency of responses, means, and cross-tabulations with the independent variables of gender, teaching experience, type of school, and community population where the school was located. The reporting of differences between the results of the data for the entire population and those of the independent variables was based on the following grounds: the percent of respondents, who rated an item as 'always', 'sometimes', 'rarely', 'never', or 'don't know' in a cross-tabulation, had to be at least 20 percent higher or lower than the percent of respondents for the corresponding item rated as 'always', 'sometimes', 'rarely', 'never', or 'don't know' by the entire population.

In interpreting the means, a mean of 4.00 or above indicated that the item was either practised or desirable, while a mean of 3.00 or below suggested that the item was either not practised or not desirable. A mean above 3.00, but below 4.00 represented the middle ground where ambiguities were found.

The results for metropolitan St. John's showed a decided tendency to be different from those of other areas in the province. When comparisons were being made between groups, the results for St. John's would alter the pattern which was otherwise consistent for the province.

Consequently, it was decided to omit the results from the analysis at this time. The number of respondents from St. John's was not sufficient to be analyzed separately as a reliable sample.

The results of the data for each component are presented, in turn, according to the order in which the components appeared in the questionnaire. Each presentation begins with a brief introduction to the component. The present practices of that component for the entire population are, then, presented, followed by a presentation of the cross-tabulations for the independent variables and a summary of the results. Finally, the preferred practices of the same component are introduced in a similar fashion. The results for the entire population are presented in tables in the text, while those for the cross-tabulations are given in the appendices.

4.2 Purposes of teacher evaluation

The four items in this section, that core French teachers were asked to rate, encompassed the formative and summative purposes of teacher evaluation. They were emphasized in the literature review. 'To make administrative decisions of tenure or dismissal' (item 1) and 'to allow for teacher and school board accountability' (item 3)

represented the summative nature of teacher evaluation. The formative aspect was incorporated in 'to improve instruction by promoting professional development of teachers' (item 2) and 'to focus on student learning' (item 4).

4.2.1 Present practices

The results of the data analysis (Table 4.2) indicated that the four purposes were divided into two, albeit close, groups.

TABLE 4.2. Frequency of use for Present Practices of Purposes for Teacher Evaluation by Entire Population (N=102)

Item	Percent of Respondents					Mean
	Always 5	Sometimes 4	Rarely 3	Never 2	Don't Know 1	
1. To make administrative decisions of tenure or dismissal.	17.8 (18)*	41.6 (42)	20.8 (21)	8.9 (9)	10.9 (11)	3.47
	Missing cases - 1					
2. To Improve instruction by promoting professional development of teachers.	19.6 (20)	35.3 (36)	26.5 (27)	10.8 (11)	7.8 (8)	3.48
	Missing cases - 0					
3. To allow for teacher and school board accountability.	16.0 (16)	31.0 (31)	29.0 (29)	6.0 (6)	18.0 (18)	3.21
	Missing cases - 2					
4. To focus on student learning.	9.1 (9)	32.3 (32)	34.3 (34)	12.1 (12)	12.1 (12)	3.14
	Missing cases - 3					

* Number of respondents

The purposes 'to make administrative decisions of tenure or dismissal' and 'to improve instruction by promoting professional development of teachers' had means of 3.47 and 3.48, respectively. More than 1/2 (about 57

percent) of the respondents rated these two purposes as practised 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'sometimes'), while about 1/3 rated them as used 'rarely/never' (emphasis on 'rarely').

'To allow for teacher and school accountability' and 'to focus on student learning' had means of 3.21 and 3.14, respectively. Forty-seven percent of respondents rated 'to allow for teacher and school board accountability' as used 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'sometimes'), compared to 35 percent as practised 'rarely/never' (emphasis on 'rarely'). 'To focus on student learning' received a rating of 41 percent as used 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'sometimes') and 46 percent as practised 'rarely/never' (emphasis on 'rarely'). It was observed that 18 percent of the respondents selected 'do not know' for the purpose 'to allow for teacher and school board accountability'.

When the results for the cross-tabulations of the purposes with the independent variables were examined (Appendix 8), there were no differences (based on the grounds previously established) in the trends observed for the entire population.

4.2.2 Summary of present practices

Of the four purposes that core French teachers were asked to rate as presently practised, neither purpose was predominant. Each purpose received support from some respondents as practised and from other respondents as not practised.

4.2.3 Preferred practices

As to the purposes the respondents would prefer to see practised, the data (Table 4.3) produced some interesting observations.

TABLE 4.3. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Purposes for Teacher Evaluation by Entire Population (N=102)

Item	Percent of Respondents					Mean
	Always 5	Sometimes 4	Rarely 3	Never 2	Don't Know 1	
1. To make administrative decisions of tenure or dismissal.	20.4 (20)* Missing cases - 4	46.9 (46)	17.3 (17)	13.3 (13)	2.0 (2)	3.70
2. To improve instruction by promoting professional development of teachers.	31.5 (72) Missing cases - 4	25.5 (25)	-- (--)	-- (--)	1.0 (1)	4.70
3. To allow for teacher and school board accountability.	25.8 (25) Missing cases - 5	35.1 (34)	20.6 (20)	10.3 (10)	8.2 (8)	3.60
4. To focus on student learning.	56.1 (55) Missing cases - 4	31.6 (31)	6.1 (6)	2.0 (2)	4.1 (4)	4.37

* Number of respondents

The purposes 'to improve instruction by promoting professional development of teachers' and 'to focus on student learning', with means of 4.70 and 4.37, respectively, received a preference rating of about 93 percent as 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'always'). In fact, 'to improve instruction by promoting professional development of teachers' was rated by 75 percent of respondents as 'always' preferred, while 'to focus on student learning' received a 56 percent preference rating as 'always'.

About 2/3 (67 percent) of the respondents rated the purposes 'to make administrative decisions of tenure or dismissal' and 'to allow for teacher and school board accountability' as preferred 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'sometimes'), compared to 30 percent as 'rarely/never' (emphasis on 'rarely').

When the data for preferred practices for the entire population was cross-tabulated with the independent variables (Appendix 9), the trends observed for the purposes 'to improve instruction by promoting professional development of teachers', 'to focus on student learning', and 'to allow for teacher and school board accountability' were similar. However, there were two differences observed

with the purpose 'to make administrative decisions of tenure or dismissal'.

Elementary school teachers rated 'to make administrative decisions of tenure or dismissal' 46 percent as 'always' preferred. In contrast, junior high teachers gave this purpose a preference rating of 73 percent as 'sometimes'. This difference may reflect a perception on the part of elementary school teachers that teacher evaluations are used as a basis for such decisions. It may also reflect a younger teaching population at the elementary school level.

4.2.4 Summary of preferred practices

The respondents identified the formative purposes 'to improve instruction by promoting professional development of teachers' and 'to focus on student learning' as practices they would prefer. Their preference for the summative purposes 'to make administrative decisions of tenure or dismissal' and 'to allow for teacher and school board accountability' was ambiguous.

Elementary school teachers identified the summative purpose 'to make administrative decisions of tenure or dismissal' as a desirable practice.

4.3 Criteria to judge effective teaching

In order to evaluate a teacher for effectiveness, a broad set of criteria is essential. The criteria listed in the questionnaire reflected the three types identified in the literature review on teacher evaluation - presage, process, and product.

'Physical characteristics' (item 1), 'personal qualities' (item 4), 'teaching experience' (item 6), and 'academic qualifications/subject competency' (item 8) were the presage criteria that respondents to the questionnaire were asked to rate.

The process criteria included 'organizational behaviours' (item 2), 'presentation behaviours' (item 5), 'comportment behaviours' (item 7), 'observable student behaviours' (item 9), 'co-curricular involvement' (item 10), and 'school-related behaviours' (item 11).

The only product criterion, that core French teachers were asked to rate, was 'students' test results' (item 3).

4.3.1 Present practices

The results of the data analysis (Table 4.4) indicated that the criteria, as presently practised, were divided into three distinct groups which crossed over the categories used in designing the questionnaire.

TABLE 4.4. Frequency of use for Present Practices of
Criteria for Teacher Evaluation by Entire
Population (N=102)

Item	Percent of Respondents					Mean
	Always 5	Sometimes 4	Rarely 3	Never 2	Don't Know 1	
1. Physical characteristics (personal appearance; general health; dress; etc.).	10.8 (11)* Missing cases - 0	39.2 (40)	29.4 (30)	9.8 (10)	10.8 (11)	3.29
2. Organizational behaviours (clearly defined objectives; well-developed lesson plans; etc.).	41.2 (42)	42.2 (43)	6.9 (7)	3.9 (4)	5.9 (6)	4.09
3. Students' test results.	7.9 (8) Missing cases - 1	39.6 (40)	29.7 (30)	10.9 (11)	11.9 (12)	3.21
4. Personal qualities (self-image; age/sex; enthusiasm; personality; etc.).	19.0 (19) Missing cases - 2	50.0 (50)	20.0 (20)	3.0 (3)	8.0 (8)	3.69
5. Presentation behaviours (variety; creativity; caters to individual (student) differences; voice control; etc.).	38.6 (39) Missing cases - 1	41.6 (42)	10.9 (11)	1.0 (1)	7.9 (8)	4.02
6. Teaching experience.	12.9 (13) Missing cases - 1	37.6 (38)	24.8 (25)	9.9 (10)	14.9 (15)	3.24
7. Comportment behaviours (respectful to students; warm and considerate, yet good classroom control; requires acceptable standards of work; etc.).	45.5 (46) Missing cases - 1	43.6 (44)	5.0 (5)	1.0 (1)	5.0 (5)	4.24

(continued)

TABLE 4.4. (continued)

Item	Percent of Respondents					Mean
	Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
	5	4	3	2	1	
8. Academic qualifications/ subject competency.	44.0 (44) Missing cases - 2	36.0 (36)	11.0 (13)	-- (--)	7.0 (7)	4.10
9. Observable student behaviours (eager; respectful towards teacher; desire to learn; etc.).	18.8 (19) Missing cases - 1	50.5 (51)	18.8 (19)	4.0 (4)	7.9 (8)	3.68
10. Co-curricular involvement (school activities; professional/community organizations; curriculum development; etc.).	23.8 (24) Missing cases - 1	30.7 (31)	24.8 (25)	11.9 (12)	8.9 (9)	3.49
11. School-related behaviours (promptness with reports; well-kept student records; co-operation; punctuality; etc.).	20.8 (21) Missing cases - 1	45.5 (46)	15.8 (16)	7.9 (8)	9.9 (10)	3.59

* Number of respondents

About 83 percent of the respondents rated the process criteria 'organizational behaviours', 'presentation behaviours', and 'comportment behaviours', and the presage criterion 'academic qualifications/subject competency' as 'always/sometimes' used. There was about equal emphasis on 'always' and 'sometimes' and the ratings for both were less than 50 percent. These four criteria had means ranging from 4.02 to 4.24.

The presage criterion 'personal qualities' and the process criteria 'observable student behaviours' and

'school-related behaviours' were rated by about 2/3 of the respondents as 'always/sometimes' used. The emphasis was definitely on 'sometimes' as the ratings as 'sometimes' practised were 50 percent, 51 percent, and 46 percent, respectively. The means for these three criteria ranged from 3.59 to 3.69.

Just over or under 1/2 of the respondents identified the presage criteria 'physical characteristics' and 'teaching experience', the process criterion 'co-curricular involvement', and the product criterion 'students' test results' as criteria used 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'sometimes'). However, over 1/3 of the respondents indicated that these criteria were practised 'rarely/never' (emphasis on 'rarely'). These four criteria had means ranging from 3.21 to 3.49.

In cross-tabulating the data for the entire population with the independent variables (Appendix 10), there were some differences observed.

The presage criterion 'personal qualities' was rated 62 percent as 'always' used and 23 percent as 'sometimes' used by elementary school teachers.

Thirty-nine percent of elementary school teachers rated the process criterion 'observable student behaviours' as

'always' practised and 54 percent as 'sometimes' practised.

'Co-curricular involvement' was rated 54 percent as 'always' used and 75 percent as 'always/sometimes' used by elementary teachers.

4.3.2 Summary of present practices

The process criteria 'organizational behaviours', 'comportment behaviours', and 'presentation behaviours' and the presage criterion 'academic qualifications/subject competency' were identified by the respondents as criteria used by their evaluators. The results for the other process criteria 'observable student behaviours', 'co-curricular involvement', and 'school-related behaviours' were ambiguous. The same trend applied to the presage criteria 'physical characteristics', 'personal qualities' and 'teaching experience' and to the product criterion 'students' test results'.

Elementary school teachers, however, indicated that the process criteria 'observable student behaviours' and 'co-curricular involvement' and the presage criterion 'personal qualities' were criteria used, as well, by their evaluators.

4.3.3 Preferred practices

Based on the data analysis for the criteria

(Table 4.5), certain trends were observed as to the preferences of respondents.

TABLE 4.5. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Criteria for Teacher Evaluation by Entire Population (N=102)

Item	Percent of Respondents -					Mean
	Always 5	Sometimes 4	Rarely 3	Never 2	Don't Know 1	
1. Physical characteristics (personal appearance; general health; dress; etc.)	15.8 (16)* Missing cases - 1	38.6 (39)	24.8 (25)	15.8 (16)	5.0 (5)	3.45
2. Organizational behaviours (clearly defined objectives; well-developed lesson plans; etc.)	62.0 (62)	32.0 (32) Missing cases - 2	3.0 (3)	2.0 (2)	1.0 (1)	4.52
3. Students' test results.	7.0 (7) Missing cases - 2	49.0 (49)	32.0 (32)	10.0 (10)	2.0 (2)	3.49
4. Personal qualities (self-image; age/sex; enthusiasm; personality; etc.).	30.6 (30) Missing cases - 4	49.0 (48)	18.4 (18)	-- (--)	2.0 (2)	4.06
5. Presentation behaviours (variety; creativity; caters to individual (student) differences; voice control; etc.).	65.0 (65) Missing cases - 2	30.0 (30)	4.0 (4)	-- (--)	1.0 (1)	4.58
6. Teaching experience.	17.3 (17) Missing cases - 4	44.9 (44)	25.4 (20)	10.2 (10)	7.1 (7)	3.55
7. Comportment behaviours (respectful to students; warm and considerate, yet good classroom control; requires acceptable standards of work; etc.)	80.8 (80) Missing cases - 3	16.2 (16)	2.0 (2)	-- (--)	1.0 (1)	4.76

(continued)

TABLE 4.5. (continued)

Item	Percent of Respondents					Mean
	Always 5	Sometimes 4	Rarely 3	Never 2	Don't Know 1	
8. Academic qualifications/subject competency.	69.3 (70) Missing cases - 1	27.7 (28)	2.0 (2)	-- (--)	1.0 (1)	4.64
9. Observable student behaviours (eager; respectful towards teacher; desire to learn; etc.).	37.0 (37) Missing cases - 2	51.0 (51)	10.0 (10)	1.3 (1)	1.0 (1)	4.22
10. Co-curricular involvement (school activities; professional/community organizations; curriculum development; etc.)	25.5 (26) Missing cases - 4	46.9 (46)	17.3 (15)	9.2 (9)	2.0 (2)	3.87
11. School-related behaviours (promptness with reports; well-kept student records; co-operation; punctuality; etc.).	47.5 (47) Missing cases - 3	42.4 (42)	6.1 (6)	2.0 (2)	2.0 (2)	4.31

* Number of respondents

The process criteria 'organizational behaviours', 'comportment behaviours', and 'presentation behaviours', and the presage criterion 'academic qualifications/subject competency' were given a preference rating of about 65 percent as 'always' and about 30 percent as 'sometimes'. The respondents rated the criterion 'comportment behaviours' 81 percent as 'always' preferred and only 16 percent as 'sometimes'. These three criteria had means ranging from 4.52 to 4.76.

The process criteria 'observable student behaviours'

and 'school-related behaviours' and the presage criterion 'personal qualities' were rated 88 percent, 90 percent, and 80 percent, respectively, as criteria 'always/sometimes' preferred. 'Observable student behaviours' was rated 51 percent as 'sometimes'. While the emphasis for 'school-related behaviours' was on 'always' and the emphasis for 'personal qualities' was on 'sometimes', the ratings for 'always' and 'sometimes' for both of these criteria were less than 50 percent. The means for these three criteria ranged from 4.06 to 4.31.

'Teaching experience' from the presage criteria was rated by almost 2/3 of respondents (62 percent) as preferred 'always/sometimes' (emphasis heavily on 'sometimes'), but by almost 1/3 (31 percent) as 'rarely/never' (emphasis on 'rarely'). About 3/4 of respondents (73 percent) rated 'co-curricular involvement' from the process criteria as preferred 'always/sometimes' (emphasis heavily on 'sometimes'), while 1/4 rated this criteria as 'rarely/never' preferred. The means for both criteria were 3.55 and 3.87, respectively.

Those respondents (about 55 percent) who preferred the presage criterion 'physical characteristics' and the product criterion 'students' test results' as 'always/sometimes'

(emphasis on 'sometimes') were matched by 42 percent of respondents who rated these criteria as 'rarely/never' preferred. Both of these criteria had means of 3.45 and 3.49, respectively.

When the data for the entire population were cross-tabulated with the independent variables (Appendix 11), it was observed that junior high teachers rated 'personal qualities' 70 percent as 'sometimes' preferred and 10 percent as 'always'. Elementary teachers gave this presage criterion a preference rating of 54 percent as 'always'.

In addition, junior high teachers rated the process criterion 'co-curricular involvement' 55 percent as 'always/sometimes' preferred and 46 percent as 'rarely/never'. In contrast, about 3/4 of high school and elementary teachers gave this criterion a preference rating as 'always/sometimes' and about 1/4 as 'rarely/never'.

4.3.4 Summary of preferred practices

The respondents indicated that the process criteria 'compartment behaviours', 'organizational behaviours', 'presentation behaviours', 'observable student behaviours', and 'school-related behaviours' were desired practices. This trend also applied to the presage criteria 'academic qualifications/subject competency', and 'personal

qualities'. The results for the presage criteria 'teaching experience' and 'physical characteristics' were ambiguous. This same trend applied, as well, to the process criterion 'co-curricular involvement' and to the product criterion 'students' tests results'.

The use of the presage criterion 'personal qualities' was ambiguous for junior high school teachers rather than desirable.

Both high school and elementary school teachers identified the process criterion 'co-curricular involvement' as a desired practice.

4.4 Sources used to obtain information about a teacher's effectiveness

To evaluate any teacher against a pre-determined set of criteria, an evaluator has to find ways to collect the necessary data. The sources of data that core French teachers were asked to rate represented 13 sources which, according to the literature on teacher evaluation, have been used at times to gather information on teachers.

4.4.1 Present practices

Based on the data received from core French teachers (Table 4.6), the sources presently used by evaluators to obtain information about a teacher's effectiveness were

divided into three groups.

TABLE 4.6. Frequency of use for Present Practices of Sources for Teacher Evaluation by Entire Population (N=102)

Item	Percent of Respondents					Mean
	Always 5	Sometimes 4	Rarely 3	Never 2	Don't Know 1	
1. Standard form (checklist).	24.2 (24)* Missing cases - 3	31.3 (31)	12.1 (12)	10.1 (10)	22.2 (22)	3.25
2. Results of teacher-made tests.	2.1 (2) Missing cases - 6	21.9 (21)	28.1 (27)	24.0 (23)	24.0 (23)	2.54
3. Results of standardized tests.	-- (--) Missing cases - 6	19.8 (19)	27.1 (26)	26.0 (25)	27.1 (26)	2.40
4. Video-taped lessons.	1.0 (1) Missing cases - 5	6.2 (6)	20.6 (20)	59.8 (58)	12.4 (12)	2.24
5. Classroom observation.	65.0 (65) Missing cases - 2	22.0 (22)	8.0 (8)	3.0 (3)	2.0 (2)	4.45
6. Written reports of classroom observation.	52.6 (51) Missing cases - 5	26.8 (26)	9.3 (9)	6.2 (6)	5.2 (5)	4.15
7. Written report at end of evaluation period.	60.8 (59) Missing cases - 5	18.6 (18)	7.2 (7)	5.2 (5)	8.2 (8)	4.19
8. Daily plan book/lesson plans.	14.4 (14) Missing cases - 5	27.8 (27)	22.7 (22)	29.2 (29)	5.2 (5)	3.16
9. Self-evaluation.	14.4 (14) Missing cases - 5	30.9 (30)	25.8 (25)	23.7 (23)	5.2 (5)	3.26
10. Peer evaluation.	1.0 (1) Missing cases - 4	8.2 (8)	22.4 (22)	58.2 (57)	10.2 (10)	2.32

(continued)

TABLE 4.6. (continued)

Item	Percent of Respondents					Mean
	Always 5	Sometimes 4	Rarely 3	Never 2	Don't Know 1	
11. Student evaluation.	4.1 (4) Missing cases - 5	19.6 (19)	14.4 (14)	54.6 (53)	7.2 (7)	2.59
12. Parent input.	1.0 (1) Missing cases - 3	10.1 (10)	15.2 (15)	64.6 (64)	9.1 (9)	2.29
13. Involvement in co-curricular/ system activities.	12.0 (12) Missing cases - 2	31.0 (31)	21.0 (21)	27.0 (27)	9.0 (9)	3.10

* Number of respondents

The sources in the first group had means ranging from 4.15 to 4.45. They included 'classroom observation', 'written report(s) of classroom observation', and 'written report at end of evaluation period'. As to 'always/sometimes' practised, 'classroom observation' received a rating of 87 percent and both types of 'written report' were rated 79 percent. 'Written report at end of evaluation period' was rated by 61 percent of the respondents as 'always' practised, while 'classroom observation' and 'written report(s) of classroom observation' were rated by the respondents 65 percent and 53 percent, respectively, as sources 'always' used.

In the second group were the sources 'standard form (checklist)', 'daily plan book/lesson plans', 'self-evaluation', and 'involvement in co-curricular/system activities'. The last three sources in this group were rated

about 43 percent as used 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'sometimes') and about 50 percent as 'rarely/never'. The use of the source 'standard form (checklist)' was rated 56 percent as 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'sometimes'), 22 percent as 'rarely/never', and 22 percent as 'do not know'. These four sources had means ranging from 3.10 to 3.26.

The final group consisted of six sources whose means, as to presently practised, ranged from 2.24 to 2.59. These sources were as follows: 'results of teacher-made tests', 'results of standardized tests', 'video-taped lessons', 'peer evaluation', 'student evaluation', and 'parent input'. The first two sources were rated about 21 percent as 'sometimes' used and 52 percent as 'rarely/never'. About 25 percent of the respondents indicated that they did not know whether these two sources were used. 'Video-taped lessons', 'peer evaluation', 'student evaluation', and 'parent input' were not only rated as 'rarely/never' used by almost 3/4 of the respondents, but these four sources were rated as 'never' used by about 60 percent of the respondents.

When the data for the entire population were cross-tabulated with the independent variables (Appendix 12), it was observed that elementary teachers rated 'daily plan book/lesson plans' 39 percent as 'always' used and 77 percent as 'always/sometimes' practised. Junior high

teachers rated this source as used 44 percent 'rarely' and 22 percent as 'never'.

4.4.2 Summary of present practices

The sources 'classroom observation', 'written report(s) of classroom observation', and 'written report at end of evaluation period' were identified by the respondents as having been used by their evaluators. The respondents indicated that the sources 'results of teacher-made tests', 'results of standardized tests', 'video-taped lessons', 'peer evaluation', 'student evaluation', and 'parent input' were not used. The results for the sources 'standard form (checklist)', 'daily plan book/lesson plans', 'self-evaluation', and 'involvement in co-curricular/system activities' were ambiguous.

Elementary school teachers, however, identified the source 'daily plan book/lesson plans' as having been used, as well, by their evaluators.

4.4.3 Preferred practices

Using the results of the data for preferred practices (Table 4.7), four trends were observed.

TABLE 4.7. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Sources for Teacher Evaluation by Entire Population (N=102)

Item	Percent of Respondents					Mean
	Always 5	Sometimes 4	Rarely 3	Never 2	Don't Know 1	
1. Standard form (checklist).	16.3 (16)*	45.9 (45)	23.5 (23)	6.1 (6)	8.2 (8)	3.56
	Missing cases - 4					
2. Results of teacher-made tests.	4.1 (4)	51.5 (4)	29.9 (50)	9.3 (29)	5.2 (9)	3.40 (9)
	Missing cases - 5					
3. Results of standardized tests.	4.2 (4)	30.2 (29)	33.3 (32)	20.8 (20)	11.5 (11)	2.95
	Missing cases - 6					
4. Video-taped lessons.	1.0 (1)	33.3 (32)	28.1 (27)	31.3 (30)	6.3 (6)	2.92
	Missing cases - 6					
5. Classroom observation.	55.8 (55)	40.4 (40)	3.0 (3)	1.0 (1)	-- (--)	4.51
	Missing cases - 3					
6. Written reports of classroom observation.	49.5 (48)	41.2 (40)	5.2 (5)	2.1 (2)	2.1 (2)	4.34
	Missing cases - 5					
7. Written report at end of evaluation period.	64.9 (63)	27.8 (27)	3.1 (3)	2.1 (2)	2.1 (2)	4.52
	Missing cases - 5					
8. Daily plan book/lesson plans.	20.8 (20)	40.2 (39)	20.6 (20)	18.6 (18)	-- (--)	3.63
	Missing cases - 5					
9. Self-evaluation.	34.7 (34)	56.1 (55)	7.1 (7)	2.0 (2)	-- (--)	4.23
	Missing cases - 4					
10. Peer Evaluation.	11.1 (11)	51.5 (51)	17.2 (17)	17.2 (17)	3.0 (3)	3.51
	Missing cases - 3					

(continued)

TABLE 4.7. (continued)

Item	Percent of Respondents					Mean
	Always 5	Sometimes 4	Rarely 3	Never 2	Don't Know 1	
11. Student evaluation.	7.1 (7)	42.9 (42)	24.5 (24)	19.4 (19)	6.1 (6)	3.26
	Missing cases - 4					
12. Parent input.	-- (--)	37.8 (37)	26.5 (26)	31.6 (31)	4.1 (4)	2.98
	Missing cases - 4					
13. Involvement in co-curricular/ system activities.	16.3 (16)	51.0 (50)	14.3 (14)	16.3 (16)	2.0 (2)	3.63
	Missing cases - 4					

* Number of respondents

Four sources had means ranging from 4.23 to 4.52. 'Written report(s) of classroom observation', 'self-evaluation', 'classroom observation', and 'written report at end of evaluation period' received a preference rating of 90 percent or more as 'always/sometimes'. While 'self-evaluation' was rated 56 percent as 'sometimes' preferred, 'classroom observation', 'written report(s) of classroom observation', and 'written report at end of evaluation period' were rated 56 percent, 50 percent, and 65 percent, respectively, as preferred 'always' by respondents.

There were five sources, with means ranging from 3.40 to 3.63, which about 60 percent of respondents rated as preferred 'always/sometimes'. However, the emphasis was on 'sometimes' and about 1/3 of respondents rated their use as 'rarely/never'. They included 'standard form (checklist)',

'results of teacher-made tests', 'daily plan book/lesson plans', 'peer evaluation', and 'involvement in co-curricular/system activities'.

'Student evaluation', with a mean of 3.26, was rated as 'always/sometimes' preferred by 1/2 of the respondents and as 'rarely/never' preferred by 44 percent of the population. The emphasis was certainly on 'sometimes' and slightly on 'rarely'.

Finally, three sources had means ranging from 2.92 to 2.98. 'Results of standardized tests', 'video-taped lessons', and 'parent input' were rated by more than 1/2 of the respondents (about 57 percent) as sources 'rarely/never' preferred and by about 30 percent as 'always/sometimes'.

When the data for the cross-tabulations was examined (Appendix 13), it was observed that high school teachers gave 'student evaluation' 71 percent as a source 'always/sometimes' preferred (emphasis on 'sometimes'). Junior high teachers rated this source 18 percent as 'always/sometimes' preferred and 64 percent as 'rarely/never' (slight emphasis on 'never').

It was also observed that junior high teachers rated 'daily plan book/lesson plans' 40 percent as a source 'always/sometimes' preferred and 60 percent as

'rarely/never'. This same source was rated by 78 percent of elementary teachers as 'always/sometimes' preferred and by 23 percent as 'rarely/never'.

In addition, junior high teachers gave the source 'involvement in co-curricular/system activities' a preference rating of 46 percent as 'always/sometimes' and 55 percent as 'rarely/never'. In contrast, elementary teachers rated this source 73 percent as 'always/sometimes' preferred and 17 percent as 'rarely/never'.

4.4.4 Summary of preferred practices

The sources 'classroom observation', 'written report(s) of classroom observation', 'written report at end of evaluation period', and 'self-evaluation' were identified by the respondents as desired practices. 'Self-evaluation' was a source that was not identified in determining practices presently used. The respondents indicated that the sources 'results of standardized tests', 'video-taped lessons', and 'parent input' were not desired practices. The results for the remaining sources ('standard form (checklist)', 'results of teacher-made tests', 'daily plan book/lesson plans', 'peer evaluation', 'student evaluation', and 'involvement in co-curricular/system activities') were ambiguous.

Junior high school teachers, however, identified 'student evaluation' as a source that was not desired.

Elementary teachers viewed 'daily plan book/lesson plans' and 'involvement in co-curricular/system activities' as desired sources.

4.5 Characteristics and objectives of the pre-conference

The pre-conference was characterized in the literature review as an essential ingredient in the teacher evaluation process, especially as a measure in safe-guarding the concept of due process.

The first two items in Component D of the questionnaire were two ideal characteristics suggested in the literature on teacher evaluation. The remaining items were suggested ideal objectives of a pre-conference.

4.5.1 Present practices

The observations from the data received from respondents were quite straight forward (Table 4.8). All of the characteristics and objectives, except 'to establish rapport between teacher and evaluator', had means ranging from 3.03 to 3.39.

'To establish rapport between teacher and evaluator', with a mean of 3.66, was rated as used 'always/sometimes'

(slight emphasis on 'always') by less than 2/3 (61 percent) of the respondents and as 'rarely/never' by nearly 1/3 (31 percent).

TABLE 4.8. Frequency of use for Present Practices of Pre-conferences for Teacher Evaluation by Entire Population (N=102)

Item	Percent of Respondents					Mean
	Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1. To take place before each classroom visit.	17.8 (18) Missing cases - 1	31.7 (32)	3 (26)	2 (21)	1 (4)	1.39
2. To take place in the teacher's classroom or resource centre.	12.4 (12) Missing cases - 5	29.9 (29)	16.5 (16)	30.9 (30)	10.1 (10)	3.03
3. To establish rapport between teacher and evaluator.	34.0 (34) Missing cases - 2	27.0 (27)	18.0 (18)	13.0 (13)	8.0 (8)	3.66
4. To receive information about class composition.	17.0 (17) Missing cases - 2	34.0 (34)	21.0 (21)	19.0 (19)	9.0 (9)	3.31
5. To review information about the lesson or series of lessons to be observed (content; methodology; goals; materials; evaluation; etc.).	18.0 (18) Missing cases - 2	35.0 (35)	20.0 (20)	30.0 (20)	7.0 (7)	3.37
6. To classify and establish criteria that will be observed during the lesson or series of lessons.	17.8 (18) Missing cases - 1	34.7 (35)	16.8 (17)	23.8 (24)	6.9 (7)	3.33
7. To clarify stages of the evaluation cycle.	20.0 (20) Missing cases - 2	27.0 (27)	21.0 (21)	24.0 (24)	8.0 (8)	3.27
8. To agree on practical questions (introduction of evaluator to the class; the recording instrument; the feedback procedure; etc.).	16.0 (16) Missing cases - 2	31.0 (31)	18.0 (18)	26.0 (26)	9.0 (9)	3.19

* Number of respondents

Just over 1/2 (about 52 percent) of core French teachers rated the objectives 'to receive information about class composition', 'to review information about the lesson ...', and 'to clarify and establish criteria ...' as practised 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'sometimes'). However, 40 percent of the respondents rated these objectives as 'rarely/never' used.

As to 'always/sometimes' and 'rarely/never' practised, 'to take place before each classroom visit' received a rating of 50 percent and 47 percent, 'to clarify stages of the evaluation cycle', 47 percent and 45 percent, and 'to agree on practical questions', 47 percent and 44 percent. These ratings were all in the direction of 'always/sometimes' with emphasis on 'sometimes' and 'rarely'.

Forty-two percent of the respondents rated the characteristic 'to take place in the teacher's classroom or resource centre' as practised 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'sometimes') and 47 percent as used 'rarely/never' (emphasis on 'never').

When the data for the entire population were cross-tabulated with the independent variables (Appendix 14), it was observed that these trends were consistent across

sub-groups.

4.5.2 Summary of present practices

All the results for the two characteristics and the six objectives of the pre-conference were ambiguous. This finding suggests that there are no definite practices followed regularly for the pre-conference.

4.5.3 Preferred practices

From the data analysis (Table 4.9), a common trend for preferred practices was observed.

Except for the characteristic 'to take place in the teacher's classroom or resource centre', all items had means ranging from 4.43 to 4.64 and were rated 87 percent to 96 percent as 'always/sometimes' preferred. In fact, these items received a preference rating between 60 percent and 71 percent as 'always'.

Seventy-six percent of the respondents preferred that the characteristic 'to take place in the teacher's classroom or resource centre' be practised 'always/sometimes' (fairly even emphasis). The mean for this characteristic was 3.87.

When the data for the entire population was cross-tabulated (Appendix 15), these trends were consistently observed.

**TABLE 4.9. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices
of Pre-conference for Teacher Evaluation
by Ethnic Population (N=102)**

Item	Percent of Respondents					Mean
	Always 5	Sometimes 4	Rarely 3	Never 2	Don't Know 1	
1. To take place before each classroom visit.	64.0 (64)* Missing cases - 2	29.0 (29)	4.0 (4)	2.0 (2)	1.0 (1)	4.53
2. To take place in the teacher's classroom or resource centre.	39.4 (39) Missing cases - 3	36.4 (36)	8.1 (8)	4.0 (4)	12.1 (12)	3.87
3. To establish rapport between teacher and evaluator.	71.1 (69) Missing cases - 3	23.7 (23)	4.1 (4)	-- (--)	1.0 (1)	4.64
4. To receive information about class composition.	59.6 (59) Missing cases - 3	32.3 (32)	6.1 (6)	1.0 (1)	1.0 (1)	4.48
5. To review information about the lesson or series of lessons to be observed (content; methodology; goals; materials; evaluation; etc.).	65.7 (65) Missing cases - 3	30.3 (30)	3.0 (3)	1.0 (1)	-- (--)	4.61
6. To classify and establish criteria that will be observed during the lesson or series of lessons.	66.7 (66) Missing cases - 3	27.3 (27)	4.0 (4)	1.0 (1)	1.0 (1)	4.58
7. To clarify stages of the evaluation cycle.	66.7 (66) Missing cases - 3	23.2 (23)	8.1 (8)	2.0 (2)	-- (--)	4.55
8. To agree on practical questions (introduction of evaluator to the class; the recording instrument; the feedback procedure; etc.).	60.6 (60) Missing cases - 3	26.3 (26)	10.1 (10)	2.0 (2)	1.0 (1)	4.43

* Number of respondents

4.5.4 Summary of preferred practices

The characteristic 'to take place before each classroom visit' and the six objectives were identified by the respondents as desired practices. This was certainly not the case for present practices. The results for the characteristic 'to take place in the teacher's classroom or resource centre' were ambiguous. This finding suggests that teachers are more concerned about the content of the pre-conference than where it takes place.

4.6 Characteristics and objectives of the post-conference

The post-conference was mentioned in the literature as an essential ingredient in the teacher evaluation process, especially in helping to enhance the concept of due process and to improve instruction.

The characteristics (items 1 and 2) and the objectives (items 3 through 9), which core French teachers were asked to rate, were suggested as ideal practices.

4.6.1 Present practices

The results from the data received (Table 4.10) indicated that the practices for the post-conference were presently divided into four different groups by core French teachers.

TABLE 4.10. Frequency of use for Present Practices of
post-conference for Teacher Evaluation
by Entire Population (N=102)

Item	Percent of Respondents					Mean
	Always 4	Sometimes 5	Rarely 3	Never 2	Don't Know 1	
1. To take place after each classroom visit.	46.5 (47)*	30.7 (31)	10.9 (11)	7.9 (8)	4.0 (4)	4.08
	Missing cases - 1					
2. To take place in the teacher's classroom or resource centre.	14.0 (14)	34.0 (34)	21.0 (21)	21.0 (21)	10.0 (10)	3.21
	Missing cases - 2					
3. To review records of previous classroom observations.	8.9 (9)	27.7 (28)	27.7 (28)	23.8 (24)	11.9 (12)	2.98
	Missing cases - 1					
4. To receive the teacher's perception of the lesson.	15.8 (20)	43.6 (44)	14.9 (15)	14.9 (15)	6.9 (7)	3.54
	Missing cases - 1					
5. To share the evaluator's perception of the lesson with the teacher.	48.5 (49)	33.7 (34)	7.9 (8)	4.0 (4)	5.9 (6)	4.15
	Missing cases - 1					
6. To clarify and establish job targets and arrangement for follow-up with support services.	12.2 (12)	39.8 (39)	21.4 (21)	12.2 (12)	14.3 (14)	3.23
	Missing cases - 4					
7. To record the contribution of the teacher to the school generally and to the system.	16.3 (16)	30.6 (30)	21.4 (21)	19.4 (19)	12.2 (12)	3.19
	Missing cases - 4					
8. To record the teacher's strengths and weaknesses.	42.4 (42)	39.4 (39)	9.1 (9)	2.0 (2)	7.1 (7)	4.08
	Missing cases - 3					
9. To secure commitment on the part of the teacher to change, where deemed desirable and appropriate.	25.3 (25)	34.3 (34)	17.2 (17)	10.1 (10)	13.1 (13)	3.48
	Missing cases - 3					

* Number of respondents

In the first group were 'to take place after each classroom visit', 'to share the evaluator's perception of the lesson with the teacher', and 'to record the teacher's

strengths and weaknesses'. All of these items were rated by about 80 percent of the respondents as practised 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'always') and had means ranging from 4.08 to 4.15.

The objectives 'to receive the teacher's perception of the lesson', 'to clarify and establish job targets and arrangement for follow-up with support services', and 'to secure commitment on the part of the teacher to change, where deemed desirable and appropriate' made up the second group.

'To receive the teacher's perception of the lesson' and 'to secure commitment on the part of the teacher to change...' had means of 3.54 and 3.48, respectively, and were rated by less than 2/3 of the respondents (about 61 percent) as used 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'sometimes'). However, more than 1/4 of the respondents (about 28 percent) rated these objectives as 'rarely/never' practised. 'To clarify and establish job targets and arrangement for follow-up services' was rated by respondents 52 percent as used 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'sometimes') and 34 percent as 'rarely/never' practised. This objective had a mean of 3.23.

The third group consisted of 'to take place in the teacher's classroom or resource centre' and 'to record the

contribution of the teacher to the school generally and to the system'. These items, with means of 3.21 and 3.19, respectively, were rated about 47 percent as practised 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'sometimes') and 41 percent as 'rarely/never' practised.

'To review records of previous classroom observations', with a mean of 2.98, was the only objective in the final group. The respondents gave this objective a rating of 37 percent as used 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'sometimes') and 52 percent as 'rarely/never' practised.

Some differences in these trends were observed when the data was cross-tabulated with the independent variables (Appendix 16).

High school teachers rated 'to take place after each classroom visit' 23 percent as 'always' practised and 50 percent as 'sometimes'. Forty-six percent of the elementary teachers rated this characteristic as 'always' and as 'sometimes' practised.

The objective 'to review records of previous classroom observations' was rated by 54 percent of the elementary teachers as used 'always/sometimes' (all the emphasis on 'sometimes'). The finding for the characteristic was lower for the entire population.

Fifty-four percent of those respondents with greater than 20 years of teaching experience rated the objective 'to share the evaluator's perception of the lesson with the teacher' as 'sometimes' used and 29 percent as 'always'. This objective was rated 61 percent as 'always' practised and 28 percent as 'sometimes' by those respondents with fewer than 10 years of teaching experience. This finding would suggest that, in general, evaluators discuss lessons more with the less experienced teachers.

4.6.2 Summary of present practices

The characteristic 'to take place after each classroom visit' and the objectives 'to share the evaluator's perception of the lesson with the teacher' and 'to record the teacher's strengths and weaknesses' were identified by the respondents as presently practised in the teacher evaluation process. The objective 'to review records of previous classroom observations' was viewed by the respondents as not a present practice. The results for the remaining items were ambiguous.

The objective 'to share the evaluator's perception of the lesson with the teacher' was ambiguous for those respondents with greater than 20 years of teaching

experience. The results for the objective 'to review records of previous classroom observations' and for the characteristic 'to take place after each classroom visit' were ambiguous, as well, for elementary and high school teachers, respectively.

4.6.3 Preferred practices

Based on the results of the data analysis (Table 4.11), all the characteristics and objectives were rated as 'always/sometimes' preferred and had means above 4.00.

'To take place after each classroom visit', 'to share the evaluator's perception of the lesson with the teacher', 'to receive the teacher's perception of the lesson', and 'to record the teacher's strengths and weaknesses' were rated by the respondents about 80 percent as 'always' preferred. These items had means ranging from 4.78 to 4.84.

Over 2/3 (69 percent) of the respondents indicated a preference as 'always' practiced, compared to 27 percent as 'sometimes', for the objective 'to secure commitment on the part of the teacher to change ...'. This objective had a mean of 4.61.

'To record the contribution of the teacher to the school generally and to the system' and 'to clarify and establish job targets ...' were given a preference rating

of 51 percent as 'always' and about 36 percent as 'sometimes'.

TABLE 4.11. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Post-Conference for Teacher Evaluation by Entire Population (N=102)

Item	Percent of Respondents					Mean
	Always 5	Sometimes 4	Rarely 3	Never 2	Don't Know 1	
1. To take place after each classroom visit.	85.0 (85)* Missing cases - 2	11.0 (11)	3.0 (3)	1.0 (1)	-- (--)	4.80
2. To take place in the teacher's classroom or resource centre.	45.5 (45) Missing cases - 3	34.3 (34)	10.1 (10)	3.0 (3)	7.1 (7)	4.08
3. To review records of previous classroom observations.	45.5 (45) Missing cases - 3	40.4 (40)	8.1 (8)	4.0 (4)	2.0 (2)	4.23
4. To receive the teacher's perception of the lesson.	75.0 (75) Missing cases - 2	24.0 (24)	-- (--)	-- (--)	1.0 (1)	4.72
5. To share the evaluator's perception of the lesson with the teacher.	85.9 (85) Missing cases - 3	13.1 (13)	-- (--)	1.0 (1)	-- (--)	4.84
6. To clarify and establish job targets and arrangement for follow-up with support services.	52.6 (50) Missing cases - 7	36.8 (35)	5.3 (5)	-- (--)	5.3 (5)	4.32
7. To record the contribution of the teacher to the school generally and to the system.	53.1 (52) Missing cases - 4	35.7 (35)	5.1 (5)	3.1 (3)	3.1 (3)	4.33
8. To record the teacher's strengths and weaknesses.	78.6 (77) Missing cases - 4	20.4 (20)	1.0 (1)	-- (--)	-- (--)	4.78
9. To secure commitment on the part of the teacher to change, where deemed desirable and appropriate.	69.4 (68) Missing cases - 4	26.5 (26)	1.0 (1)	2.0 (2)	1.0 (1)	4.61

* Number of respondents

Forty-six percent of the respondents rated the items 'to take place in the teacher's classroom or resource centre' and 'to review records of previous classroom observation' as 'always' preferred, while 40 percent and 34 percent, respectively, rated these items as 'sometimes'.

When the data was cross-tabulated, it was observed that junior high school teachers gave a preference rating of 89 percent as 'always' and 11 percent as 'sometimes' for the objective 'to clarify and establish job targets and arrangement for follow-up with support services'. Central high school teachers rated this objective 32 percent as 'always' preferred and 42 percent as 'sometimes'. These differences may reflect differences in age and number of years teaching experience between these two populations.

4.6.4 Summary of preferred practices

The respondents identified both of the characteristics and all seven objectives as desired practices for the post-conference.

The results for the objective 'to clarify and establish job targets and arrangement for follow-up with support services' were rated as ambiguous rather than desirable practices by central high teachers.

4.7 Evaluators involved in the teacher evaluation process

Armed with a set of criteria to judge effective teaching and with sources to obtain the necessary information about a teacher's effectiveness, someone has to take the responsibility to conduct the evaluation.

The eight evaluators, that core French teachers were asked to rate, have been involved, according to the literature on teacher evaluation, at one time or another in the evaluation process.

4.7.1 Present practices

Based on the results of the data (Table 4.12), certain trends were observed.

The 'principal/vice-principal' was rated by nearly 3/4 (72 percent) of the respondents as 'always' used and 20 percent as 'sometimes'. This item had a mean of 4.58.

'Self-evaluation' was rated 25 percent as 'always' practised and 28 percent as 'sometimes' used. However, 39 percent of the respondents or nearly 2/5 rated this item as 'rarely/never' used (emphasis on 'never'). Forty four percent of the respondents rated 'French co-ordinator' as 'always/sometimes' used and 50 percent as used 'rarely/never' (emphasis on 'never'). The item 'assistant superintendent' was rated by 46 percent of the respondents

as 'always/sometimes' used and by 48 percent as 'rarely/never' (emphasis on 'never'). 'Self-evaluation', 'French co-ordinator' and 'assistant superintendent' had means of 3.39, 3.21, and 3.28, respectively.

TABLE 4.12. Frequency of use for Present Practices of Evaluators for Teacher Evaluation by Entire Population (N=102)

Item	Percent of Respondents					Mean
	Always 5	Sometimes 4	Rarely 3	Never 2	Don't Know 1	
1. The principal/vice-principal.	71.6 (73)*	19.6 (20)	5.9 (6)	1.0 (1)	2.0 (2)	4.58
	Missing cases - 0					
2. Assistant Superintendent.	24.5 (24)	21.4 (21)	17.3 (17)	30.9 (30)	5.1 (6)	3.28
	Missing cases - 4					
3. French co-ordinator.	23.0 (23)	21.0 (21)	16.0 (16)	34.0 (34)	5.0 (6)	3.21
	Missing cases - 2					
4. French Department Head.	6.0 (5)	8.4 (7)	10.8 (9)	54.2 (45)	20.5 (17)	2.25
	Missing cases - 19					
5. Peer (another teacher).	2.0 (2)	5.1 (5)	9.1 (9)	71.7 (71)	12.1 (12)	2.13
	Missing cases - 3					
6. Self-evaluation.	25.3 (25)	28.3 (28)	14.1 (14)	25.3 (25)	7.1 (7)	3.39
	Missing cases - 3					
7. Students	6.1 (6)	15.2 (15)	17.2 (17)	55.6 (55)	6.1 (6)	2.60
	Missing cases - 3					
8. Parents.	-- (--)	7.1 (7)	9.2 (9)	74.5 (73)	9.2 (9)	2.14
	Missing cases - 4					

* Number of respondents

The remaining four items, with means ranging from 2.13 to 2.60, received a rating by more than 50 percent of the respondents as 'never' used. 'French department head' and 'students' received a rating of about 55 percent and 'peer' and 'parents' about 73 percent as items 'never' used.

When the data were cross-tabulated with the independent variables (Appendix 18), it was observed that those respondents with greater than 20 years of teaching experience identified 'assistant superintendent' as used 0 percent 'always', 37 percent 'sometimes', and 59 percent 'rarely/never' (emphasis on 'never'). Those respondents with fewer than 10 years of teaching rated this item 38 percent as 'always' used and 17 percent as 'sometimes'. This finding would suggest that there is a tendency for those who have been teaching for a longer period of time to be evaluated by different evaluators from those who are newer to the profession.

4.7.2 Summary of present practices

The respondents identified 'the principal/vice-principal' as the evaluator presently used. The results for the items 'assistant superintendent', 'French co-ordinator', and 'self-evaluation' were ambiguous. The remaining items were indicated by the respondents as not practised.

The evaluator 'assistant superintendent' was identified by those respondents with greater than 20 years of teaching experience as not used.

4.7.3 Preferred practices

Based on the results of the data analysis (Table 4.13), certain trends were observed as to whom core French teachers would prefer as their evaluators.

TABLE 4.13. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Evaluators for Teacher Evaluation by Entire Population (N=102)

Item	Percent of Respondents					Mean
	Always 5	Sometimes 4	Rarely 3	Never 2	Don't Know 1	
1. The principal/vice-principal.	59.6 (59)*	33.3 (33)	7.1 (7)	-- (--)	-- (--)	4.53
	Missing cases - 3					
2. Assistant superintendent.	24.0 (23)	31.3 (30)	24.0 (23)	15.6 (15)	5.2 (5)	3.53
	Missing cases - 6					
3. French co-ordinator.	47.0 (47)	36.0 (36)	11.0 (11)	3.0 (3)	3.0 (3)	4.21
	Missing cases - 2					
4. French Department Head.	24.4 (21)	43.0 (37)	9.3 (8)	11.6 (10)	11.6 (10)	3.57
	Missing cases - 1					
5. Peer (another teacher).	9.2 (9)	37.8 (37)	16.3 (16)	28.6 (28)	8.2 (8)	3.11
	Missing cases - 4					
6. Self-evaluation.	56.6 (56)	35.4 (35)	3.0 (3)	3.0 (3)	2.0 (2)	4.41
	Missing cases - 3					
7. Students.	8.2 (8)	43.9 (43)	20.4 (20)	24.5 (24)	3.1 (3)	3.30
	Missing cases - 4					
8. Parents.	1.0 (1)	27.8 (27)	22.7 (22)	42.3 (41)	6.2 (6)	2.75
	Missing cases - 5					

* Number of respondents

'The principal/vice-principal', 'self-evaluation', and 'French co-ordinator' were the three items with means above 4.00. About 58 percent of the respondents rated 'the principal/vice-principal' and 'self-evaluation' as 'always' preferred, and about 34 percent as 'sometimes' preferred. The means for these two items were 4.53 and 4.41, respectively. 'French co-ordinator', with a mean of 4.21, received a preference rating of 47 percent as 'always' and 36 percent as 'sometimes'.

'French department head', with a mean of 3.57, was rated by 67 percent as preferred 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'sometimes') compared to 21 percent as 'rarely/never'.

About 54 percent of the respondents gave 'assistant superintendent' and 'students' a preference rating as 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'sometimes'). 'Assistant superintendent' was rated by 40 percent as 'rarely/never' preferred and 'students' by 45 percent as 'rarely/never'. The means for these two items were 3.53 and 3.30, respectively.

'Peer', with a mean of 3.11, was rated by 47 percent of the respondents as preferred 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'sometimes') and 45 percent as 'rarely/never' (emphasis on

'never').

The only item to receive a rating of more than 50 percent as 'rarely/never' preferred and a mean of less than 3.00 was 'parents'. 'Parents' received a preference rating of 42 percent as 'never', 23 percent as 'rarely', and 29 percent as 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'sometimes'). The mean for 'parents' was 2.75.

When the data for the entire population were cross-tabulated with the independent variables (Appendix 19), it was observed that the item 'assistant superintendent' was rated by those respondents with fewer than 10 years of teaching experience 78 percent as 'always/sometimes' preferred and 20 percent as 'rarely/never'. Reversely, those respondents with greater than 20 years of teaching experience rated this item 26 percent as 'always/sometimes' preferred and 70 percent as 'rarely/never'.

4.7.4 Summary of preferred practices

The respondents identified the items 'the principal/vice-principal', 'French co-ordinator', and 'self-evaluation' as desired practices. The item 'parents' was viewed by the respondents as a practice that was not desired. The results for the remaining items ('assistant superintendent', 'French department head', 'peer', and

'students') were ambiguous.

Those respondents with greater than 20 years of teaching experience identified the use of the 'assistant superintendent' as a practice that was not desired.

4.8 Characteristics of the evaluator(s)

According to the literature, proper training of evaluators is an important link in the teacher evaluation process.

Core French teachers were asked to rate eleven characteristics. Except for the characteristic that evaluators 'cut corners to save time' (item 3), the remaining characteristics were suggested in the literature on teacher evaluation as those required by an effective evaluator.

4.8.1 Present practices

Table 4.14 represents the results of the data received from core French teachers. They indicated that the eleven characteristics were divided into four different groups.

In group one was that evaluators 'maintain teacher confidentiality'. This characteristic had a mean of 4.26 and 62 percent of respondents rated it as 'always' present. Twenty-four percent of the respondents gave this item a rating as 'sometimes' practised.

TABLE 4.14. Frequency of use for Present Practices of Characteristics of Evaluators for Teacher Evaluation by Entire Population (N=102)

Item	Percent of Respondents					Mean
	Always 5	Sometimes 4	Rarely 3	Never 2	Don't Know 1	
1. They teach part of the day which allows them to remain in contact with the teaching environment.	20.2 (20) Missing cases - 3	26.3 (26)	22.2 (22)	28.3 (28)	3.0 (3)	3.32
2. They encourage the teacher to experiment in the classroom.	23.0 (23) Missing cases - 2	36.0 (36)	23.0 (23)	13.0 (13)	5.0 (5)	3.59
3. They cut corners to save time.	7.1 (7) Missing cases - 3	31.3 (31)	25.3 (25)	13.2 (13)	17.2 (17)	2.92
4. They maintain teacher confidentiality.	62.0 (62) Missing cases - 2	24.0 (24)	2.0 (2)	2.0 (2)	10.0 (10)	4.26
5. They demonstrate a desire to work with the teacher to solve a problem.	30.7 (31) Missing cases - 1	41.6 (42)	17.8 (18)	5.0 (5)	5.0 (5)	3.88
6. They model a new idea or technique in an actual classroom setting as a way to provide support for the teacher.	5.9 (6) Missing cases - 1	16.8 (17)	29.7 (30)	35.6 (36)	11.9 (12)	2.69
7. They rely on the feedback of others who may be more knowledgeable in curriculum content matters.	12.1 (12) Missing cases - 3	24.2 (24)	25.3 (25)	15.2 (15)	23.2 (23)	2.87
8. They are consistent in applying evaluation rules and regulations.	29.3 (29) Missing cases - 3	37.4 (37)	11.1 (11)	7.1 (7)	15.2 (15)	3.59

(cont. Inued)

TABLE 4.14. (continued)

Item	Percent of Respondents					Mean
	Always 5	Sometimes 4	Rarely 3	Never 2	Don't Know 1	
9. They spend a reasonable amount of time in a teacher's class.	15.0 (15)	33.0 (33)	31.0 (31)	14.0 (14)	7.0 (7)	3.35
	Missing cases - 2					
10. They are knowledgeable on what constitutes effective teaching.	24.0 (24)	52.0 (52)	14.0 (14)	3.0 (3)	7.0 (7)	3.83
	Missing cases - 2					
11. They are good facilitators of communication. (They value what others say.; They keep an open mind.; They communicate that they have heard what was said to them.; etc.)	28.0 (28)	47.0 (47)	16.0 (16)	4.0 (4)	5.0 (5)	3.89
	Missing cases - 2					

* Number of respondents

The second group consisted of five items which were rated by more than 50 percent of the respondents as 'always/sometimes' practised and had means ranging from 3.59 to 3.89. About 3/4 of the respondents rated evaluators 'demonstrate a desire to work with the teacher to solve a problem', 'are knowledgeable on what constitutes effective teaching', and 'are good facilitators of communication' as present 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'sometimes'). About 1/4 of the population rated these three characteristics as practised 'rarely/never' (emphasis on 'rarely'). These three characteristics had means of 3.88, 3.83, and 3.89,

respectively. It was noted that evaluators 'are knowledgeable on what constitutes effective teaching' was rated by 52 percent as 'sometimes' present.

Evaluators 'are consistent in applying evaluation rules and regulations' was rated by 67 percent as practised 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'sometimes') and 18 percent as 'rarely/never' practised. Nearly 60 percent of the respondents rated evaluators 'encourage the teacher to experiment in the classroom' as 'always/sometimes' practised and 36 percent as 'rarely/never' practised. Both of these characteristics had a mean of 3.59.

The third group consisted of evaluators 'teach part of the day ...' and 'spend a reasonable amount of time in a teacher's class'. These two characteristics had means of 3.32 and 3.35, respectively. About 1/2 (51 percent) of the respondents rated evaluators 'teach part of the day ...' as present 'rarely/never' (emphasis on 'never') and 47 percent as 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'sometimes'). Forty-eight percent of respondents rated evaluators 'spend a reasonable amount of time in a teacher's class' as 'always/sometimes' the case and 45 percent as 'rarely/never'.

The characteristics in the final group had means ranging from 2.69 to 2.92. Evaluators 'cut corners to save

time' was rated by 45 percent of the respondents as 'rarely/never' practised and by 38 percent as 'always/sometimes'. Seventeen percent of the respondents rated this characteristic as 'do not know'. Evaluators 'rely on the feedback of others ...' received a rating of 41 percent as 'rarely/never' the case and 36 percent as practised 'always/sometimes'. Twenty-three percent of the respondents rated this characteristic as 'do not know'. Sixty-five percent of the respondents rated evaluators 'model a new idea or technique ...' as present 'rarely/never' (emphasis on 'never') and 23 percent as 'always/sometimes'.

When the data for the entire population were cross-tabulated with the independent variables (Appendix 20), these trends were consistently observed.

4.8.2 Summary of present practices

The respondents identified evaluators 'maintain teacher confidentiality' as a characteristic presently practised. Evaluators 'rely on the feedback of others ...', 'cut corners to save time', and 'model a new idea or technique ...' were indicated as characteristics not presently practised. The results of the remaining seven characteristics were ambiguous.

4.8.3 Preferred practices

The results of the data for the entire population (Table 4.15) indicated that every characteristic, except evaluators 'cut corners to save time', received a rating as 'always' preferred from more than 1/2 of the population. In addition, these characteristics had means above 4.00. However, there were differences in the ratings as to 'always' preferred.

Five of the characteristics were rated 86 percent or higher as 'always' preferred, with means ranging from 4.77 to 4.91. They included evaluators 'maintain teacher confidentiality', 'demonstrate a desire to work with the teacher to solve a problem', 'are knowledgeable on what constitutes effective teaching', 'are good facilitators of communication', and 'are consistent in applying evaluation rules and regulations'.

Evaluators 'encourage the teacher to experiment in the classroom' and 'spend a reasonable amount of time in a teacher's class' were rated by about 73 percent of the respondents as 'always' preferred and about 22 percent as 'sometimes' preferred. The means for these two characteristics were 4.68 and 4.69, respectively.

Three characteristics were rated 50 percent to 60 percent as 'always' preferred and 31 percent to 41 percent as 'sometimes'. They included evaluators 'teach part of the day ...', 'model a new idea or technique in an actual classroom setting ...' and 'rely on the feedback of others'.

TABLE 4.15. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Characteristics of Evaluators for Teacher Evaluation by Entire Population (N=102)

Item	Percent of Respondents					Mean
	Always 5	Sometimes 4	Rarely 3	Never 2	Don't Know 1	
1. They teach part of the day which allows them to remain in contact with the teaching environment.	60.6 (60) ^a Missing cases - 3	37.4 (37)	1.0 (1)	-- (--)	1.0 (1)	4.57
2. They encourage the teacher to experiment in the classroom.	71.0 (71) Missing cases - 2	26.0 (26)	3.0 (3)	-- (--)	-- (--)	4.68
3. They cut corners to save time.	7.1 (7) Missing cases - 4	16.3 (16)	21.4 (21)	48.0 (47)	7.1 (7)	2.68
4. They maintain teacher confidentiality.	94.0 (94) Missing cases - 2	5.0 (5)	-- (--)	-- (--)	1.0 (1)	4.91
5. They demonstrate a desire to work with the teacher to solve a problem.	90.1 (91) Missing cases - 1	9.9 (10)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	4.90
6. They model a new idea or technique in an actual classroom setting as a way to provide support for the teacher.	54.0 (54) Missing cases - 2	41.0 (41)	-- (--)	1.0 (1)	4.0 (4)	4.40
7. They rely on the feedback of others who may be more knowledgeable in curriculum content matters.	58.0 (58) Missing cases - 2	31.0 (31)	5.0 (5)	2.0 (2)	4.0 (4)	4.37
8. They are consistent in applying evaluation rules and regulations.	86.9 (86) Missing cases - 3	9.1 (9)	1.0 (1)	-- (--)	3.0 (3)	4.77

(continued)

TABLE 4.15. (continued)

Item	Percent of Respondents					Mean
	Always 5	Sometimes 4	Rarely 3	Never 2	Don't Know 1	
9. They spend a reasonable amount of time in a teacher's class.	76.5 (75)	18.4 (18)	4.1 (4)	-- (--)	1.0 (1)	4.09
	Missing cases - 4					
10. They are knowledgeable on what constitutes effective teaching.	91.0 (91)	7.0 (7)	1.0 (1)	-- (--)	1.0 (1)	4.07
	Missing cases - 2					
11. They are good facilitators of communication. (They value what others say.; They keep an open mind.; They communicate that they have heard what was said to them.; etc.).	90.9 (90)	7.1 (7)	-- (--)	-- (--)	2.0 (2)	4.05
	Missing cases - 3					

* Number of respondents

The means for these three characteristics were 4.57, 4.40, and 4.37, respectively.

Evaluators 'cut corners to save time' was rated by 69 percent of the respondents as preferred 'rarely/never' (emphasis on 'never') and 23 percent as 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'sometimes'). The mean for this characteristic was 2.68.

Based on the cross-tabulations of the data for the entire population with the independent variables (Appendix 21), it was observed that those respondents with greater than 20 years of teaching experience preferred evaluators 'rely on the feedback of others ...' 36 percent as 'always'

and 46 percent as 'sometimes'. Those respondents with fewer than 10 and fewer than 20 years of teaching experience rated this characteristic 67 percent as 'always' preferred and about 25 percent as 'sometimes'. This finding suggests that older teachers are less often open to the use of feedback from sources other than the evaluator(s).

4.8.4 Summary of preferred practices

All of the characteristics, except evaluators 'cut corners to save time', were identified by the respondents as desired practices for their evaluators. Evaluators 'cut corners to save time' was a characteristic not desired.

The results for evaluators 'rely on the feedback of others ...' were ambiguous for those respondents with greater than 20 years of teaching experience.

4.9 Organizational context of teacher evaluation

As stakeholders in the teacher evaluation process, school boards have played an immense role. Core French teachers were asked to rate if teachers were informed in advance of all the steps in the evaluation process and if evaluation procedures were co-operatively designed by both teachers and administrators. In addition, the questionnaire inquired as to whether or not teacher evaluation was placed as a high priority and resources were made available for

teacher development.

4.9.1 Present practices

Based on the data analysis for the entire population (Table 4.16), there was only one item that received 50 percent or more as 'always' practised and had a mean above 4.00. 'Teachers are informed in advance of all steps in the evaluation process' was rated as 'always' practised by just over 1/2 (54 percent) of the respondents and as 'sometimes' by just over 1/4 (27 percent) of the population. The mean for this item as 4.19.

TABLE 4.16. Frequency of use for Present Practices of Organizational Context for Teacher Evaluation by Entire Population (N=102)

Item	Percent of Respondents					Mean
	Always 5	Sometimes 4	Rarely 3	Never 2	Don't Know 1	
1. Teachers are informed in advance of all steps in the evaluation process.	53.5 (54)* Missing cases - 1	26.7 (27)	9.9 (10)	5.0 (5)	5.0 (5)	4.19
2. Evaluation procedures are co-operatively designed by both teachers and administrators.	16.2 (16) Missing cases - 3	14.1 (14)	30.3 (30)	17.2 (17)	22.2 (22)	2.85
3. Teacher evaluation is placed as a high priority.	15.0 (15) Missing cases - 2	44.0 (44)	21.0 (21)	8.0 (8)	12.0 (12)	3.42
4. Available resources are made for teacher development (released time from regular classroom duties for conferences; staff development activities; peer mentors; etc.).	20.8 (21) Missing cases - 1	38.6 (39)	25.7 (26)	13.9 (14)	1.0 (1)	3.64

* Number of respondents

'Teacher evaluation is placed as a high priority' and 'available resources are made for teacher development' were rated by about 60 percent of the respondents as practised 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'sometimes'). The former item received a rating of 29 percent and the latter, 40 percent, as practised 'rarely/never' (emphasis on 'rarely'). The means for these two items were 3.42 and 3.64, respectively.

Core French teachers gave 'evaluation procedures are co-operatively designed by both teachers and administrators' a rating of 48 percent as practised 'rarely/never' (emphasis on 'rarely') and 30 percent as 'always/sometimes' practised. This item was rated 'do not know' by almost 1/4 (22 percent) of the respondents and had a mean of 2.85.

When the data were cross-tabulated with the independent variables (Appendix 22), it was observed that high school teachers rated 'evaluation procedures are co-operatively designed by both teachers and administrators' 55 percent as practised 'always/sometimes' (emphasis on 'always') and 40 percent as 'rarely/never' (emphasis on 'never'). This rating for 'always/sometimes' was generally much higher than the remainder of the population. This finding would suggest that, at present, high school teachers have more input into their evaluation process than do teachers at any other

level.

4.9.2 Summary of present practices

The respondents identified 'teachers are informed in advance of all steps in the evaluation process' as an item that was presently practised. 'Evaluation procedures are cooperatively designed by both teachers and administrators' was indicated by the respondents as an item that was not practised. The results of the remaining two items ('teacher evaluation is placed as a high priority' and 'available resources are made for teacher development') were ambiguous.

The results for 'evaluation procedures are cooperatively designed by both teachers and administrators' were ambiguous for high school teachers rather than not practised as was the case for the results for the general population.

4.9.3 Preferred practices

The results of the data analysis (Table 4.17) indicated that all four items were rated as 'always' preferred by more than 1/2 of the respondents and had means above 4.00.

'Teachers are informed in advance of all steps in the evaluation process' was rated by 96 percent of the respondents as 'always' preferred. The mean for this item was 4.96.

TABLE 4.17. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Organizational Context for Teacher Evaluation by Entire Population (N=102)

Item	Percent of Respondents					Mean
	Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1. Teachers are informed in advance of all steps in the evaluation process.	96.0 (97)* Missing cases - 1	4.0 (4)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	4.96
2. Evaluation procedures are co-operatively designed by both teachers and administrators.	79.0 (79) Missing cases - 2	16.0 (16)	3.0 (3)	-- (--)	2.0 (2)	4.70
3. Teacher evaluation is placed as a high priority.	55.6 (55) Missing cases - 3	37.4 (37)	5.1 (5)	1.0 (1)	1.0 (1)	4.45
4. Available resources are made for teacher development (released time from regular classroom duties for conferences; staff development activities; peer mentors; etc.).	80.4 (82) Missing cases - 0	19.6 (20)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	4.80

* Number of respondents

The respondents gave 'resources are made available for teacher development' a preference rating of 80 percent as 'always' and 20 percent as 'sometimes'. This item had a mean of 4.80.

Seventy-nine percent of the respondents rated 'evaluation procedures are co-operatively designed by both teachers and administrators' as 'always' preferred, compared to 16 percent as 'sometimes'. The mean for this item was 4.70.

'Teacher evaluation is placed as a high priority' was rated by 56 percent of the respondents as 'always' preferred

and 37 percent as 'sometimes'. This item had a mean of 4.45.

When the data for the entire population were cross-tabulated with the independent variables (Appendix 23), there were no differences observed in these trends.

4.9.4 Summary of preferred practices

All four of the items were identified by the respondents as desired practices in the organizational context of teacher evaluation.

4.10 Conclusion

The results of the data for each component have now been presented and analyzed. The presentation and analysis included the results for the entire population and for the independent variables of gender, years of teaching experience, type of school, and community population. This procedure applied to both present and preferred practices.

The respondents, 102 core French teachers, rated a total of 68 items which were divided among eight major components of the teacher evaluation process. These items were generally suggested in the literature on teacher evaluation as ideal practices. Each item was rated according to the way the respondents viewed it as presently practised and how they would like to see it practised.

Table 4.18 represents the thirteen items which had

means of 4.00 or above. These items were identified by the respondents as presently practised in the teacher evaluation process. It was noted that two components, purposes and characteristics and objectives of the pre-conference, had no items which were identified by the respondents as presently practised. The results for the remaining items were either ambiguous (40 items with means ranging from 3.00 to 3.99) or were identified as not practised (15 items with means below 3.00).

TABLE 4.18. Summary of Present Practices for Items with Means of 4.00 or above by Entire Population (N=102)

<u>Component</u>	<u>Present Practices</u>
1. Criteria to judge effective teaching	.organizational behaviours .presentation behaviours .comportment behaviours .academic qualifications/subject competency
2. Sources of data	.classroom observation .written report(s) of classroom observation .written report at end of evaluation period
3. Characteristics and objectives of the post-conference	.to take place after each classroom visit .to share the evaluator's perception of the lesson with the teacher .to record the teacher's strengths and weaknesses
4. The evaluator(s) involved in the evaluation process	.the principal/vice-principal
5. Characteristics of the evaluator(s)	.they maintain teacher confidentiality
6. The organizational context of teacher evaluation	.teachers are informed in advance of all steps in the evaluation process

Table 4.19 represents the 46 items which had means of 4.00 or above. These items were identified by the respondents as desired practices in the teacher evaluation process. They included all of the 13 items from Table 4.19.

TABLE 4.19. Summary of Preferred Practices for Items with Means of 4.00 or above by Entire Population (N=102)

<u>Component</u>	<u>Preferred Practices</u>
1. Purposes of teacher evaluation	.to improve instruction by promoting professional development of teachers .to focus on student learning
2. Criteria to judge effective teaching	.organizational behaviours .personal qualities .presentation behaviours .comportment behaviours .academic qualifications subject/competency .observable student behaviours .school-related behaviours
3. Sources of data	.classroom observation .written report(s) of classroom observation .written report at end of evaluation period .self-evaluation
4. Characteristics and objectives of the pre-conference	.to take place before each classroom visit .to establish rapport between teacher and evaluator .to receive information about class composition .to review information about the lesson or series of lessons to be observed .to classify and establish criteria that will be observed during the lesson or series of lessons .to clarify stages of the evaluation cycle .to agree on practical questions

(continued)

TABLE 4.19. (continued)

Component	Preferred Practices
5. Characteristics and objectives of the post-conference	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .to take place after each classroom visit .to take place in the teacher's classroom or resource centre .to review records of previous classroom observations .to receive the teacher's perception of the lesson .to share the evaluator's perception of the lesson with teacher .to clarify and establish job targets and arrangement for follow-up with support services .to record the contribution of the teacher to the school and to the system .to record the teacher's strengths and weaknesses .to secure commitment on the part of the teacher to change, where deemed desirable and appropriate
6. The evaluator(s) involved in the evaluation process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .the principal/vice-principal .French co-ordinator .self-evaluation
7. Characteristics of the evaluator(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .they teach part of the day .they encourage the teacher to experiment in the classroom .they maintain teacher confidentiality .they demonstrate a desire to work with the teacher to solve a problem .they model a new idea or technique in an actual classroom setting .they rely on the feedback of others who may be more knowledgeable in curriculum content matters .they are consistent in applying evaluation rules and regulations .they spend a reasonable amount of time in a teacher's class .they are knowledgeable on what constitutes effective teaching .they are good facilitators of communication
8. The organizational context of teacher evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .teachers are informed in advance of all steps in the evaluation process .evaluation procedures are co-operatively designed by both teachers and administrators .teacher evaluation is placed as a high priority .available resources are made for teacher development

The results for the remaining items were either ambiguous (17 items with means ranging from 3.00 to 3.99) or were identified by the respondents as practices that were not desired (5 items with means ranging from 2.50 to 2.99).

When the data was cross-tabulated with the independent variables, no discussable differences were found for the variables gender and community population. However, some differences were found associated with the variables type of school and years of teaching experience.

Elementary school teachers indicated that the presage criterion 'personal qualities', the process criteria 'observable student behaviours' and 'co-curricular involvement', and the source of data 'daily plan book/lesson plans' were items presently practised, as well as the ones identified in common with the general population. In addition, elementary school teachers added the summative purpose 'to make administrative decisions of tenure or dismissal', the process criterion 'co-curricular involvement', and the sources of data 'daily plan book/lesson plans' and 'involvement in co-curricular/system activities' to the list of desired practices.

Junior high school teachers gave less importance to the presage criterion 'personal qualities' as a desired practice, compared to the general population.

High school teachers indicated that the characteristic of the post-conference 'to take place after each classroom visit' was ambiguous, as to presently practised, suggesting that this follow-up characteristic currently occurs less often for this group of teachers. In addition, high school teachers, like their elementary counterparts, added the process criterion 'co-curricular involvement' to the list of desired practices.

Central high school teachers showed least desire for a post-conference 'to clarify and establish job targets and arrangement for follow-up with support services'.

For those respondents with greater than 20 years of teaching experience, the results for the objective of the post-conference 'to share the evaluator's perception of the lesson with the teacher' were ambiguous as presently practised, compared to the general population who identified this objective as a present practice. In addition, the results for the characteristic that evaluators 'rely on the feedback of others ...' were ambiguous, as a desired practice, for this particular group of teachers, compared to the general population who identified this characteristic as a desired practice.

Although the questionnaire did not specifically address the issue of an evaluator's ability to understand the French

language as one of the requirements of an effective evaluator, the lack of this ability in present practices was somewhat evident when the results for 'French co-ordinator', as an evaluator, were ambiguous. It was also a major concern emanating from the comments that many of the respondents wrote at the end of the questionnaire. The importance on the part of the respondents for their evaluator(s) to possess some understanding of the French language was equally evident when the 'French co-ordinator' was identified as a desired evaluator, along with 'the principal/vice-principal' and 'self-evaluation'.

The next appropriate step will be to discuss these results by examining any patterns, similarities, and differences between the present and preferred practices as identified by core French teachers with what the literature suggested. It is hoped, therefore, that this final step will lead to recommendations and suggestions for improvement, where deemed desirable and appropriate. This will be the focus of Chapter Five.

Chapter Five

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of having distributed the questionnaire to core French teachers was not simply to discover their opinions as to how the process of teacher evaluation was presently practised. Neither was it just a question of finding out how they would like to see the process practised. Equally important was the issue of using the results of the questionnaire, if possible, to evaluate the present teacher evaluation practices and to improve the teacher evaluation process, thus making it more effective for core French teachers.

Therefore, before any recommendations and suggestions can be made, the results of the questionnaire need to be placed in perspective. To accomplish this task, the present and preferred practices identified by core French teachers will be examined in light of the ideal practices suggested in the literature review on teacher evaluation. This analysis will form the basis of any recommendations and suggestions.

5.2 Present and preferred practices in teacher evaluation for core French teachers

The research, as to the purposes of teacher evaluation, has suggested that there is a tendency by school boards to place greater emphasis on the summative aspect (Duke and

Stiggins, 1986). It has also been suggested in the literature that teachers tend to assume that the primary purpose of teacher evaluation is summative in nature (Lawton et al., 1986; Burger, 1987). However, core French teachers in Newfoundland and Labrador, through their ratings of the four purposes in the questionnaire, suggested that the emphasis in present practices was fairly even as to summative and formative.

The literature on teacher evaluation has indicated, as well, that misunderstanding as to the nature of the purposes for teacher evaluation is the result of ill-defined purposes (Wentzell, 1991). This trend appears to be evident from the low ratings that core French teachers gave the four purposes as presently practised. This was not the case for preferred practices. The respondents clearly indicated that they preferred the formative purposes of improving instruction by promoting the professional development of teachers and of focusing on student learning over the summative purposes of making administrative decisions of tenure or dismissal and of allowing for teacher and school board accountability.

A trend in the research has revealed that teacher evaluation means nothing unless teachers can say at the end of the process that the focus was on student learning and

the attainment of the goals and objectives of the school and school system (Davis, 1989; Hickman, 1992). From the present ratings that core French teachers gave the purpose to focus on student learning, it would appear that this purpose has been somewhat neglected in the teacher evaluation process. The preferred ratings given this purpose by the respondents suggested that core French teachers recognized that this was a void that should be filled. Although it would appear that the respondents have not been sufficiently sold on the importance of focusing teacher evaluation on student learning and attaining school goals, the ratings from the questionnaire seemed to suggest that it would not take much effort to convince core French teachers of its importance to the success of the overall teacher evaluation process.

As to the criteria to be used for judging a teacher's effectiveness, the literature has proposed that everyone involved in the teacher evaluation process must possess a basic knowledge of the factors that characterize effective teaching and an expertise in identifying them. As well, this knowledge must not only be shared by both the evaluators and the teachers, but must be accepted as valid (Babiuk, 1988). From the ratings that core French teachers gave the eleven criteria in the questionnaire as present and preferred

practices, there appears to be a reasonable degree of expertise and belief in what constitutes the characteristics necessary for effective teaching. The four criteria (organizational behaviours, presentation behaviours, comportment behaviours, and academic qualification/subject competency), that were rated very highly as presently practised, were rated very highly, as well, as preferred practices. However, these four criteria were rated even higher as preferred criteria. In addition, other criteria, such as observable student behaviours and school-related behaviours, were rated by the respondents as preferred more than they were presently practised. Therefore, further work is required between core French teachers and their evaluators in sharing the knowledge of which criteria constitute effective teaching.

A trend in the literature, as to the sources used to judge a teacher's effectiveness, is that any one source of data alone is not sufficient to judge the effectiveness of a teacher (Duke and Stiggins, 1986). The three sources of data, (classroom observation, written report(s) of classroom observation, and written report at the end of the evaluation period), which core French teachers indicated were dominant in present practices, are in fact just a duplication of the same source. The assumption, of course, is that the written

report at the end of the evaluation period is based on classroom observation. To complicate the problem, the respondents suggested that their evaluators generally did not spend enough time in the teacher's classroom. This is not a different trend. It is generally agreed among current researchers that classroom observations are too few to obtain reliable data on the teachers' routine instructional behaviour.

As to the sources that core French teachers preferred to see practised, they basically chose these same three sources. However, the respondents did place another source at the top of the list. Core French teachers, unlike their evaluators, recognized, to a greater degree, the importance of self-evaluation as a source of data in the teacher evaluation process. The research has shown that when self-assessments are incorporated into classroom observation reports, teachers become more willing to engage in follow-up growth activities (Koehler, 1990).

The literature has suggested that the use of the results of standardized tests and the use of video-taped lessons, as sources of data, are considered to be unsuitable practices. Standardized tests are too imprecise to serve as valid performance criteria and there are too many factors that are beyond the control of the teacher which influence

student performance on these tests (Duke and Stiggins, 1986). Video-taping lessons is not encouraged because time retrieval prevents immediate feedback (Freer, 1987). Therefore, it is a positive step for the teacher evaluation process in this province that these two sources were rated in the questionnaire as neither widely practised nor desired by core French teachers.

Although the use of the standard form (checklist) was not widely practised or preferred as a source of data, the finding that over 1/2 of the respondents indicated that this source was always or sometimes practised and preferred is an issue that should be resolved. The literature on teacher evaluation has suggested that the use of data collection by means of checklists is on the way out (Blake and De Mont, 1990). The teacher characteristics, such as knowledge of subject matter, effectiveness in disciplining, and quality of lesson plans, which checklists frequently gauge, are often not highly correlated with effective teaching (Stake, 1989).

Another concern coming out of the results of the questionnaire is the lack of use of sources, such as peer assessments, results of teacher-made tests, student assessments, parent input and daily plan book/lesson plans, for present practices. The research has identified many

benefits of their use in the teacher evaluation process. Tests, quizzes, assignments and lesson plans reflect the extent to which teachers have clarified their expectations of students and linked assessment to instruction (Duke and Stiggins, 1986; Freiberg, 1987). Student evaluation of teachers is a viable data source because teachers are especially concerned with student views of their teaching and students are good reporters of many classroom conditions (Peterson, 1990). Parent evaluation can indicate whether or not the teacher has provided parents with the information needed to understand the class and has created an opportunity to learn (Peterson, 1990). Peer evaluation is not only a means for teachers to communicate professional knowledge, but also a way to give credibility and reassurance to colleagues (Peterson, 1990). Although core French teachers recognized, to some degree, the benefits derived from the use of these sources, especially peer evaluation, in their preferred choices, it would appear that these sources of information for teacher evaluation should be explored more by both teachers and evaluators.

The literature on teacher evaluation has shown that a standardized systematic sequence of steps is a common trait of almost all teacher evaluation models. The planning conference and the post-teaching conference represent two of

these steps. The characteristics and objectives of the pre- and post-conferences, which core French teachers were asked to rate in the questionnaire, are, in fact, not only ideal practices, but are recommended guidelines (Freer, 1987; Wareing, 1990; Hickman, 1992). The respondents, in identifying which characteristics and objectives they would prefer to see practised, generally supported these guidelines.

Although the post-conference, as to present practices, fared slightly better than the pre-conference, the results of the questionnaire demonstrated that the time has arrived for evaluators to rethink about the purposes and, as a consequence, the characteristics for appropriate pre- and post-conference sessions. In some cases, it would also appear that teachers need further education in the importance of these aspects of teacher evaluation.

According to the literature, the principal has traditionally fulfilled the role of evaluating teachers based on classroom observation (Ondrack and Oliver, 1986). This tradition was certainly evident from the responses of core French teachers when they rated the evaluators presently involved in the teacher evaluation process. However, there are indications in the research on teacher evaluation that this method has been subject to bias on some

occasions. In addition, this method represents only a small portion of the teacher's total behaviour in the school environment (Ondrack and Oliver, 1986).

The literature on teacher evaluation suggests alternatives to this traditional role, such as teacher self-evaluation, multiple appraisers (a combination of the principal, department head and assistant superintendent), evaluation by outside experts, peer evaluation, appraisal by students, and parent input. The respondents to the questionnaire were thinking along the same lines when they showed a preference for the principal/vice-principal, French co-ordinator, and teacher self-evaluation as evaluators. Although there was an increase in their preference, over what was presently practised, for the French department head, another teacher, students, and parents to serve in the role of evaluators, the reluctance on the part of some core French teachers to accept these alternatives appears to be still quite strong. Further learning and encouragement is needed, not only on the part of core French teachers, but even more so for teacher evaluation policy makers to explore these additional alternatives.

As to the proper training of the evaluators, the research on teacher evaluation has stressed that evaluators need to be credible, persuasive, trusting, and trustworthy,

must develop a proven track record, and have to be willing to model a new idea (Duke and Stiggins, 1986). In addition, the evaluators have to be trained in instructional analysis (Wareing, 1990) and be good facilitators of communication (Hickman, 1992).

The research, however, has also suggested that the lack of proper supervisory training is quite commonplace in teacher evaluation (Ritchie, 1990; Everton, 1989; Cressman, 1987). This trend was evident from the ratings core French teachers gave the characteristics of their evaluators. The findings of the questionnaire left little doubt as to the perceived lack of training on the part of the evaluators who are presently overseeing the evaluation of core French teachers. The results also demonstrated that these characteristics are the same ones that core French teachers in this province would like for their evaluators to possess. Therefore, it would appear that work needs to be done to insure that evaluators possess the desired characteristics and to encourage core French teachers in accepting that every effort is being made to include these characteristics in the training of evaluators.

As to teachers being informed in advance of all the steps in the evaluation process, the research clearly suggests that this is one of the aspects which is essential

and critical to providing due process (Macy, 1988). Present practice for core French teachers indicates that this aspect of due process is being somewhat adhered to, but not to the extent core French teachers would like to see it practised. Evaluators in the province may need to be sensitized to the importance of this aspect of the evaluation process.

Research has consistently advocated that teachers, as professionals, should take primary responsibility for their own professional development (Parkinson, 1991). "All too often, teacher evaluation is something that is done to teachers, rather than a process that is done with teachers" (Ripley and Hart, 1989, p. 14). When the respondents rated to what extent evaluation procedures were co-operatively designed by both teachers and administrators, they identified that co-operation occurred very seldom or that they did not know. However, that procedures be co-operatively designed was a concept that core French teachers recognized should exist.

School boards who do not regard teacher evaluation as a high priority, according to the literature, are in fact encouraging evaluators to take shortcuts which in turn will drive teachers to not take the evaluation process seriously (Duke and Stiggins, 1986). Core French teachers who responded to the questionnaire indicated that teacher

evaluation was given some degree of priority. Nevertheless, the respondents suggested that they would prefer to see greater emphasis on teacher evaluation.

The research on teacher evaluation has suggested, as well, that school boards must make resources available for development if teacher evaluation is expected to contribute to teacher growth (Duke and Stiggins, 1986; Freer, 1987; Burger and Bumbarger, 1991; Cousins, 1990). Present practice for core French teachers in this province appeared to suggest that some effort is being made to provide the necessary resources for teacher development. However, core French teachers would prefer an increase in the availability of such resources. It may be that the availability of resources needs to be stressed more in discussions with teachers.

The only reference in the literature on teacher evaluation where differences are encouraged is in relation to the criteria used to judge a teacher's effectiveness. No one set of criteria that adequately suits all teaching situations can be established since effective teaching behaviours vary for different grades, levels, subject areas, types of students, and instructional goals (Hunter, 1987; Thorson, Miller, and Bellon, 1987). Based on the results of the questionnaire, there appeared to be a reasonable amount

of consistency in both the present and the preferred practices for core French teachers.

However, the results do suggest that the evaluation process at the present time seems to be perceived more positively by elementary core French teachers than by those teachers at the junior high school level or those teachers with greater than 20 years of experience. Several reasons may be advanced for these differences. The latter groups may be less familiar with the evaluation process and less sure of its necessity. In addition, current practices may respond less to the needs of these two groups.

The analysis of the data by the independent variables also suggests some anomalies in the present evaluation practices for core French teachers in the province. Evaluators appeared to be using the presage criterion 'personal qualities' and the process criteria 'observable student behaviours' and 'co-curricular involvement' in their evaluation of elementary school teachers, but not in their evaluation of core French teachers at other grade levels. A post-conference after each classroom visit occurred less frequently for high school core French teachers than for other teachers. The evaluator's perception of the teacher's lesson was shared less with those teachers with greater than 20 years of experience, but more with inexperienced

teachers.

In addition, there were some anomalies in the preferred evaluation practices. Unlike teachers at other levels, both elementary and high school teachers appeared to desire the process criterion 'co-curricular involvement' in judging a teacher's effectiveness. Core French teachers at the elementary level seemed to be the only group to show a preference for the summative purpose 'to make administrative decisions of tenure or dismissal' and the sources of data 'daily plan book/lesson plans' and 'involvement in co-curricular/system activities'.

5.3 Recommendations and suggestions

As a result of the foregoing discussion, the following recommendations and suggestions are proposed for the improvement of the evaluation process for core French teachers in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador:

1. School boards should establish ii. their evaluation policies, if they already have not done so, that the primary purpose is to improve instruction by promoting the professional development of teachers in order that the learning environment of students may improve. However, the development of this policy should not be done unilaterally, but through co-operation with teachers so that a consensus

can be reached. This can be accomplished through in-service or through a committee-type structure which should ensure that core French teachers and evaluators are in complete agreement on the purposes of evaluation.

2. Whatever the purposes are, school boards should make certain that all core French teachers are quite clear as to the purposes of teacher evaluation. A written statement to core French teachers via a memo or a French department meeting is probably appropriate to ensure that all core French teachers are aware of the school board policy. However, more personal contact, through discussion, would also be desirable.

3. Greater co-operation between core French teachers and evaluators is required in identifying the factors that characterize effective teaching so that there is consensus on the validity of these characteristics. A committee-type structure, with representation from both sides, is recommended to draw up a list of suitable characteristics. However, the committee should be so structured as to be able to accept input from everyone involved.

4. The frequency of classroom observations should be increased. Two to three hours for each evaluation cycle is recommended.

5. Evaluators should use a variety of sources to properly

judge a core French teacher's effectiveness. Classroom observation, written report(s) of classroom observation, written report at the end of the evaluation period, self-evaluation, peer evaluation, parent input, student assessments, daily plan book/lesson plans, and results of teacher-made tests are suggested sources. However, both evaluators and core French teachers should agree on the sources used.

6. Both evaluators and core French teachers should be further educated about the merits of peer evaluation, parent input, student assessments, and daily plan book/lesson plans as sources of data and about the weaknesses of the standard form (checklist) as an appropriate source. This goal can be accomplished through some type of in-service.

7. More evaluators should be used in assessing a core-French teacher's effectiveness. A combination of the principal/vice-principal, French co-ordinator, French department head, self-evaluation, and students is recommended. When students are involved however, it is important that evaluation instruments and procedures are carefully designed and used. Appropriate student evaluation should not result in a popularity contest or the rewarding of a particular style of teaching or marking (Peterson, 1990).

8. School boards should provide opportunities for evaluators to become better trained so that they are aware of the characteristics of an effective evaluator, know how to conduct a pre- and post-conference, and are knowledgeable of the steps involved in the concept of due process. In-service or university courses, such as Administration 6550 offered at Memorial University of Newfoundland, are possible means to this end.

9. Core French teachers should be more involved in the development of evaluation procedures. If many of the recommendations and suggestions, previously reported in this thesis, are adopted, this involvement should be accomplished.

10. School boards should place a higher priority on teacher evaluation. This priority can be perceived by all stakeholders if school boards take the time, money, and effort to train the evaluators, allow for in-service during regular class time, and make other resources more available, such as staff development activities, peer mentors, and, even, guest speakers.

11. The teacher evaluation process at the junior high level should be examined. Some type of in-service may be required for junior high teachers in order to better familiarize them with the evaluation process and to reassure them of its

necessity. In addition, in-service may afford them the opportunity to express any special needs that they have.

5.4 Recommendations for further research

Based on the findings of this thesis, the following recommendations for further research are proposed:

1. Since there are many teachers in this province teaching core French less than 80 percent of the time, their attitudes on the teacher evaluation process should be studied.
2. Further research should be completed on the attitudes that core French teachers living in metropolitan St. John's have to the evaluation process. This would enhance the findings of this thesis.
3. A national study of the attitudes of core French teachers on the teacher evaluation process may be appropriate at this time.
4. The ability of an evaluator with little or no knowledge of the French language to effectively evaluate a core French teacher should be appropriately researched.

5.5 Conclusion

The focus of this thesis was an examination of the attitudes of core French teachers in Newfoundland and Labrador to the teacher evaluation process. The

questionnaire was the vehicle which offered core French teachers an opportunity to express their opinions not only on the way teacher evaluation was presently practised, but also as to how they would like to see it practised. The current literature on teacher evaluation was the basis on which the results of the questionnaire were interpreted. From this comparison, some differences, similarities, and patterns were drawn and some recommendations and suggestions were made. It is now hoped that school boards, core French teachers, and evaluators in this province will react in a positive and co-operative manner by using the findings of this thesis in order to make the teacher evaluation process more effective for core French teachers. In this way, the study of French should become a more effective learning experience for all students in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Bibliography

- Babiuk, G. (1988). The characteristics of an effective teacher evaluation program. The Canadian School Executive, 8(1).
- Blake, Norine & De Mont, Roger A. (1990). From checklist evaluation to clinical supervision. The Executive, 14-15.
- Bradley, J. (1990). Wanted: Fair Evaluation. The Manitoba Teacher, 19-20.
- Burger, J.M. (1987). Teacher Evaluation Policy Implementation. (Under contract to Alberta Education, Edmonton, Alberta). Edmonton, Alberta: Alberta Education.
- Burger, J.M. & Bumbarger, C.S. (1991). Teacher evaluation in school systems: An analysis of local policies. The Canadian Administrator, 30(5), 1-7.
- Campbell, L.P. (1987). Streamlined seminar: Evaluating Teachers. NAESP, 6(1).
- Craft-Tripp, Marsha (1990). Identifying and Evaluating Teacher Competencies in a Special Education Setting. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children, Toronto, April.
- Cressman, R. (1987). Supervision in York Region Practice Not Theory. Ontario Education, 19 (1), 6-9.
- Cousins, J.B. (1990). Why don't principals use their own performance appraisal data? The Canadian School Executive, 9, 22-26.
- Dagley, D.L. & Orso, K.J. (1991, September). Integrating summative, formative modes of evaluation. NASSP Bulletin, 75(536).
- Davis, J. (1989). Effective schools, organizational culture, and local policy initiatives. In M. Homes, K.A. Leithwood & D.F. Musella (eds.), Educational Policy for Effective Schools (pp. 112-127).

- Department of Education, Division of Program Development, Language Programs Section, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, 1992. Form and Function: The Total Process. Intermediate Core French Program.
- Depasquale, Jr. D. (1990). Evaluating Tenured Teachers: A Practical Approach. NASSP Bulletin, 74 (527), 19-23.
- Duke, D.L. & Stiggins, R.J. (1986). Teacher Evaluation - Five Keys to Success. Joint Publication of American Association of School Administrators, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals and National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
- Evaluation (1980). Evaluation and the Department Head. Evaluation Bulletin, 1 (3).
- Everton, C.M. (1989). Capturing classroom context: The observation system as lens for assessment. Journal of Personal Evaluation in Education, (2), 297-320.
- Freer, M.L. (1987). Clinical supervision: Training that works. NASSP Bulletin, 71 (503), 12.-17.
- Freiberg, J.H. (1987). Teacher self-evaluation and principal supervision. NASSP Bulletin, 85-92.
- Gorman, W.J. (1990). Supervision and Evaluation of Teachers in Halifax. The Canadian School Executive, 10 (2), 16-18.
- Gorton, R. & Ohlemacher, R. (1987). Counselor Evaluation: A New Priority for the Principal's Agenda. NASSP Bulletin, 71 (496), 120-124.
- Haycock, K. (1991). Evaluation of the Teacher-Librarian: A Discussion Guide. Emergency Librarian, 18 (4), 1-8.
- Herbert, J. & McNergney, R. (1989). Evaluating teacher evaluators using a set of public standards. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 2 (4), 321-333.
- Hickman, G.A. (1988). Teacher Evaluation: Bridging the Gap Between Theory and Practice. The Morning Watch, 16 (1-2).

- Hickman, G.A. (1989). Towards a Credible Model for Evaluation of Program, Students and Personnel. Paper presented at the Centre for Educational Leadership, Western Australia College of Advanced Education, Perth, Australia.
- Hickman, G.A. (Summer, 1992). Class lecture notes for Educational Administration A6560: The Evaluation of Educational Personnel.
- Hunter, C. (1987). Implementing performance appraisal. The Canadian School Executive, 6 (8), 3-7.
- Katims, D.S. & Henderson, R.L. (1990). Teacher Evaluation in Special Education. NASSP Bulletin, 46-52.
- Koehler, Michael (1990). Self-assessment in the evaluation process. NASSP Bulletin, September, 41-44.
- Lawton, S.B., Hickcox, E.S., Leithwood, K.A. & Musella, D.F. (1986). Development and use of performance appraisal of certificated education staff in Ontario School Boards. (Under contract of the Ministry of Education, Ontario). Ontario: Ministry of Education.
- Livingstone, D.W., Hart, D.J. & Davis, L.E. (1988). Public attitudes toward education in Ontario (Seventh OISE survey). Orbit, 17 (19).
- MacDonald, J. (1986). Highlight: A Support and Supervision System. Aviso, 2, 20.
- Macy, N. (1988). A perspective on due process in teacher evaluation. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 2(1).
- Manatt, R.P. (1987). Lessons from a comprehensive performance appraisal project. Educational Leadership, 44(7), 8-14.
- McLelland, W.D. (1988). Evaluating Resource Staff in Waterloo County. The Canadian School Executive, 8 (3).
- Mitzel, H.E. (1987). Teacher effectiveness. Encyclopedia of Educational Research, New York: MacMillian, Co.

- Mbeo, F.E. (1991). Distinguishing between formative and summative evaluation. The ATA Magazine, 71, 27-30.
- National Education Association Data-Search. (1988). The Use of Recognized Teaching Models for Teacher Evaluation. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- Ondrack, D.A. & Oliver, C. (1986). A review and analysis of performance appraisal processes: A review of the literature (Vol. 1). Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario.
- Pannwitt, B. (1986). Evaluating English Teachers: The Focus and the Process of Performance Appraisal. NASSP Bulletin, 73 (494), 70-74.
- Parkinson, G.M. (1991). Model for improving teachers' professional practice. The Canadian School Executive, 10, 22-25.
- Peterson, K.D. (1990). Assistance and assessment for beginning teachers. In J. Millman and L. Darling-Hammond (eds), The New Handbook of Teacher Evaluation Assessing Elementary and Secondary School Teachers (pp. 105-114). Newbury Park, California: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Popham, W.J. (1988). The Dysfunctional Marriage of Formative and Summative Teacher Evaluation. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 1 (3).
- Provincial Collective Agreement. September 1, 1991 to August 31, 1993.
- Rebell, M.A. (1990). Legal issues concerning teacher evaluation. In J. Millman and L. Darling-Hammond (eds.), The New Handbook of Teacher Evaluation Assessing Elementary and Secondary School Teachers (pp. 337-351). Newbury Park, California: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Ripley, D. & Haet, C. (1989). Action research in teacher evaluation. The Canadian School Executive, 2, 12-15.
- Ritchie, T.J. (1990). Fixing teacher evaluation. The Canadian School Executive, 10(3), 25-27.
- Spence, D. (1987). Is there a doctor in the house? Orbit, 18, 24-25.

- Stake, R.E. (1989). The evaluation of teaching. In H. Simons and J. Elliott (eds.), Rethinking Appraisal and Assessment (pp. 13-18). Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- The Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Delivery of Programs and Services in Primary, Elementary, Secondary Education. Our Children Our Future. (1992). St. John's: Queen's Printers.
- Thorson, J.R., Miller, R.K. and Bellon, J.J. (1987). Instructional improvement through personnel evaluation. Educational Leadership, 44(7), 52-54.
- Townsend, D. (1987). Components of a model of teacher evaluation. Education Canada, 27, 24-30.
- Wareing, C. (1990). Up close and personal: A model for supervision and evaluation. The Clearing House, 63, 245-250.
- Warger, C.L. & Aldinger, L.E. (1987). Teacher Evaluation: The Special Case of the Special Educator. NASSP Bulletin, 71 (500), 54-62.
- Watson, K. (1978). Accountability in English Education. Educational Administrator, 6 (2), 9-21.
- Wentzell, R.C. (1991). Teacher evaluation: A symphony miscondacted. The Canadian School Executive, 11, 17-19.
- Wickstrom, R.A. (1987). Evaluation and education: A view of the future. Education Canada, 23, 10-13.
- Williams, L. (1987). The impact of collective bargaining on the principal's role in teacher evaluation - a Newfoundland study. Education Canada, 44-48.

APPENDIX 1

I am presently in the process of completing my thesis entitled Attitudes of Core French Teachers on the Teacher Evaluation Process: Implications for Change.

As you are probably aware, there is no existing list of Core French teachers for the province. However, a part of my thesis requires that a questionnaire be sent to a random sample of full-time (or teaching French at least 80% of the time) Core French teachers in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador in order to elicit their views.

With this in mind, I am requesting your assistance in providing for me a complete listing of each Core French teacher in your district who, if evaluated, would be evaluated in the French class. It is assumed that they would be teaching mostly at the Intermediate and Senior High levels.

Along with his or her name, I would appreciate the name, address, and postal code of the appropriate school in order that a copy of the questionnaire could be directly sent to each selected candidate.

Your co-operation is greatly appreciated.

Yours truly,

Max Symonds

P.S. A self-addressed stamped envelope has been enclosed for your use. If you are interested in a copy of this list, please let me know.

APPENDIX 2



The Avalon Consolidated School Board

P.O. BOX 1980, ST JOHN'S, NEWFOUNDLAND A1C 5R5
TELEPHONE (709) 754-0710 FAX (709) 754-0122

February 4, 1993

Mr. Max Symonds
6A Woodford Place
Mount Pearl, NF
A1A 2S2

Dear Mr. Symonds,

Thank you for dropping off your questionnaire earlier today.

Beverley Park has prepared a list of french teachers which is attached.

You may now continue with the administration of your questionnaire. I ask that you approach the teachers in the school by consulting first with the principals.

Every success in your research.

Yours truly,

Fred B. Rowe,
Assistant Superintendent

FBR/lq.

c.c. B. Park
H. Hodder
F. Tulk
G. Mayo
H. Hillier
D. Hockey
G. Coombs
C. Flight
D. Dibbon
D. Moore

APPENDIX 3

Dear Fellow Colleague:

I am in the process of completing my thesis entitled Attitudes of French Core Teachers on the Teacher Evaluation Process: Implications for Change.

As part of my thesis, I have devised a questionnaire which seeks your opinion on both present practices and what should be practised in teacher evaluation in your system based on your own experiences.

I am kindly requesting that you take the time from your busy schedule to complete the attached questionnaire and to return it to me in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope.

Your responses are important and will remain confidential.

Yours truly,

Max Symonds

P.S. If you wish to receive a summary of the results, please complete and forward to me the information sheet below. Please do not mail this sheet with your completed questionnaire.

I wish to receive a summary of the results.

Name: _____

Address: _____

Mail to:

Mr. Max Symonds
6A Woodford Place
Mount Pearl, NF
A1N 2S2

APPENDIX 4

TEACHER EVALUATION
QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR CORE FRENCH TEACHERS

Part one: Identification

1. What is your sex? (Circle one)
 - Male.....1
 - Female.....2
2. How old are you? (Circle one)
 - Twenty to thirty.....1
 - Thirty-one to forty.....2
 - Over forty.....3
3. How many years have you been teaching? (Circle one)
 - Less than ten.....1
 - Eleven to twenty.....2
 - Greater than twenty.....3
4. In what type of school do you work? (Circle one)
 - High School.....1
 - Central High.....2
 - Junior High.....3
 - All-grade.....4
 - Elementary.....5
 - Other.....6
5. What is the population of the community where your school is located?
(Circle one)
 - Less than 5000.....1
 - Greater than 5000.....2
 - Metropolitan St. John's...3

Part Two: Present and Preferred Practices

Listed below are 8 major components of the teacher evaluation process. Each component is accompanied by a series of items. In the five-point rating scale, circle the rating for each item that best represents your opinion as it is presently practised in your school system and as it should be practised in your school system.

Scale: 5 - always
 4 - sometimes
 3 - rarely
 2 - never
 1 - don't know

	<u>Present</u>	<u>Preferred</u>
<u>A. Purposes of teacher evaluation:</u>		
1. To make administrative decisions of tenure or dismissal.	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
2. To improve instruction by promoting professional development of teachers.	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
3. To allow for teacher and school board accountability.	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
4. To focus on student learning.	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
<u>B. Criteria to judge effective teaching:</u>		
1. Physical characteristics (personal appearance; general health; dress; etc.).	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
2. Organizational behaviours (clearly defined objectives; well-developed lesson plans; etc.).	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
3. Students' test results.	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1

Scale: 5 - always; 4 - sometimes; 3 - rarely; 2 - never; 1 - don't know.

	<u>Present</u>					<u>Preferred</u>				
4. Personal qualities (self-image; age/sex; enthusiasm; personality; etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
5. Presentation behaviours (variety; creativity; caters to individual (student) differences; voice control; etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
6. Teaching experience.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
7. Comportment behaviours (respectful to students; warm and considerate, yet good classroom control; requires acceptable standards of work; etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
8. Academic qualifications/subject competency.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
9. Observable student behaviours (eager; respectful towards teacher; desire to learn, etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
10. Co-curricular involvement (school activities; professional/community organizations; curriculum development; etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
11. School-related behaviours (promptness with reports; well-kept student records; co-operation; punctuality; etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
<u>C. Sources of data for documentation:</u>										
1. Standard form (checklist).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
2. Results of teacher-made tests.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
3. Results of standardized tests.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
4. Video-taped lessons.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
5. Classroom observation/written report.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

Scale: 5 - always; 4 - sometimes; 3 - rarely; 2 - never; 1 - don't know.

	<u>Present</u>					<u>Preferred</u>				
6. Written report at end of evaluation period.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
7. Daily plan book/lesson plans.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
8. Self-evaluation.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
9. Peer evaluation.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
10. Student evaluation.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
11. Parent input.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
12. Involvement in co-curricular/system activities.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
D. <u>Characteristics of the pre-conference for classroom observation:</u>										
1. To take place before <u>each</u> classroom visit.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
2. To take place in the teacher's classroom or resource centre.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
3. To establish rapport between teacher and evaluator.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
4. To receive information about class composition.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
5. To review information about the lesson or series of lessons to be observed (content; methodology; goals; materials; evaluation; etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
6. To classify and establish criteria.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
7. To clarify stages of the evaluation cycle.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
8. To agree on practical questions (introduction of evaluator to the class; the recording instrument; the feedback procedure; etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

Scale: 5 - always; 4 - sometimes; 3 - rarely; 2 - never; 1 - don't know.

	<u>Present</u>					<u>Preferred</u>					
<u>E. Characteristics of the post-conference for classroom observation:</u>											
1.	To take place after <u>each</u> classroom visit.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
2.	To take place in the teacher's classroom or resource centre.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
3.	To review records of class observation.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
4.	To receive the teacher's perception of the lesson.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
5.	To share the evaluator's perception of the lesson with the teacher.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
6.	To clarify and establish job targets and arrangement for follow-up with support services.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
7.	To record the contribution of the teacher to the school generally and to the system.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
8.	To record the teacher's strengths and weaknesses.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
9.	To secure commitment on the part of the teacher to change, where deemed desirable and appropriate.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
<u>F. The evaluator(s) involved in the teacher evaluation process:</u>											
1.	The principal/vice-principal	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
2.	Assistant superintendent.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
3.	French co-ordinator.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
4.	French Department Head.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
5.	Peer (another teacher).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
6.	Self-evaluation.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

Scale: 5 - always; 4 - sometimes; 3 - rarely; 2 - never; 1 - don't know.

	<u>Present</u>					<u>Preferred</u>				
7. Students.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
8. Parents.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
9. <u>Characteristics of the evaluator(s):</u> Although you may have one or more than one evaluator, you are asked to respond how you <u>generally</u> view him, her, or them.										
1. Teach part of the day.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
2. Encourage the teacher to experiment in the classroom.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
3. Cut corners to save time.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
4. Maintain teacher confidentiality.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
5. Demonstrate a desire to work with the teacher to solve a problem.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
6. Model a new idea or technique in an actual classroom setting.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
7. Rely on the feedback of others who may be more knowledgeable in curriculum content matters.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
8. Consistent in applying evaluation rules and regulations.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
9. Spend a reasonable amount of time in a teacher's class.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
10. Knowledgeable on what constitutes effective teaching.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
11. Good facilitators of communication (Value what others say.; Keep an open mind.; Communicate that they have heard what was said to them.; etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

Scale: 5 - always; 4 - sometimes; 3 - rarely; 2 - never; 1 - don't know.

	<u>Present</u>					<u>Preferred</u>				
<u>H. The organizational context of teacher evaluation (the School Board):</u>										
1. Teachers are informed in advance of all steps in the evaluation process.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
2. Evaluation procedures are co-operatively designed by both teachers and administrators.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
3. Teacher evaluation is placed as a high priority.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
4. Available resources are made for teacher development (released time from regular classroom duties for conferences; staff development activities; peer mentors; etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

APPENDIX 5

Dear Fellow Colleague:

I am in the process of completing my thesis entitled Attitudes of Core French Teachers in Newfoundland and Labrador on the Teacher Evaluation Process: Implications for Change. The thesis proposal has been approved by my Supervisor, Mrs. Joan Netten, and the study meets the ethical guidelines of the Faculty of Education.

As part of my thesis, I have devised a questionnaire which seeks your opinion on both present practices and what should be practised in teacher evaluation in your system based on your own experiences.

I am kindly requesting that you take the time from your busy schedule to complete the attached questionnaire and to return it to me in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope by April 22, 1993.

Your responses are important and will remain confidential. As well, you are free to refrain from answering any questions you wish to omit.

Yours truly,

Max Symonds,
Core French teacher, Mount Pearl Junior High

P.S. If you wish to receive a summary of the results, please complete and forward to me the information sheet below. Please do not mail this sheet with your completed questionnaire.

I wish to receive a summary of the results.

Name: _____

Mail to:

Address: _____

Mr. Max Symonds
6A Woodford Place
Mount Pearl, NF
A1N 2S2

APPENDIX 6
TEACHER EVALUATION
QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR CORE FRENCH TEACHERS

Part one: Background information

1. What is your sex? (Circle one)
 - Male.....1
 - Female.....2
2. How old are you? (Circle one)
 - Twenty to thirty.....1
 - Thirty-one to forty.....2
 - Over forty.....3
3. How many years have you been teaching? (Circle one)
 - Less than ten.....1
 - Eleven to twenty.....2
 - Greater than twenty.....3
4. In what type of school do you work? (Circle one)
 - High School.....1
 - Central High.....2
 - Junior High.....3
 - All-grade.....4
 - Elementary.....5
5. What is the population of the community where your school is located?
(Circle one)
 - Less than 5000.....1
 - Greater than 5000.....2
 - Metropolitan St. John's....3

Part one (continued)

6. When did your last formal teacher evaluation occur? (Circle one)
- Within the past two years...1
- Three to five years ago....2
- More than five years ago....3
- More than ten years ago....4
7. What was your teaching status when you were last evaluated?
(Circle one)
- Probationary teacher.....1
- Tenured teacher.....2
8. Regarding the amount of time during the evaluation period that an evaluator spends observing your teaching, what would you consider as reasonable? (Circle one)
- One hour or less.....1
- Two to three hours.....2
- Four to five hours.....3
- More than five hours.....4

Part Two: Present and Preferred Practices

Listed on the remaining pages are 8 major components of the teacher evaluation process. Each component is accompanied by a series of items. In the five-point rating scale, circle the rating for each item that best represents your opinion as it is presently practiced in your school system and as it should be practiced in your school system.

Scale: 5 - always; 4 - sometimes; 3 - rarely; 2 - never; 1 - don't know.

...3

Scale: 5 - always; 4 - sometimes; 3 - rarely; 2 - never; 1 - don't know.

A. Purposes of teacher evaluation:

	<u>Present</u>					<u>Preferred</u>				
1. To make administrative decisions of tenure or dismissal.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
2. To improve instruction by promoting professional development of teachers.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
3. To allow for teacher and school board accountability.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
4. To focus on student learning.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

B. Criteria to judge effective teaching:

1. Physical characteristics (personal appearance; general health; dress; etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
2. Organizational behaviours (clearly defined objectives; well-developed lesson plans; etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
3. Students' test results.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
4. Personal qualities (self-image; age/sex; enthusiasm; personality; etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
5. Presentation behaviours (variety; creativity; caters to individual (student) differences; voice control; etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
6. Teaching experience.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
7. Comportment behaviours (respectful to students; warm and considerate, yet good classroom control; requires acceptable standards of work; etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
8. Academic qualifications/subject competency.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

...4

Scale: 5 - always; 4 - sometimes; 3 - rarely; 2 - never; 1 - don't know.

B. Criteria (continued)

	<u>Present</u>					<u>Preferred</u>				
	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
9. Observable student behaviours (eager; respectful towards teacher; desire to learn, etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
10. Co-curricular involvement (school activities; professional/community organizations; curriculum development; etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
11. School-related behaviours (promptness with reports; well-kept student records; co-operation; punctuality; etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

C. Sources used to obtain information about a teacher's effectiveness:

1. Standard form (checklist).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
2. Results of teacher-made tests.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
3. Results of standardized tests.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
4. Video-taped lessons.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
5. Classroom observation.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
6. Written report(s) of classroom observation.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
7. Written report at end of evaluation period.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
8. Daily plan book/lesson plans.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
9. Self-evaluation.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
10. Peer evaluation.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
11. Student evaluation.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
12. Parent input.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
13. Involvement in co-curricular/system activities.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

...5

Scale: 5 - always; 4 - sometimes; 3 - rarely; 2 - never; 1 - don't know.

D. Characteristics and objectives of the pre-conference held before a teacher is actually observed in a classroom setting:

	<u>Present</u>					<u>Preferred</u>				
1. To take place before <u>each</u> classroom visit.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
2. To take place in the teacher's classroom or resource centre.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
3. To establish rapport between teacher and evaluator.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
4. To receive information about class composition.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
5. To review information about the lesson or series of lessons to be observed (content; methodology; goals; materials; evaluation; etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
6. To classify and establish criteria that will be observed during the lesson or series of lessons.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
7. To clarify stages of the evaluation cycle.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
8. To agree on practical questions (introduction of evaluator to the class; the recording instrument; the feedback procedure; etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

E. Characteristics and objectives of the post-conference held after a teacher has actually been observed in a classroom setting:

1. To take place after <u>each</u> classroom visit.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
2. To take place in the teacher's classroom or resource centre.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
3. To review records of previous classroom observations.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
4. To receive the teacher's perception of the lesson.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

...6

Scale: 5 - always; 4 - sometimes; 3 - rarely; 2 - never; 1 - don't know.

E. Post-conference (continued)

	<u>Present</u>					<u>Preferred</u>				
5. To share the evaluator's perception of the lesson with the teacher.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
6. To clarify and establish job targets and arrangement for follow-up with support services.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
7. To record the contribution of the teacher to the school generally and to the system.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
8. To record the teacher's strengths and weaknesses.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
9. To secure commitment on the part of the teacher to change, where deemed desirable and appropriate.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

F. The evaluator(s) involved in the teacher evaluation process:

1. The principal/vice-principal.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
2. Assistant superintendent.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
3. French co-ordinator.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
4. French Department Head.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
5. Peer (another teacher).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
6. Self-evaluation.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
7. Students.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
8. Parents.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

...7

Scale: 5 - always; 4 - sometimes; 3- rarely; 2 - never; 1 - don't know.

6. Characteristics of the evaluator(s) who evaluate(s) a teacher's effectiveness: Although you may have one or more than one evaluator, you are asked to respond how you generally view him, her, or them.

	<u>Present</u>					<u>Preferred</u>				
1. They teach part of the day which allows them to remain in contact with the teaching environment.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
2. They encourage the teacher to experiment in the classroom.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
3. They cut corners to save time.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
4. They maintain teacher confidentiality.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
5. They demonstrate a desire to work with the teacher to solve a problem.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
6. They model a new idea or technique in an actual classroom setting as a way to provide support for the teacher.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
7. They rely on the feedback of others who may be more knowledgeable in curriculum content matters.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
8. They are consistent in applying evaluation rules and regulations.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
9. They spend a reasonable amount of time in a teacher's class.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
10. They are knowledgeable on what constitutes effective teaching.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
11. They are good facilitators of communication. (They value what others say.; They keep an open mind.; Communicate that they have heard what was said to them.; etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

...8

Scale: 5 - always; 4 - sometimes; 3 - rarely; 2- never; 1 - don't know.

H. The organizational context of teacher evaluation (the School Board):

	<u>Present</u>				<u>Preferred</u>					
1. Teachers are informed in advance of all steps in the evaluation process.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
2. Evaluation procedures are co-operatively designed by both teachers and administrators.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
3. Teacher evaluation is placed as a high priority.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
4. Available resources are made for teacher development (released time from regular classroom duties for conferences; staff development activities; peer mentors; etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

APPENDIX 7

This letter is to inform you that several core French teachers in your district have been sent a questionnaire to determine their attitudes on present and preferred practices in the teacher evaluation process.

I have enclosed for your perusal a copy of not only the questionnaire but also the accompanying letter which outlines in detail the purpose and the procedures followed for the study.

If you have any concerns or questions, I would appreciate if you direct them to me at the above address or to Mrs. Joan Netten, c/o Faculty of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Yours truly,

Max Symonds

Enclosures

APPENDIX 8

TABLE A. Frequency of use for Present Practices
of Purposes for Teacher Evaluation by
Sex (N=102)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Percent of Respondents</u>					<u>Mean</u>
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	Male	15.7	47.6	21.6	9.8	5.9	3.57
	Female	20.0	36.0	20.0	8.0	16.0	3.36
2.	Male	17.6	41.2	23.5	11.8	5.9	3.53
	Female	21.6	29.4	29.4	9.8	9.8	3.43
3.	Male	7.8	37.3	29.4	7.8	17.6	3.09
	Female	24.5	24.5	28.6	4.1	18.4	3.32
4.	Male	10.0	32.0	32.0	12.0	14.0	3.12
	Female	8.2	32.7	36.7	12.2	10.2	3.16

TABLE B. Frequency of use for Present Practices
of Purposes for Teacher Evaluation by
Years Teaching (N=102)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Percent of Respondents</u>					<u>Mean</u>
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<10	18.6	41.9	20.9	2.3	16.3	3.44
	11-20	23.3	30.0	20.0	23.3	3.3	3.47
	>20	10.7	53.6	21.4	3.6	10.7	3.50
2.	<10	18.2	29.5	36.4	9.1	6.8	3.43
	11-20	26.7	36.7	23.3	10.0	3.3	3.73
	>20	14.3	42.9	14.3	14.3	14.3	3.29
3.	<10	18.2	29.5	27.3	4.5	20.5	3.21
	11-20	13.3	33.3	23.3	10.0	20.0	3.10
	>20	15.4	30.8	38.5	3.8	11.5	3.35
4.	<10	6.8	36.4	36.4	4.5	15.9	3.14
	11-20	13.3	33.3	26.7	13.3	13.3	3.20
	>20	8.0	24.0	40.0	24.0	4.0	3.08

TABLE C. Frequency of use for Present Practices of Purposes for Teacher Evaluation by Type of School (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	High	22.7	27.3	18.2	22.7	9.1	3.32
	Central High	--	50.0	35.0	5.0	10.0	3.25
	Junior High	9.1	54.5	9.1	9.1	18.2	3.27
	All-Grade	25.0	42.9	17.9	--	14.3	3.64
	Elementary	30.8	38.5	15.4	7.7	7.7	3.77
2.	High	22.7	36.4	13.6	18.2	9.1	3.45
	Central High	30.0	40.0	25.0	--	5.0	3.90
	Junior High	27.3	18.2	45.0	--	9.1	3.55
	All-Grade	10.3	41.4	20.7	20.7	6.9	3.28
	Elementary	23.1	15.4	38.5	7.7	15.4	3.23
3.	High	18.2	36.4	18.2	4.5	22.7	3.23
	Central High	15.0	45.0	20.0	5.0	15.0	3.40
	Junior High	18.2	36.4	36.4	--	9.1	3.55
	All-Grade	14.3	21.4	35.7	10.7	17.9	3.04
	Elementary	25.0	16.7	33.3	8.3	16.7	3.25
4.	High	9.5	28.6	42.9	14.3	4.8	3.24
	Central High	15.0	35.0	15.0	15.0	20.0	3.10
	Junior High	9.1	27.3	45.5	9.1	9.1	3.18
	All-Grade	--	35.7	32.1	14.3	17.9	2.86
	Elementary	25.0	25.0	41.7	8.3	--	3.67

TABLE D. Frequency of use for Present Practices of Purposes for Teacher Evaluation by Community Population (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<5000	18.2	40.9	22.7	7.6	10.6	3.48
	>5000	14.3	42.9	17.9	10.7	14.3	3.32
	Metro St. John's	16.7	50.0	16.7	16.7	--	3.67

(continued)

TABLE D. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
2.	<5000	13.9	35.8	20.9	13.4	9.0	3.46
	>5000	17.9	39.3	32.1	3.6	7.1	3.57
	Metro St. John's	16.7	16.7	50.0	16.7	--	3.33
3.	<5000	16.4	29.9	29.9	7.5	16.4	3.22
	>5000	15.4	38.5	19.2	--	26.9	3.15
	Metro St. John's	16.7	16.7	66.7	--	--	3.50
4.	<5000	7.5	32.8	32.8	13.4	13.4	3.07
	>5000	16.0	28.0	36.0	8.0	12.0	3.28
	Metro St. John's	--	33.3	50.0	16.7	--	3.17

TABLE A. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Purposes for Teacher Evaluation by Sex (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	Male	12.0	46.0	20.0	18.0	4.0	3.44
	Female	29.2	47.9	14.6	8.3	--	3.98
2.	Male	70.0	28.0	--	--	2.0	4.64
	Female	77.1	22.9	--	--	--	4.77
3.	Male	18.0	40.0	22.0	12.0	8.0	3.48
	Female	34.0	29.8	19.1	8.5	8.5	3.72
4.	Male	50.0	32.0	8.0	4.0	6.0	4.16
	Female	62.5	31.3	4.2	--	2.1	4.52

TABLE B. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Purposes for Teacher Evaluation by Years Teaching (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<10	30.0	50.0	17.5	2.5	--	4.08
	11-20	16.7	43.3	16.7	23.3	--	3.53
	>20	10.7	46.4	17.9	17.9	7.1	3.36
2.	<10	71.4	28.6	--	--	--	4.71
	11-20	66.7	33.3	--	--	--	4.67
	>20	84.6	11.5	--	--	3.8	4.73
3.	<10	36.6	31.7	17.1	4.9	9.8	3.80
	11-20	16.7	40.0	30.0	10.0	3.3	3.57
	>20	19.2	34.6	15.4	19.2	11.5	3.31
4.	<10	61.9	28.6	2.4	2.4	4.8	4.40
	11-20	50.0	33.3	13.3	--	3.3	4.27
	>20	53.8	34.6	3.8	3.8	3.8	4.31

TABLE C. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Purposes for Teacher Evaluation by Type of School (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	High	15.0	45.0	15.0	20.0	5.0	3.45
	Central High	10.5	52.6	21.0	10.5	5.3	3.53
	Junior High	9.1	72.7	--	18.2	--	3.73
	All-Grade	25.0	50.0	14.3	10.7	--	3.89
	Elementary	46.2	15.4	30.8	7.7	--	4.00
2.	High	71.4	23.8	--	--	4.8	4.57
	Central High	78.9	21.1	--	--	--	4.79
	Junior High	81.8	18.2	--	--	--	4.82
	All-Grade	78.6	21.4	--	--	--	4.79
	Elementary	66.7	33.3	--	--	--	4.67
3.	High	33.3	38.1	14.3	4.8	9.2	3.81
	Central High	31.6	26.3	10.5	21.1	10.5	3.47
	Junior High	27.3	36.4	18.2	18.2	--	3.73
	All-Grade	25.9	37.0	29.6	7.4	--	3.82
	Elementary	16.7	25.0	25.0	8.3	25.0	3.00
4.	High	52.4	28.6	14.3	--	4.8	4.24
	Central High	63.2	26.3	--	5.3	5.3	4.37
	Junior High	54.5	27.3	9.1	--	9.1	4.18
	All-Grade	46.4	42.9	3.6	3.6	3.6	4.25
	Elementary	66.7	25.0	8.3	--	--	4.58

TABLE D. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Purposes for Teacher Evaluation by Community Population (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<5000	18.8	45.3	20.3	12.5	3.1	3.64
	>5000	22.2	51.9	11.1	14.8	--	3.81
	Metro St. John's	33.3	50.0	--	16.7	--	4.00

(continued)

TABLE D. (continued)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Percent of Respondents</u>					<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Mean</u>
		<u>Always</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>			
2.	<5000	72.7	25.8	--	--	1.5	4.68	
	>5000	76.0	24.0	--	--	--	4.76	
	Metro St. John's	83.3	16.7	--	--	--	4.83	
3.	<5000	26.2	32.3	26.2	9.2	6.2	3.63	
	>5000	24.0	44.0	8.0	8.0	16.0	3.52	
	Metro St. John's	33.0	16.7	16.7	33.3	--	3.50	
4.	<5000	53.0	31.8	7.6	3.0	4.5	4.26	
	>5000	60.0	36.0	--	--	4.0	4.48	
	Metro St. John's	66.7	16.7	16.7	--	--	4.50	

TABLE A. Frequency of use for Present Practices of
Criteria for Teacher Evaluation by
Sex (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	Male	11.8	41.2	29.4	5.9	11.8	3.35
	Female	9.8	37.3	29.4	13.7	9.8	3.24
2.	Male	39.2	47.1	7.8	2.0	3.9	4.16
	Female	43.1	37.3	5.9	5.9	7.8	4.02
3.	Male	7.8	47.1	31.4	9.8	3.9	3.45
	Female	8.0	32.0	28.0	12.0	20.0	2.96
4.	Male	7.8	62.7	17.6	2.0	9.8	3.57
	Female	30.6	36.7	22.4	4.1	6.1	3.82
5.	Male	32.0	52.0	10.0	--	6.0	4.04
	Female	45.1	31.4	11.8	2.0	9.8	4.00
6.	Male	11.8	43.1	23.5	13.7	7.8	3.37
	Female	14.0	32.0	26.0	6.0	22.0	3.10
7.	Male	39.2	54.9	3.9	--	2.0	4.20
	Female	52.0	32.0	6.0	2.0	8.0	4.18
8.	Male	33.3	45.1	17.6	--	3.9	4.04
	Female	55.1	26.5	8.2	--	10.2	4.16
9.	Male	18.0	50.0	22.0	6.0	4.0	3.72
	Female	19.6	51.0	15.7	2.0	11.8	3.65
10.	Male	20.0	32.0	28.0	14.0	6.0	3.46
	Female	27.5	29.4	21.6	9.8	11.8	3.51
11.	Male	22.0	46.0	14.0	10.0	8.0	3.64
	Female	19.6	45.1	17.6	5.9	11.8	3.55

TABLE B. Frequency of use for Present Practices of
Criteria for Teacher Evaluation by
Years Teaching (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<10	13.6	31.8	31.8	11.4	11.4	3.25
	11-20	6.7	43.3	36.7	10.0	3.3	3.40
	>20	10.7	46.4	17.9	7.1	17.9	3.25
2.	<10	36.4	45.5	9.1	2.3	6.8	4.02
	11-20	50.0	36.7	3.3	3.3	6.7	4.20
	>20	39.3	42.9	7.1	7.1	3.6	4.07
3.	<10	9.3	30.2	30.2	16.3	14.0	3.05
	11-20	3.3	50.0	20.0	10.0	16.7	3.13
	>20	10.7	42.9	39.3	3.6	3.6	3.54
4.	<10	28.6	28.6	33.3	--	9.5	3.67
	11-20	16.7	66.7	3.3	6.7	6.7	3.80
	>20	7.1	64.3	17.9	3.6	7.1	3.61
5.	<10	45.5	31.8	11.4	--	11.4	4.00
	11-20	44.8	34.5	10.3	3.4	6.9	4.07
	>20	21.4	64.3	10.7	--	3.6	4.00
6.	<10	9.3	39.5	25.6	7.0	18.6	3.14
	11-20	10.0	33.3	20.0	16.7	20.0	2.97
	>20	21.4	39.3	28.6	7.1	3.6	3.68
7.	<10	45.5	45.5	2.3	--	6.8	4.23
	11-20	51.7	31.0	10.3	3.4	3.4	4.24
	>20	39.3	53.6	3.6	--	3.6	4.25
8.	<10	52.4	28.6	11.9	--	7.1	4.19
	11-20	43.3	30.0	16.7	--	10.0	3.97
	>20	32.1	53.6	10.7	--	3.6	4.11
9.	<10	25.0	47.7	15.9	2.3	9.1	3.77
	11-20	20.0	53.3	10.0	6.7	10.0	3.67
	>20	7.4	51.9	33.3	3.7	3.7	3.56
10.	<10	29.5	34.1	20.5	4.5	11.4	3.66
	11-20	16.7	30.0	26.7	13.3	13.3	3.23
	>20	22.2	25.9	29.6	22.2	--	3.48

(continued)

TABLE B. (continued)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Percent of Respondents</u>					<u>Mean</u>
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
11.	<10	13.6	43.2	27.3	4.5	11.4	3.43
	11-20	30.0	40.0	3.3	13.3	13.3	3.60
	>20	22.2	55.6	11.1	7.4	3.7	3.85

TABLE C. Frequency of use for Present Practices of Criteria for Teacher Evaluation by Type of School (N=102)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Percent of Respondents</u>					<u>Mean</u>
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	High	13.6	22.7	40.9	9.1	13.6	3.14
	Central High	15.0	40.0	25.0	20.0	--	3.50
	Junior High	9.1	45.5	18.2	9.1	18.2	3.18
	All-Grade	3.4	41.4	27.6	10.3	17.2	3.03
	Elementary	15.4	53.8	23.1	--	7.7	3.69
2.	High	36.4	54.5	--	9.1	--	4.18
	Central High	50.0	30.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	4.15
	Junior High	36.4	45.5	--	--	18.0	3.82
	All-Grade	37.9	34.5	13.8	3.4	10.3	3.86
	Elementary	38.5	53.8	7.7	--	--	4.30
3.	High	19.0	42.9	33.3	--	4.8	3.71
	Central High	5.0	35.0	35.0	15.0	10.0	3.10
	Junior High	--	54.5	18.2	--	27.3	3.00
	All-Grade	6.9	34.5	20.7	27.6	10.3	3.00
	Elementary	7.7	38.5	38.5	--	15.4	3.23
4.	High	18.2	54.5	18.2	9.1	--	3.82
	Central High	30.0	35.0	20.0	5.0	10.0	3.70
	Junior High	--	80.0	--	--	20.0	3.40
	All-Grade	--	50.0	35.7	--	14.3	3.21
	Elementary	61.5	23.1	15.4	--	--	4.46

(continued)

TABLE C. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
5.	High	36.4	36.4	18.2	4.5	4.5	3.96
	Central High	55.0	35.0	5.0	--	5.0	4.35
	Junior High	27.3	54.5	--	--	18.2	3.73
	All-Grade	25.0	50.0	10.7	--	14.3	3.71
	Elementary	53.8	23.1	23.1	--	--	4.30
6.	High	13.6	36.4	22.7	13.6	13.6	3.23
	Central High	30.0	20.0	15.0	20.0	15.0	3.30
	Junior High	--	60.0	20.0	--	20.0	3.20
	All-Grade	10.3	34.5	34.5	6.9	13.8	3.20
	Elementary	7.7	53.8	23.1	--	15.4	3.38
7.	High	50.0	31.8	9.1	4.5	4.5	4.18
	Central High	45.0	50.0	5.0	--	--	4.40
	Junior High	27.3	63.6	--	--	9.1	4.00
	All-Grade	37.9	44.8	6.9	--	10.3	4.00
	Elementary	66.7	33.3	--	--	--	4.67
8.	High	38.1	47.6	9.5	--	4.8	4.14
	Central High	70.0	20.0	5.0	--	5.0	4.50
	Junior High	27.3	54.5	--	--	18.2	3.73
	All-Grade	35.7	28.6	25.0	--	10.7	3.79
	Elementary	46.2	30.8	23.1	--	--	4.23
9.	High	23.8	47.6	9.5	9.5	9.5	3.67
	Central High	15.0	60.0	20.0	5.0	--	3.85
	Junior High	9.1	63.6	9.1	--	18.2	3.45
	All-Grade	6.9	48.3	31.0	3.4	10.3	3.38
	Elementary	38.5	53.8	7.7	--	--	4.31
10.	High	14.3	33.3	38.1	9.5	4.8	3.43
	Central High	30.0	30.0	25.0	10.0	5.0	3.70
	Junior High	27.3	27.3	9.1	27.3	9.1	3.36
	All-Grade	13.8	31.0	31.0	10.3	13.8	3.21
	Elementary	53.8	23.1	7.7	7.7	7.7	4.08
11.	High	4.8	61.9	19.0	9.5	4.8	3.52
	Central High	40.0	40.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	4.00
	Junior High	18.2	63.6	--	--	18.2	3.63
	All-Grade	17.2	41.4	17.2	10.3	13.8	3.38
	Elementary	30.8	30.8	23.1	7.7	7.7	3.69

TABLE D. Frequency of use for Present Practices of
Criteria for Teacher Evaluation by
Community Population

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<5000	10.4	37.3	31.3	10.4	10.4	3.27
	>5000	10.7	45.3	21.4	7.1	14.3	3.32
	Metro St. John's	16.7	16.7	50.0	16.7	--	3.33
2.	<5000	40.3	41.8	9.0	3.0	6.0	4.07
	>5000	42.9	42.9	3.6	7.1	3.6	4.14
	Metro St. John's	50.0	33.3	--	--	16.7	4.00
3.	<5000	6.1	40.9	28.8	16.7	7.6	3.21
	>5000	10.7	35.7	32.1	--	21.4	3.14
	Metro St. John's	16.7	50.0	16.7	--	16.7	3.50
4.	<5000	15.2	50.0	24.2	1.5	9.1	3.61
	>5000	33.3	40.7	11.1	7.4	7.4	3.85
	Metro St. John's	--	83.3	16.7	--	--	3.83
5.	<5000	40.9	39.4	10.6	--	9.1	4.03
	>5000	39.3	46.4	7.1	3.6	3.6	4.14
	Metro St. John's	16.7	50.0	16.7	--	16.7	3.50
6.	<5000	14.9	32.8	28.4	11.9	11.9	3.27
	>5000	11.1	40.7	22.2	7.4	18.5	3.19
	Metro St. John's	--	66.7	--	--	33.3	3.00
7.	<5000	45.5	42.4	6.1	--	6.1	4.21
	>5000	50.0	42.9	--	3.6	3.6	4.32
	Metro St. John's	33.3	50.0	16.7	--	--	4.17
8.	<5000	43.9	36.4	13.6	--	6.1	4.12
	>5000	46.4	35.7	10.7	--	7.1	4.14
	Metro St. John's	40.0	40.0	--	--	20.0	3.80
9.	<5000	19.4	49.3	19.4	6.0	6.0	3.70
	>5000	22.2	51.9	14.8	--	11.1	3.74
	Metro St. John's	--	50.0	33.3	--	16.7	3.17
10.	<5000	17.9	34.3	28.4	10.4	9.0	3.42
	>5000	40.7	25.9	7.4	18.5	7.4	3.74
	Metro St. John's	16.7	16.7	50.0	--	16.7	3.17

(continued)

TABLE D. (continued)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Percent of Respondents</u>					<u>Mean</u>
		<u>Always</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	
11.	<5000	23.9	40.3	17.9	9.0	9.0	3.61
	>5000	14.8	59.3	11.1	3.7	11.1	3.63
	Metro St. John's	16.7	50.0	16.7	--	16.7	3.50

TABLE A. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of
Criteria for Teacher Evaluation by Sex
(N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	Male	15.7	47.1	19.6	11.8	5.9	3.55
	Female	16.0	30.0	30.0	20.0	4.0	3.34
2.	Male	58.0	34.0	4.2	2.0	2.0	4.44
	Female	66.0	30.0	2.0	2.0	--	4.60
3.	Male	3.9	54.9	31.4	7.8	2.0	3.51
	Female	10.2	42.9	32.7	12.2	2.0	3.47
4.	Male	32.7	46.9	18.4	--	2.0	4.08
	Female	28.6	51.0	18.4	--	2.0	4.04
5.	Male	64.0	30.0	4.0	--	2.0	4.54
	Female	66.0	30.0	4.0	--	--	4.62
6.	Male	11.8	52.9	19.6	7.8	7.8	3.53
	Female	23.4	36.2	21.3	12.8	6.4	3.57
7.	Male	70.6	23.5	3.9	--	2.0	4.61
	Female	91.7	8.3	--	--	--	4.92
8.	Male	64.7	31.4	2.0	--	2.0	4.57
	Female	74.0	24.0	2.0	--	--	4.72
9.	Male	32.0	54.0	10.0	2.0	2.0	4.12
	Female	42.0	48.0	10.0	--	--	4.32
10.	Male	22.4	49.0	16.3	8.2	4.1	3.78
	Female	30.6	44.9	14.3	10.2	--	3.96
11.	Male	40.0	46.0	6.0	4.0	4.0	4.14
	Female	55.1	38.0	6.1	--	--	4.49

TABLE B. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of
Criteria for Teacher Evaluation by Years
Teaching (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<10	23.3	27.9	25.6	16.3	7.0	3.44
	11-20	6.7	43.3	23.3	23.3	3.3	3.27
	>20	14.3	50.0	25.0	7.1	3.6	3.64
2.	<10	60.5	27.9	7.0	2.3	2.3	4.42
	11-20	60.0	36.7	--	3.3	--	4.53
	>20	66.7	33.3	--	--	--	4.67
3.	<10	11.9	47.6	26.2	9.5	4.8	3.52
	11-20	3.3	43.3	43.3	10.0	--	3.40
	>20	3.6	57.1	28.6	10.7	--	3.54
4.	<10	31.0	38.1	26.2	--	4.8	3.90
	11-20	31.0	62.1	6.9	--	--	4.24
	>20	29.6	51.9	18.5	--	--	4.11
5.	<10	62.8	30.2	4.7	--	2.3	4.51
	11-20	70.0	30.0	--	--	--	4.70
	>20	63.0	29.6	7.4	--	--	4.56
6.	<10	17.1	36.6	26.8	9.8	9.8	3.41
	11-20	10.3	48.3	13.8	17.2	10.3	3.31
	>20	25.0	53.6	17.9	3.6	--	4.00
7.	<10	88.1	7.1	2.4	--	2.4	4.79
	11-20	82.8	13.8	3.4	--	--	4.79
	>20	67.9	32.1	--	--	--	4.68
8.	<10	72.1	20.9	4.7	--	2.3	4.60
	11-20	70.0	30.0	--	--	--	4.70
	>20	64.3	35.7	--	--	--	4.64
9.	<10	46.5	48.8	2.3	--	2.3	4.37
	11-20	36.7	43.3	16.7	3.3	--	4.13
	>20	22.2	63.0	14.8	--	--	4.07
10.	<10	27.9	53.5	7.0	7.0	4.7	3.93
	11-20	25.0	46.4	21.4	7.1	--	3.89
	>20	25.9	37.0	22.2	14.8	--	3.74

(continued)

TABLE B. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
11.	<10	46.5	39.5	9.3	--	4.7	4.23
	11-20	44.8	51.7	--	3.4	--	4.38
	>20	51.9	37.0	7.4	3.7	--	4.37

TABLE C. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Criteria for Teacher Evaluation by Type of School (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	High	19.0	33.3	19.0	23.8	4.8	3.38
	Central High	20.0	45.0	20.0	10.0	5.0	3.65
	Junior High	9.1	45.0	27.3	18.2	--	3.46
	All-Grade	17.2	31.0	27.6	17.2	6.9	3.34
	Elementary	7.7	46.2	23.1	15.4	7.7	3.31
2.	High	40.0	55.0	5.0	--	--	4.35
	Central High	60.0	30.0	--	5.0	5.0	4.35
	Junior High	72.7	18.2	--	9.1	--	4.55
	All-Grade	65.5	31.0	3.4	--	--	4.62
	Elementary	92.3	7.7	--	--	--	4.92
3.	High	9.5	52.4	33.3	4.8	--	3.67
	Central High	5.0	50.0	25.0	15.0	5.0	3.35
	Junior High	--	40.0	30.0	20.0	10.0	3.00
	All-Grade	6.9	44.8	34.5	13.8	--	3.45
	Elementary	15.4	53.8	30.8	--	--	3.85
4.	High	15.8	68.4	15.8	--	--	4.00
	Central High	25.0	50.0	20.0	--	5.0	3.90
	Junior High	10.0	70.0	20.0	--	--	3.90
	All-Grade	27.6	41.4	27.6	--	3.4	3.90
	Elementary	53.8	38.5	7.7	--	--	4.46

(continued)

TABLE C. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
5.	High	55.0	40.0	5.0	--	--	4.50
	Central High	70.0	20.0	5.0	--	5.0	4.50
	Junior High	63.6	36.4	--	--	--	4.64
	All-Grade	58.6	34.5	6.9	--	--	4.52
	Elementary	76.9	23.1	--	--	--	4.77
6.	High	15.0	55.0	15.0	10.0	5.0	3.65
	Central High	25.0	35.0	20.0	15.0	5.0	3.60
	Junior High	10.0	50.0	30.0	10.0	--	3.60
	All-Grade	17.2	34.5	24.1	10.3	13.8	3.31
	Elementary	25.0	58.3	8.3	--	8.3	3.92
7.	High	76.2	23.8	--	--	--	4.76
	Central High	80.0	10.0	5.0	--	5.0	4.60
	Junior High	72.7	27.3	--	--	--	4.73
	All-Grade	82.1	14.3	3.6	--	--	4.79
	Elementary	91.7	8.3	--	--	--	4.92
8.	High	66.7	33.3	--	--	--	4.67
	Central High	85.0	10.0	--	--	5.0	4.70
	Junior High	54.5	36.4	9.1	--	--	4.45
	All-Grade	69.0	27.6	3.4	--	--	4.66
	Elementary	69.2	30.8	--	--	--	4.69
9.	High	45.0	50.0	5.0	--	--	4.40
	Central High	30.0	55.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.00
	Junior High	9.1	81.8	9.1	--	--	4.00
	All-Grade	34.5	51.7	13.8	--	--	4.21
	Elementary	61.5	30.8	7.7	--	--	4.54
10.	High	26.3	52.6	15.8	5.3	--	4.00
	Central High	30.0	50.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	3.90
	Junior High	18.2	36.4	9.1	36.4	--	3.36
	All-Grade	24.1	51.7	13.8	6.9	3.4	3.86
	Elementary	41.7	33.3	25.0	--	--	4.17
11.	High	30.0	70.0	--	--	--	4.30
	Central High	50.0	40.0	--	5.0	5.0	4.25
	Junior High	27.3	54.5	18.2	--	--	4.09
	All-Grade	55.2	31.0	6.9	3.4	3.4	4.31
	Elementary	75.0	25.0	--	--	--	4.75

TABLE D. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of
Criteria for Teacher Evaluation by
Community Population (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<5000	16.4	37.3	26.9	13.4	6.0	3.45
	>5000	14.8	40.7	22.2	18.5	3.7	3.44
	Metro St. John's	16.7	33.3	16.7	33.3	--	3.33
2.	<5000	51.5	40.9	4.5	1.5	1.5	4.39
	>5000	81.5	18.5	--	--	--	4.81
	Metro St. John's	83.3	--	--	16.7	--	4.50
3.	<5000	6.0	47.8	34.3	10.4	1.5	3.46
	>5000	7.4	55.6	25.9	7.4	3.7	3.56
	Metro St. John's	20.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	--	3.60
4.	<5000	29.9	47.8	19.4	--	3.0	4.01
	>5000	29.2	54.2	16.7	--	--	4.13
	Metro St. John's	50.0	33.3	16.7	--	--	4.33
5.	<5000	64.2	29.9	4.5	--	1.5	4.55
	>5000	61.5	34.6	3.8	--	--	4.58
	Metro St. John's	83.3	16.7	--	--	--	4.83
6.	<5000	15.2	45.5	19.7	10.6	9.1	3.47
	>5000	24.0	40.0	24.0	8.0	4.0	3.72
	Metro St. John's	16.7	50.0	16.7	16.7	--	3.67
7.	<5000	78.5	16.9	3.1	--	1.5	4.71
	>5000	81.5	18.5	--	--	--	4.81
	Metro St. John's	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00
8.	<5000	70.1	26.9	1.5	--	1.5	4.64
	>5000	66.7	33.3	--	--	--	4.67
	Metro St. John's	66.7	16.7	16.7	--	--	4.50
9.	<5000	38.8	47.8	10.4	1.5	1.5	4.21
	>5000	34.6	57.7	7.7	--	--	4.27
	Metro St. John's	33.3	50.0	16.7	--	--	4.17
10.	<5000	23.9	53.7	11.9	7.5	3.0	3.88
	>5000	29.2	41.7	20.8	8.3	--	3.92
	Metro St. John's	50.0	--	16.7	33.3	--	3.67

(continued)

TABLE D. (continued)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Percent of Respondents</u>					<u>Mean</u>
		<u>Always</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	
11.	<5000	44.8	44.8	4.5	3.0	3.0	4.25
	>5000	56.0	36.0	8.0	--	--	4.48
	Metro St. John's	50.0	33.3	16.7	--	--	4.33

TABLE A. Frequency of use for Present Practices of Sources for Teacher Evaluation by Sex (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	Male	24.5	34.7	16.3	8.2	16.3	3.43
	Female	24.0	28.0	8.0	12.0	28.0	3.08
2.	Male	2.1	27.1	33.3	20.8	16.7	2.77
	Female	2.1	16.7	22.9	27.1	31.3	2.31
3.	Male	--	20.8	35.4	22.9	20.8	2.56
	Female	--	18.8	18.8	29.2	33.3	2.23
4.	Male	--	6.3	20.8	66.7	6.3	2.27
	Female	2.0	6.1	20.4	53.1	18.4	2.20
5.	Male	73.5	20.4	6.1	--	--	4.67
	Female	56.0	23.5	9.8	5.9	3.9	4.23
6.	Male	54.2	29.2	6.3	6.3	4.2	4.23
	Female	51.0	24.5	12.2	6.1	6.1	4.08
7.	Male	68.8	18.8	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.44
	Female	53.1	18.4	10.5	6.1	12.2	3.94
8.	Male	12.0	34.0	23.4	29.0	--	3.30
	Female	16.0	22.0	22.0	30.0	10.0	3.04
9.	Male	12.5	31.3	35.4	18.8	2.1	3.33
	Female	16.3	30.6	16.3	28.6	8.2	3.18
10.	Male	--	4.2	22.9	66.7	6.3	2.25
	Female	2.0	12.0	22.0	50.0	14.0	2.38
11.	Male	6.3	16.7	20.8	56.3	--	2.73
	Female	2.0	22.4	8.2	53.1	14.3	2.44
12.	Male	2.1	4.2	14.6	77.1	2.1	2.27
	Female	--	15.7	15.7	52.9	15.7	2.31
13.	Male	10.2	28.6	20.4	36.7	4.1	3.04
	Female	13.7	33.3	21.6	17.6	13.7	3.16

TABLE B. Frequency of use for Present Practices of Sources for Teacher Evaluation by Years Teaching (N=103)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<10	31.0	11.9	11.9	16.7	28.6	3.00
	11-20	10.0	46.7	10.0	6.7	26.7	3.07
	>20	29.6	44.4	14.8	3.7	7.4	3.85
2.	<10	2.6	12.8	28.2	25.6	30.8	2.31
	11-20	--	26.7	26.7	26.7	20.0	2.60
	>20	3.7	29.6	29.6	18.5	18.5	2.82
3.	<10	--	20.0	15.0	22.5	42.5	2.13
	11-20	--	17.2	31.0	37.9	13.8	2.52
	>20	--	22.2	40.7	18.5	18.5	2.67
4.	<10	2.5	2.5	15.0	70.0	10.0	2.18
	11-20	--	10.0	23.3	56.7	10.0	2.33
	>20	--	7.4	25.9	48.1	18.5	2.22
5.	<10	65.1	20.9	7.0	4.7	2.3	4.42
	11-20	60.0	23.3	10.0	3.3	3.3	4.33
	>20	70.4	22.2	7.4	--	--	4.63
6.	<10	61.0	22.0	9.8	2.4	4.9	4.32
	11-20	44.8	27.6	17.2	6.9	3.4	4.03
	>20	48.1	33.3	--	11.1	7.4	4.04
7.	<10	56.1	17.1	7.3	7.3	12.2	3.98
	11-20	66.7	20.0	3.3	3.3	6.7	4.37
	>20	61.5	19.2	11.5	3.8	3.8	4.31
8.	<10	12.2	22.0	17.1	39.0	9.8	2.88
	11-20	16.7	26.7	26.7	26.7	3.3	3.27
	>20	15.4	38.5	26.9	19.2	--	3.50
9.	<10	19.0	33.8	14.3	26.2	7.1	3.31
	11-20	6.9	20.7	37.9	27.6	6.9	2.93
	>20	15.4	38.5	30.8	15.4	--	3.54
10.	<10	2.4	9.8	19.5	58.5	9.8	2.37
	11-20	--	3.3	30.0	53.3	13.3	2.23
	>20	--	11.1	18.5	63.0	7.4	2.33

(continued)

TABLE B. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
11.	<10	--	22.5	5.0	62.5	10.0	2.40
	11-20	--	10.0	20.0	60.0	10.0	2.30
	>20	14.8	25.9	22.2	37.0	--	3.19
12.	<10	--	11.9	16.7	57.1	14.3	2.26
	11-20	--	3.3	10.0	76.7	10.0	2.07
	>20	3.7	14.8	18.5	63.0	--	2.59
13.	<10	18.6	25.6	20.9	23.3	11.6	3.16
	11-20	6.7	26.7	23.3	33.3	10.0	2.87
	>20	7.4	44.4	18.5	25.9	3.7	3.26

TABLE C. Frequency of use for Present Practices of Sources for Teacher Evaluation by Type of School (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	High	9.5	33.3	19.0	9.5	28.6	2.86
	Central High	31.6	31.6	5.3	5.3	26.3	3.37
	Junior High	30.0	50.0	10.0	--	10.0	3.90
	All-Grade	24.1	27.6	6.9	20.7	20.7	3.14
	Elementary	46.2	15.4	15.4	7.7	15.4	3.69
2.	High	--	20.0	30.0	20.0	30.0	2.40
	Central High	--	21.1	31.6	21.1	26.3	2.47
	Junior High	10.0	30.0	20.0	10.0	30.0	2.80
	All-Grade	--	25.9	18.5	37.0	18.5	2.52
	Elementary	7.7	15.4	38.5	23.1	15.4	2.77
3.	High	--	15.0	20.0	30.0	35.0	2.15
	Central High	--	26.3	5.3	31.6	36.8	2.21
	Junior High	--	20.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	2.20
	All-Grade	--	14.3	32.1	28.6	25.0	2.36
	Elementary	--	33.3	50.0	16.7	--	3.17

(continued)

TABLE C. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
4.	High	4.8	9.5	28.6	47.6	9.5	2.52
	Central High	--	--	10.5	78.9	10.5	2.00
	Junior High	--	10.0	20.0	40.0	30.0	2.10
	All-Grade	--	3.7	18.5	63.0	14.8	2.11
	Elementary	--	15.4	15.4	61.5	7.7	2.38
5.	High	54.5	27.3	13.6	4.5	--	4.31
	Central High	73.7	21.1	5.3	--	--	4.68
	Junior High	90.0	--	10.0	--	--	4.80
	All-Grade	55.2	27.6	3.4	6.9	6.9	4.17
	Elementary	69.2	23.1	7.7	--	--	4.62
6.	High	33.8	23.8	33.3	4.8	4.8	3.76
	Central High	68.4	26.3	5.3	--	--	4.63
	Junior High	60.0	20.0	--	20.0	--	4.20
	All-Grade	53.6	25.0	3.6	3.6	14.3	4.00
	Elementary	50.0	41.7	--	8.3	--	4.33
7.	High	47.6	28.6	4.8	14.3	4.8	4.00
	Central High	73.7	10.5	5.3	5.3	5.3	4.42
	Junior High	70.0	20.0	10.0	--	--	4.60
	All-Grade	59.3	22.2	--	--	18.5	4.03
	Elementary	46.2	15.4	30.8	--	7.7	3.92
8.	High	4.8	28.6	28.6	28.6	9.5	2.90
	Central High	21.1	31.6	26.3	21.1	--	3.53
	Junior High	11.1	22.2	44.4	22.2	--	3.22
	All-Grade	3.6	25.0	17.9	42.9	10.7	2.68
	Elementary	38.5	38.5	7.7	15.4	--	4.00
9.	High	13.6	50.0	18.2	18.2	--	3.59
	Central High	21.1	26.3	31.6	21.1	--	3.47
	Junior High	11.1	22.2	55.6	11.1	--	3.33
	All-Grade	11.1	29.6	18.5	29.6	11.1	3.00
	Elementary	15.4	30.8	7.7	38.5	7.7	3.08
10.	High	--	9.5	28.6	52.4	9.5	2.38
	Central High	5.3	15.8	21.1	52.6	5.3	2.63
	Junior High	--	--	30.0	50.0	20.0	2.10
	All-Grade	--	3.6	25.0	60.7	10.7	2.21
	Elementary	--	7.7	15.4	69.2	7.7	2.23

(continued)

TABLE C. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
11.	High	9.5	23.8	23.8	42.9	--	3.00
	Central High	5.3	21.1	15.8	47.4	10.5	2.63
	Junior High	--	10.0	20.0	50.0	20.0	2.20
	All-Grade	--	11.1	7.4	70.4	11.1	2.19
	Elementary	7.7	38.5	--	53.8	--	3.00
12.	High	--	18.2	9.1	68.2	4.5	2.41
	Central High	--	5.3	10.5	73.7	10.5	2.11
	Junior High	--	20.0	20.0	40.7	20.0	2.40
	All-Grade	--	--	14.3	71.4	14.3	2.00
	Elementary	7.7	23.1	23.1	46.2	--	2.92
13.	High	--	36.4	31.8	22.7	9.1	2.96
	Central High	15.8	36.8	15.8	26.3	5.3	3.32
	Junior High	10.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	10.0	2.80
	All-Grade	13.8	17.2	27.6	31.0	10.3	2.93
	Elementary	23.1	53.8	--	15.4	7.7	3.69

TABLE D. Frequency of use for Present Practices of Sources for Teacher Evaluation by Community Population (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<5000	24.2	33.3	12.1	10.6	19.7	3.32
	>5000	30.8	26.9	11.5	7.7	23.1	3.34
	Metro St. John's	--	33.3	16.7	--	50.0	2.33
2.	<5000	--	23.8	33.3	25.4	17.5	2.63
	>5000	3.8	23.1	19.2	19.2	34.6	2.42
	Metro St. John's	16.7	--	16.7	16.7	50.0	2.17
3.	<5000	--	20.3	28.1	28.1	23.4	2.45
	>5000	--	20.0	28.0	20.0	32.0	2.36
	Metro St. John's	--	16.7	16.7	16.7	50.0	2.00

(continued)

TABLE D. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents				Don't Know	Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never		
4.	<5000	1.6	6.3	20.3	59.4	12.5	2.25
	>5000	--	3.8	19.2	65.4	11.5	2.15
	Metro St. John's	--	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7	2.50
5.	<5000	62.1	22.7	9.1	3.0	3.0	4.38
	>5000	70.4	22.2	3.7	3.7	--	4.59
	Metro St. John's	66.7	16.7	16.7	--	--	4.50
6.	<5000	53.8	24.6	12.3	3.1	6.2	4.17
	>5000	50.0	30.8	3.8	11.5	3.8	4.12
	Metro St. John's	50.0	33.3	--	16.7	--	4.17
7.	<5000	62.5	21.9	3.1	4.7	7.8	4.27
	>5000	61.5	7.7	19.2	3.8	7.7	4.12
	Metro St. John's	50.0	33.3	--	16.7	--	4.17
8.	<5000	9.2	27.7	23.1	32.3	7.7	2.99
	>5000	32.0	32.0	12.0	24.0	--	3.72
	Metro St. John's	--	16.7	50.0	33.3	--	2.83
9.	<5000	14.1	31.3	25.0	25.0	4.7	3.25
	>5000	19.2	34.6	19.2	19.2	7.7	3.38
	Metro St. John's	--	16.7	66.7	16.7	--	3.00
10.	<5000	1.5	7.7	21.5	61.5	7.7	2.34
	>5000	--	11.5	23.1	50.0	15.4	2.31
	Metro St. John's	--	--	33.3	50.0	16.7	2.17
11.	<5000	3.1	17.2	14.1	59.4	6.3	2.52
	>5000	7.7	26.9	15.4	42.3	7.7	2.85
	Metro St. John's	--	16.7	16.7	50.0	16.7	2.33
12.	<5000	--	6.2	10.8	73.8	9.2	2.14
	>5000	3.7	22.2	22.2	48.1	3.7	2.74
	Metro St. John's	--	--	33.3	33.3	33.3	2.00
13.	<5000	13.6	27.3	22.7	30.3	6.1	3.12
	>5000	11.1	40.7	18.5	14.8	14.8	3.19
	Metro St. John's	--	33.3	16.7	33.3	16.7	2.67

APPENDIX 13

TABLE A. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Sources for Teacher Evaluation by Sex (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	Male	16.0	46.0	24.0	6.0	8.0	3.56
	Female	16.7	45.8	22.9	6.3	8.3	3.56
2.	Male	--	65.3	20.4	10.2	4.1	3.47
	Female	8.3	37.5	39.6	8.3	6.3	3.33
3.	Male	6.1	30.6	32.7	18.4	12.2	3.00
	Female	2.1	29.8	34.0	23.4	10.6	2.89
4.	Male	2.0	26.5	34.7	30.6	6.1	2.88
	Female	--	40.4	21.3	31.9	6.4	2.96
5.	Male	54.0	46.0	--	--	--	4.54
	Female	57.1	34.7	6.1	2.0	--	4.47
6.	Male	42.9	46.9	6.1	--	4.1	4.24
	Female	56.3	35.4	4.2	4.2	--	4.44
7.	Male	57.1	38.8	2.0	--	2.0	4.49
	Female	72.9	16.7	4.2	4.2	2.1	4.54
8.	Male	22.9	39.6	16.7	20.8	--	3.65
	Female	18.4	40.8	24.5	16.3	--	3.61
9.	Male	24.0	66.0	6.0	4.0	--	4.10
	Female	45.8	45.8	8.3	--	--	4.38
10.	Male	10.2	51.0	20.4	16.3	2.0	3.51
	Female	12.0	52.0	14.0	18.0	4.0	3.50
11.	Male	8.2	42.9	26.5	16.3	6.1	3.31
	Female	6.1	42.9	22.4	22.4	6.1	3.20
12.	Male	--	34.7	28.6	30.6	6.1	2.92
	Female	--	40.8	24.5	32.7	2.0	3.04
13.	Male	12.0	52.0	16.0	16.0	4.0	3.52
	Female	20.8	50.0	12.5	16.7	--	3.75

TABLE B. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Sources for Teacher Evaluation by Years Teaching (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<10	15.0	52.5	17.5	7.5	7.5	3.60
	11-20	23.3	36.7	20.0	10.0	10.0	3.53
	>20	10.7	46.4	35.7	--	7.1	3.54
2.	<10	2.6	48.7	38.5	5.1	5.1	3.38
	11-20	6.7	46.7	23.3	20.0	3.3	3.33
	>20	3.6	60.7	25.0	3.6	7.1	3.50
3.	<10	2.6	38.5	35.9	7.7	15.4	3.05
	11-20	--	27.6	24.1	44.8	3.4	2.76
	>20	10.7	21.4	39.3	14.3	14.3	3.00
4.	<10	--	28.2	25.6	41.0	5.1	2.77
	11-20	--	34.5	27.6	31.0	6.9	2.90
	>20	3.6	39.3	32.1	17.2	7.1	3.14
5.	<10	56.1	36.5	4.9	2.4	--	4.46
	11-20	53.3	43.3	3.3	--	--	4.50
	>20	57.1	42.9	--	--	--	4.57
6.	<10	56.1	39.0	2.4	2.4	--	4.49
	11-20	50.0	42.9	7.1	--	--	4.43
	>20	39.3	42.9	7.1	3.6	7.1	4.04
7.	<10	63.4	24.4	4.9	4.9	2.4	4.42
	11-20	75.9	20.7	--	--	3.4	4.66
	>20	55.6	40.7	3.7	--	--	4.52
8.	<10	17.5	42.5	20.0	20.0	--	3.58
	11-20	20.0	36.7	23.3	20.0	--	3.57
	>20	25.9	40.7	18.5	14.8	--	3.78
9.	<10	36.6	53.7	9.8	--	--	4.27
	11-20	37.9	51.7	6.9	3.4	--	4.24
	>20	28.6	64.3	3.6	3.6	--	4.18
10.	<10	9.8	43.9	22.0	19.5	4.9	3.34
	11-20	13.3	63.3	10.0	10.0	3.3	3.73
	>20	10.7	50.0	17.9	21.4	--	3.50

(continued)

TABLE B. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
11.	<10	5.0	55.0	17.5	17.5	5.0	3.38
	11-20	6.7	40.0	20.0	20.0	13.3	3.07
	>20	10.7	28.6	39.3	21.4	--	3.29
12.	<10	--	45.0	32.5	20.0	2.5	3.20
	11-20	--	40.0	16.7	36.7	6.7	2.90
	>20	--	25.0	28.6	42.9	3.6	2.75
13.	<10	22.0	51.2	14.6	9.8	2.4	3.80
	11-20	10.3	62.1	13.8	10.3	3.4	3.65
	>20	14.3	39.3	14.3	32.1	--	3.36

TABLE C. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Sources for Teacher Evaluation by Type of School (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	High	10.0	30.0	40.0	10.0	10.0	3.20
	Central High	10.5	63.2	15.8	10.5	--	3.74
	Junior High	30.0	50.0	10.0	--	10.0	3.90
	All-Grade	13.8	48.3	24.1	3.4	10.3	3.52
	Elementary	30.8	30.8	23.1	--	15.4	3.62
2.	High	4.8	47.6	33.3	4.8	9.5	3.33
	Central High	--	63.2	26.3	10.5	--	3.53
	Junior High	9.1	36.4	18.2	27.3	9.1	3.09
	All-Grade	3.7	48.1	40.7	3.7	3.7	3.44
	Elementary	8.3	58.3	16.7	8.3	8.3	3.50
3.	High	9.5	28.6	19.0	28.6	14.3	2.90
	Central High	5.3	42.1	26.3	21.1	5.3	3.21
	Junior High	--	9.1	45.0	27	18.2	2.45
	All-Grade	--	29.6	48.1	11.1	11.1	2.96
	Elementary	9.1	36.4	27.3	18.2	9.1	3.18

(continued)

TABLE C (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
4.	High	5.3	26.3	31.6	26.3	10.5	2.89
	Central High	--	31.6	31.6	36.8	--	2.95
	Junior High	--	45.5	18.2	18.2	18.2	2.91
	All-Grade	--	37.0	25.9	33.3	3.7	2.96
	Elementary	--	38.5	15.4	38.5	7.7	2.85
5.	High	42.9	52.4	4.8	--	--	4.38
	Central High	68.4	31.6	--	--	--	4.68
	Junior High	54.5	36.4	9.1	--	--	4.45
	All-Grade	57.1	35.7	3.6	--	3.6	4.46
	Elementary	61.5	38.5	--	--	--	4.62
6.	High	42.1	47.4	10.5	--	--	4.32
	Central High	68.4	31.6	--	--	--	4.68
	Junior High	45.5	36.4	9.1	--	--	4.09
	All-Grade	44.8	44.8	3.4	3.4	--	4.24
	Elementary	50.0	33.3	8.3	8.3	--	4.25
7.	High	47.4	42.1	--	10.5	--	4.26
	Central High	78.9	10.5	10.5	--	--	4.68
	Junior High	54.5	45.5	--	--	--	4.55
	All-Grade	67.9	28.6	--	--	3.6	4.57
	Elementary	69.2	15.4	7.7	--	7.7	4.38
8.	High	15.0	40.0	20.0	25.0	--	3.45
	Central High	26.3	42.1	15.8	15.8	--	3.79
	Junior High	--	40.0	20.0	40.0	--	3.00
	All-Grade	17.9	46.4	25.0	10.7	--	3.71
	Elementary	38.5	38.5	14.4	7.7	--	4.07
9.	High	28.6	71.4	--	--	--	4.29
	Central High	47.4	42.1	5.3	5.3	--	4.32
	Junior High	27.3	54.5	9.1	9.1	--	4.00
	All-Grade	32.1	57.1	10.7	--	--	4.21
	Elementary	41.7	50.0	8.3	--	--	4.33
10.	High	19.0	52.4	14.3	14.3	--	3.76
	Central High	15.8	63.2	10.5	10.5	--	3.84
	Junior High	--	54.5	9.1	18.2	18.2	3.00
	All-Grade	10.7	39.3	21.4	25.0	3.6	3.29
	Elementary	7.7	53.8	23.1	15.4	--	3.54

(continued)

TABLE C. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents				Don't Know	Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never		
11.	High	14.3	57.1	14.3	14.3	--	3.71
	Central High	5.3	52.6	21.1	15.8	5.3	3.37
	Junior High	--	18.2	27.3	36.4	18.2	2.45
	All-Grade Elementary	7.4	29.6	29.6	25.9	7.4	3.04
12.	High	--	47.6	28.6	23.8	--	3.24
	Central High	--	31.6	26.3	42.1	--	2.89
	Junior High	--	18.2	36.4	36.4	9.1	2.64
	All-Grade Elementary	--	25.9	33.3	33.3	7.4	2.78
13.	High	9.5	57.1	9.5	23.8	--	3.52
	Central High	15.8	63.2	15.8	5.3	--	3.89
	Junior High	--	45.5	9.1	45.5	--	3.00
	All-Grade Elementary	25.0	39.3	21.4	10.7	3.6	3.71
		25.0	58.3	8.3	8.3	--	4.00

TABLE D. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Sources for Teacher Evaluation by Community Population (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents				Don't Know	Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never		
1.	<5000	16.9	46.2	24.6	6.2	6.2	3.62
	>5000	15.4	42.3	19.2	7.7	15.4	3.35
	Metro St. John's	16.7	66.7	16.7	--	--	4.00
2.	<5000	3.1	53.1	34.4	6.3	3.1	3.47
	>5000	7.7	46.2	23.1	11.5	11.5	3.27
	Metro St. John's	--	50.0	16.7	33.3	--	3.17
3.	<5000	1.6	32.8	35.9	21.9	7.8	2.98
	>5000	8.0	24.0	28.0	16.0	24.0	2.76
	Metro St. John's	16.7	16.7	33.3	33.3	--	3.17

(continued)

TABLE D. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents				Don't Know	Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never		
4.	<5000	1.6	30.6	29.0	33.3	4.8	2.90
	>5000	--	29.6	29.6	33.3	7.4	2.81
	Metro St. John's	--	66.7	16.7	--	16.7	3.33
5.	<5000	53.8	41.5	3.1	1.5	--	4.48
	>5000	70.4	29.6	--	--	--	4.70
	Metro St. John's	16.7	66.7	16.7	--	--	4.00
6.	<5000	46.9	45.3	4.7	1.6	1.6	4.34
	>5000	66.7	22.2	3.7	3.7	3.7	4.44
	Metro St. John's	--	83.3	16.7	--	--	3.83
7.	<5000	61.9	30.2	3.2	3.2	1.6	4.48
	>5000	81.5	11.1	3.7	--	3.7	4.67
	Metro St. John's	16.7	83.3	--	--	--	4.17
8.	<5000	17.2	42.2	25.0	15.6	--	3.61
	>5000	30.8	38.5	7.7	23.1	--	3.77
	Metro St. John's	--	33.3	33.3	33.3	--	3.00
9.	<5000	32.3	58.5	7.7	1.5	--	4.22
	>5000	42.3	50.0	3.8	3.8	--	4.31
	Metro St. John's	16.7	66.7	16.7	--	--	4.00
10.	<5000	9.2	52.3	18.5	18.5	1.5	3.49
	>5000	18.5	44.4	18.5	14.8	3.7	3.59
	Metro St. John's	--	66.7	--	16.7	16.7	3.17
11.	<5000	4.7	50.0	20.3	20.3	4.7	3.30
	>5000	14.8	25.9	33.3	18.5	7.4	3.22
	Metro St. John's	--	50.0	16.7	16.7	16.7	3.00
12.	<5000	--	39.1	25.0	32.8	3.1	3.00
	>5000	--	37.0	25.9	33.3	3.7	2.96
	Metro St. John's	--	16.7	50.0	16.7	16.7	2.67
13.	<5000	20.0	52.3	15.4	10.8	1.5	3.78
	>5000	11.5	50.0	11.5	23.1	3.8	3.42
	Metro St. John's	--	33.3	16.7	50.0	--	2.83

APPENDIX 14

TABLE A. Frequency of use for Present Practices of
Pre-Conference for Teacher Evaluation by
Sex (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	Male	19.6	33.3	23.5	21.6	2.0	3.47
	Female	16.0	30.0	28.0	20.0	6.0	3.30
2.	Male	12.0	28.0	22.0	28.0	10.0	3.04
	Female	12.8	31.9	10.6	34.0	10.6	3.02
3.	Male	35.3	27.5	21.6	9.8	5.9	3.76
	Female	32.7	26.5	14.3	16.3	10.2	3.55
4.	Male	13.7	33.3	23.5	19.6	9.8	3.22
	Female	20.4	34.7	18.4	18.4	8.2	3.41
5.	Male	15.7	39.2	21.6	17.6	5.9	3.41
	Female	20.4	30.6	18.4	22.4	8.2	3.33
6.	Male	13.7	41.2	17.6	21.6	5.9	3.35
	Female	22.0	28.0	16.0	26.0	8.0	3.30
7.	Male	15.7	27.5	29.4	23.5	3.9	3.27
	Female	24.5	26.5	12.2	24.5	12.2	3.27
8.	Male	13.7	29.4	23.5	29.4	3.9	3.20
	Female	18.4	32.7	12.2	22.4	14.3	3.18

TABLE B. Frequency of use for Present Practices of
Per-Conference for Teacher Evaluation by
Years Teaching (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<10	16.3	25.6	30.2	23.3	4.7	3.26
	11-20	26.7	33.3	20.0	13.3	6.7	3.60
	>20	10.7	39.3	25.0	25.0	--	3.36

(continued)

TABLE B. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
2.	<10	15.0	25.0	15.0	35.0	10.0	3.00
	11-20	10.0	40.0	10.0	26.7	13.3	3.07
	>20	11.1	25.9	25.9	29.6	7.4	3.04
3.	<10	33.3	26.2	19.0	11.9	9.5	3.62
	11-20	40.0	23.3	13.3	10.0	13.3	3.67
	>20	28.6	32.1	21.4	17.9	--	3.71
4.	<10	21.4	35.7	21.4	14.3	7.1	3.50
	11-20	16.7	26.7	23.3	16.7	16.7	3.10
	>20	10.7	39.3	17.9	28.6	3.6	3.25
5.	<10	14.3	42.9	21.4	19.0	2.4	3.48
	11-20	20.0	26.7	23.3	13.3	16.7	3.20
	>20	21.4	32.1	14.3	28.6	3.6	3.29
6.	<10	16.3	37.2	14.0	27.9	4.7	3.33
	11-20	23.3	26.7	20.0	16.7	13.3	3.30
	>20	14.3	39.3	17.9	25.0	3.6	3.36
7.	<10	21.4	21.4	28.6	23.8	4.8	3.31
	11-20	26.7	16.7	16.7	20.0	20.0	3.10
	>20	10.7	46.4	14.3	28.6	--	3.29
8.	<10	19.0	26.2	19.0	28.6	7.1	3.21
	11-20	16.7	26.7	13.3	23.3	20.0	2.97
	>20	10.7	42.9	21.4	25.0	--	3.39

TABLE C. Frequency of use for Present Practices of
Pre-Conference for Teacher Evaluation by
Type of School (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	High	9.1	40.9	36.4	13.6	--	3.45
	Central High	30.0	30.0	30.0	10.0	--	3.80
	Junior High	27.3	27.3	9.1	27.3	9.1	3.36
	All-Grade	14.3	17.9	28.6	32.1	7.1	3.00
	Elementary	15.4	46.2	23.1	15.4	--	3.62
2.	High	9.5	23.8	14.3	38.1	14.3	2.76
	Central High	15.8	26.3	21.1	31.6	5.3	3.16
	Junior High	9.1	27.3	18.2	36.4	9.1	2.90
	All-Grade	7.7	23.1	23.1	30.8	15.4	2.77
	Elementary	23.1	53.8	--	23.1	--	3.77
3.	High	31.8	31.8	13.6	13.6	9.1	3.64
	Central High	45.0	25.0	15.0	5.0	10.2	3.90
	Junior High	9.1	45.5	18.2	18.2	9.1	3.27
	All-Grade	29.6	18.5	29.6	14.8	7.4	3.48
	Elementary	46.2	15.4	15.4	23.1	--	3.85
4.	High	18.2	22.7	31.8	22.7	4.5	3.27
	Central High	20.0	45.0	5.0	15.0	15.0	3.40
	Junior High	--	45.5	27.3	18.2	9.1	3.09
	All-Grade	14.8	29.6	22.2	22.2	11.1	3.15
	Elementary	23.1	30.8	30.8	15.4	--	3.62
5.	High	18.2	36.4	13.6	22.7	9.1	3.32
	Central High	20.0	45.0	15.0	15.0	5.0	3.60
	Junior High	18.0	18.0	45.5	18.2	--	3.36
	All-Grade	7.4	33.3	22.2	29.6	7.4	3.04
	Elementary	38.5	38.5	--	15.4	7.7	3.85
6.	High	22.7	22.7	9.1	36.4	9.1	3.14
	Central High	25.0	35.0	20.0	15.0	5.0	3.60
	Junior High	18.2	45.5	18.2	18.2	--	3.64
	All-Grade	7.1	39.3	17.9	25.0	10.7	3.07
	Elementary	23.1	30.8	23.1	23.1	--	3.54

(continued)

TABLE C. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents				Don't Know	Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never		
7.	High	18.2	18.2	31.8	22.7	9.1	3.14
	Central High	25.0	30.0	20.0	15.0	10.0	3.45
	Junior High	18.2	45.0	18.2	18.2	--	3.64
	All-Grade	14.8	22.2	25.9	29.6	7.4	3.07
	Elementary	23.1	30.8	--	38.5	7.7	3.23
8.	High	22.7	13.6	27.3	27.3	9.1	3.14
	Central High	25.0	30.0	15.0	20.0	10.0	3.40
	Junior High	9.1	45.5	27.3	18.2	--	3.45
	All-Grade	3.7	33.3	14.8	37.0	11.1	2.81
	Elementary	23.1	38.5	--	30.8	7.7	3.38

TABLE D. Frequency of use for Present Practices of Pre-Conference for Teacher Evaluation by Community Population (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents				Don't Know	Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never		
1.	<5000	19.7	28.8	25.8	22.7	3.0	3.39
	>5000	17.9	39.3	21.4	17.9	3.6	3.50
	Metro St. John's	--	33.3	33.3	16.7	16.7	2.83
2.	<5000	12.9	29.0	19.4	27.4	11.3	3.05
	>5000	14.3	35.7	7.1	35.7	7.1	3.14
	Metro St. John's	--	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7	2.50
3.	<5000	38.5	23.1	18.5	10.8	9.2	3.71
	>5000	32.1	32.1	10.7	17.9	7.1	3.64
	Metro St. John's	--	50.0	33.3	16.7	--	3.33
4.	<5000	16.9	33.8	18.5	20.0	10.8	3.26
	>5000	21.4	35.7	25.0	10.7	7.1	3.54
	Metro St. John's	--	33.3	33.0	33.3	--	3.00
5.	<5000	16.9	35.4	20.0	20.0	7.7	3.34
	>5000	21.4	32.1	17.9	21.4	7.1	3.29
	Metro St. John's	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7	--	3.50

(continued)

TABLE D. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
6.	<5000	18.2	34.8	15.2	24.2	7.6	3.32
	>5000	17.9	35.7	17.9	21.4	7.1	3.36
	Metro St. John's	16.7	33.3	16.7	33.3	--	3.33
7.	<5000	21.5	21.5	24.6	23.1	9.2	3.23
	>5000	17.9	39.3	10.7	25.0	7.1	3.36
	Metro St. John's	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7	--	3.50
8.	<5000	16.9	29.2	18.5	26.2	9.2	3.18
	>5000	17.9	32.1	14.3	25.0	10.7	3.21
	Metro St. John's	--	50.0	33.3	16.7	--	3.33

APPENDIX 15

TABLE A. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Pre-Conference for Teacher Evaluation by Sex (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	Male	64.7	33.3	--	2.0	--	4.61
	Female	63.3	24.5	8.2	2.0	2.0	4.45
2.	Male	32.0	34.0	10.0	6.0	18.0	3.56
	Female	46.0	38.8	6.1	2.0	6.1	4.18
3.	Male	72.5	19.6	7.8	--	--	4.65
	Female	69.6	28.3	--	--	2.2	4.63
4.	Male	51.0	35.3	9.8	2.0	2.0	4.31
	Female	68.8	29.2	2.1	--	--	4.67
5.	Male	56.9	39.2	3.9	2.1	--	4.53
	Female	75.0	20.8	2.1	--	--	4.69
6.	Male	56.0	36.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	4.42
	Female	77.6	18.4	4.1	--	--	4.73
7.	Male	56.9	29.4	9.8	3.9	--	4.39
	Female	77.1	16.7	6.3	--	--	4.71
8.	Male	51.0	35.3	9.8	3.9	--	4.33
	Female	70.8	16.7	10.4	--	2.1	4.54

TABLE B. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Pre-conference for Teacher Evaluation by Years Teaching (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<10	61.9	28.6	4.8	2.4	2.4	4.45
	11-20	73.3	23.3	3.3	--	--	4.70
	>20	57.1	35.7	3.6	3.6	--	4.46

(continued)

TABLE B. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Don't Know	Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never			
2.	<10	45.2	31.0	7.1	7.1	9.5	3.95	
	11-20	36.7	40.0	6.7	3.3	13.3	3.83	
	>20	33.3	40.7	11.1	--	14.8	3.78	
3.	<10	64.1	28.2	5.1	--	2.6	4.51	
	11-20	86.7	13.3	--	--	--	4.87	
	>20	64.3	28.6	7.1	--	--	4.57	
4.	<10	61.0	34.1	4.9	--	--	4.56	
	11-20	63.3	30.0	3.3	3.3	--	4.53	
	>20	53.6	32.1	10.7	--	3.6	4.32	
5.	<10	68.3	24.4	4.9	2.4	--	4.59	
	11-20	66.7	33.3	--	--	--	4.67	
	>20	60.7	35.7	3.6	--	--	4.57	
6.	<10	69.0	26.2	2.4	2.4	--	4.62	
	11-20	70.0	23.3	6.7	--	--	4.63	
	>20	59.3	33.3	3.7	--	3.7	4.44	
7.	<10	71.4	16.7	9.5	2.4	--	4.57	
	11-20	75.9	13.8	6.9	3.4	--	4.62	
	>20	50.0	42.9	7.1	--	--	4.43	
8.	<10	61.9	23.8	9.5	2.4	2.4	4.40	
	11-20	69.0	10.3	17.2	3.4	--	4.44	
	>20	50.0	46.4	3.6	--	--	4.46	

TABLE C. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of
Pre-Conference for Teacher Evaluation by
Type of School (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	High	71.4	19.0	9.5	--	--	4.62
	Central High	80.0	15.0	5.0	--	--	4.75
	Junior High	45.0	36.4	--	9.1	9.1	4.00
	All-Grade	67.9	28.6	--	3.6	--	4.61
	Elementary	46.2	46.2	7.7	--	--	4.38
2.	High	23.8	47.6	9.5	4.0	14.3	3.62
	Central High	31.6	26.3	15.8	5.3	21.1	3.42
	Junior High	45.5	27.3	--	9.1	18.2	3.73
	All-Grade	46.4	39.3	7.1	--	7.1	4.18
	Elementary	53.8	30.8	7.7	--	7.7	4.23
3.	High	65.0	25.0	10.0	--	--	4.55
	Central High	80.0	15.0	5.0	--	--	4.75
	Junior High	63.6	27.3	--	--	9.1	4.36
	All-Grade	70.4	25.9	3.7	--	--	4.67
	Elementary	75.0	25.0	--	--	--	4.70
4.	High	61.9	23.8	14.3	--	--	4.48
	Central High	45.0	50.0	5.0	--	--	4.40
	Junior High	63.6	27.3	--	--	9.1	4.36
	All-Grade	66.7	25.9	7.4	--	--	4.59
	Elementary	61.5	38.5	--	--	--	4.62
5.	High	57.1	33.3	9.5	--	--	4.47
	Central High	70.0	30.3	--	--	--	4.70
	Junior High	72.7	27.3	--	--	--	4.73
	All-Grade	63.0	29.6	3.7	3.7	--	4.52
	Elementary	76.9	23.1	--	--	--	4.77
6.	High	61.9	23.8	9.5	--	4.8	4.38
	Central High	65.0	35.0	--	--	--	4.65
	Junior High	80.0	20.0	--	--	--	4.80
	All-Grade	60.7	35.7	3.6	--	--	4.57
	Elementary	76.9	15.4	7.7	--	--	4.69
7.	High	52.4	33.3	14.3	--	--	4.38
	Central High	70.0	20.0	5.0	5.0	--	4.55
	Junior High	81.8	18.2	--	--	--	4.82
	All-Grade	64.3	28.6	7.1	--	--	4.57
	Elementary	75.0	16.7	8.3	--	--	4.67

(continued)

TABLE C. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
8.	High	57.1	23.8	19.0	--	--	4.38
	Central High	60.0	25.0	5.0	10.0	--	4.35
	Junior High	63.6	27.3	9.1	--	--	4.55
	All-Grade	60.7	32.1	3.6	--	3.6	4.46
	Elementary	58.3	33.3	8.3	--	--	4.50

TABLE D. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Pre-Conference for Teacher Evaluation by Community Population (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<5000	65.2	28.8	4.5	1.5	--	4.58
	>5000	63.0	29.6	3.7	3.7	--	4.52
	Metro St. John's	66.7	16.7	--	--	16.7	4.17
2.	<5000	33.8	40.0	9.2	4.6	12.3	3.78
	>5000	51.9	29.6	7.4	3.7	7.4	4.15
	Metro St. John's	50.0	33.3	--	--	16.7	4.00
3.	<5000	68.8	25.0	6.3	--	--	4.63
	>5000	76.9	19.2	--	--	3.8	4.65
	Metro St. John's	66.7	33.3	--	--	--	4.67
4.	<5000	52.3	36.9	9.2	1.5	--	4.40
	>5000	77.8	18.5	--	--	3.7	4.67
	Metro St. John's	50.0	50.0	--	--	--	4.50
5.	<5000	58.5	36.9	4.6	--	--	4.54
	>5000	77.8	18.5	--	3.7	--	4.70
	Metro St. John's	83.3	16.7	--	--	--	4.83
6.	<5000	59.1	33.3	4.5	1.5	1.5	4.47
	>5000	80.8	15.4	3.8	--	--	4.77
	Metro St. John's	83.3	16.7	--	--	--	4.83

(continued)

TABLE D. (continued)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Percent of Respondents</u>				<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Mean</u>
		<u>Always</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>		
7.	<5000	59.1	28.8	9.1	3.0	--	4.44
	>5000	76.9	15.4	7.7	--	--	4.69
	Metro St. John's	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00
8.	<5000	56.1	28.8	12.1	3.0	--	4.38
	>5000	69.2	23.1	3.8	--	3.8	4.54
	Metro St. John's	66.7	16.7	16.7	--	--	4.50

TABLE A. Frequency of use for Present Practices of
Post-Conference for Teacher Evaluation
by Sex (N=102)

Item	<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Percent of Respondents</u>					<u>Mean</u>
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	Male	49.0	27.5	13.7	5.9	3.9	4.12
	Female	44.0	34.0	8.0	10.0	4.0	4.04
2.	Male	12.0	36.0	22.0	22.0	8.0	3.22
	Female	16.0	32.0	20.0	20.0	12.0	3.20
3.	Male	11.8	29.4	31.4	19.6	7.8	3.18
	Female	6.0	26.0	24.0	28.0	16.0	2.78
4.	Male	17.6	45.1	15.7	15.7	5.9	3.53
	Female	22.0	42.0	14.0	14.0	8.0	3.56
5.	Male	43.1	37.3	9.8	3.9	5.9	4.08
	Female	54.0	30.0	6.0	4.0	6.0	4.22
6.	Male	11.8	35.3	31.4	9.8	11.8	3.25
	Female	12.8	47.7	10.6	14.9	17.0	3.21
7.	Male	13.7	29.4	27.5	21.6	7.8	3.20
	Female	19.1	31.9	14.9	17.0	17.0	3.19
8.	Male	37.3	45.1	11.8	--	5.9	4.08
	Female	47.9	33.3	6.3	4.2	8.3	4.08
9.	Male	23.5	35.3	13.5	11.8	5.9	3.58
	Female	27.1	33.3	10.4	8.3	20.8	3.38

**TABLE B. Frequency of use for Present Practices of
Post-Conference for Teacher Evaluation by
Years Teaching (N=102)**

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<10	58.1	23.3	9.3	7.0	2.3	4.28
	11-20	43.3	36.7	6.7	3.3	10.0	4.00
	>20	32.1	35.7	17.9	14.3	--	3.86
2.	<10	14.3	40.5	19.0	19.0	7.1	3.36
	11-20	13.3	30.0	20.0	20.0	16.7	3.03
	>20	14.3	28.6	25.0	25.0	7.1	3.18
3.	<10	9.3	25.6	25.6	27.9	11.6	2.93
	11-20	6.7	26.7	26.7	23.3	16.7	2.83
	>20	10.7	32.1	32.1	17.9	7.1	3.21
4.	<10	32.6	46.5	11.6	7.0	2.3	4.00
	11-20	10.0	40.0	16.7	16.7	16.7	3.10
	>20	10.7	42.9	17.9	25.0	3.6	3.32
5.	<10	60.5	27.9	7.0	2.3	2.3	4.42
	11-20	50.0	23.3	10.0	3.3	13.3	3.93
	>20	28.6	53.6	7.1	7.1	3.6	3.96
6.	<10	19.5	31.7	17.1	14.6	17.1	3.22
	11-20	13.8	41.4	17.2	10.3	17.2	3.24
	>20	--	50.0	32.2	10.7	7.1	3.25
7.	<10	19.5	26.8	22.0	19.5	12.2	3.22
	11-20	17.2	24.1	17.2	20.7	20.7	2.97
	>20	10.7	42.9	25.0	17.9	3.6	3.39
8.	<10	52.4	28.6	11.9	2.4	4.8	4.21
	11-20	34.5	48.3	--	3.4	13.8	3.86
	>20	35.7	46.4	14.3	--	3.6	4.11
9.	<10	28.6	31.0	16.7	7.1	16.7	3.48
	11-20	31.0	31.0	13.8	6.9	17.2	3.52
	>20	14.3	42.9	21.4	17.9	3.6	3.46

TABLE C. Frequency of use for Present Practices of
 Post-Conference for Teacher Evaluation by
 Type of School (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	High	22.7	50.0	13.6	13.6	--	3.82
	Central High	55.0	20.0	15.0	5.0	5.0	4.15
	Junior High	36.4	36.4	9.1	18.2	--	3.91
	All-Grade	60.7	14.3	14.3	3.6	7.1	4.18
	Elementary	46.2	46.2	--	7.7	--	4.30
2.	High	--	31.8	22.7	31.8	13.6	2.73
	Central High	10.5	36.8	15.8	31.6	5.3	3.16
	Junior High	9.1	36.4	27.3	9.1	18.2	3.09
	All-Grade	14.3	35.7	17.9	21.4	10.7	3.21
	Elementary	30.8	38.5	23.1	7.7	--	3.92
3.	High	4.5	18.2	22.7	36.4	18.3	2.55
	Central High	10.0	30.0	30.0	15.0	15.0	3.05
	Junior High	9.1	27.3	27.3	18.2	18.2	2.91
	All-Grade	14.3	21.4	25.0	32.1	7.1	3.04
	Elementary	--	53.8	30.8	15.4	--	3.38
4.	High	13.6	40.9	18.2	18.2	9.1	3.32
	Central High	30.0	40.0	10.0	15.0	5.0	3.75
	Junior High	18.2	45.5	27.3	9.1	--	3.73
	All-Grade	21.4	39.3	14.3	17.9	7.1	3.50
	Elementary	--	61.5	15.4	15.4	7.7	3.31
5.	High	36.4	31.8	13.6	9.1	9.1	3.77
	Central High	45.0	45.0	5.0	--	5.0	4.25
	Junior High	36.4	36.4	18.2	9.1	--	4.00
	All-Grade	57.1	32.1	3.6	--	7.1	4.32
	Elementary	61.5	23.1	7.7	7.7	--	4.38
6.	High	9.1	36.4	22.7	22.7	9.1	3.14
	Central High	15.0	35.0	25.0	--	25.0	3.15
	Junior High	--	66.7	11.1	11.1	11.1	3.33
	All-Grade	18.5	33.3	22.2	14.8	11.1	3.33
	Elementary	7.7	53.8	15.4	15.4	7.7	3.38
7.	High	9.1	22.7	27.3	22.7	18.2	2.82
	Central High	15.0	25.0	35.0	10.0	15.0	3.15
	Junior High	10.0	50.0	10.0	20.0	10.0	3.30
	All-Grade	19.2	30.8	15.4	26.9	7.7	3.27
	Elementary	15.4	46.2	15.4	15.4	7.7	3.46

(continued)

TABLE C. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
8.	High	36.4	31.8	9.1	9.1	13.6	3.68
	Central High	45.0	35.0	15.0	--	5.0	4.15
	Junior High	40.0	40.0	20.0	--	--	4.20
	All-Grade	40.7	48.1	3.7	--	7.4	4.15
	Elementary	46.2	46.2	7.7	--	--	4.38
9.	High	19.0	33.3	14.3	14.3	19.0	3.19
	Central High	35.0	30.0	10.0	15.0	10.0	3.65
	Junior High	10.0	60.0	20.0	--	10.0	3.60
	All-Grade	25.0	39.3	14.3	10.7	10.7	3.57
	Elementary	30.8	23.1	23.1	7.7	15.4	3.46

TABLE D. Frequency of use for Present Practices of Post-Conference for Teacher Evaluation by Community Population (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<5000	51.5	24.2	13.6	6.1	4.5	4.12
	>5000	39.3	39.3	3.6	14.3	3.6	3.99
	Metro St. John's	33.3	50.0	16.7	--	--	4.17
2.	<5000	12.3	33.8	20.0	24.6	9.2	3.15
	>5000	21.4	32.1	25.0	14.3	7.1	3.46
	Metro St. John's	--	50.0	--	16.7	33.3	2.67
3.	<5000	9.1	24.2	30.3	25.8	10.6	2.95
	>5000	10.7	35.7	17.9	21.4	14.3	3.07
	Metro St. John's	--	33.3	33.3	16.7	16.7	2.83
4.	<5000	24.2	39.4	15.2	15.2	6.1	3.61
	>5000	10.7	53.6	10.7	14.3	10.7	3.39
	Metro St. John's	16.7	50.0	33.3	--	--	3.83
5.	<5000	53.0	34.8	4.5	1.5	6.1	4.27
	>5000	46.4	28.6	7.1	10.7	7.1	3.96
	Metro St. John's	16.7	50.0	33.3	--	--	3.83

(continued)

TABLE D. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
6.	<5000	18.5	36.9	27.7	7.7	9.2	3.48
	>5000	--	48.1	11.1	18.5	22.2	2.85
	Metro St. John's	--	40.0	--	20.0	40.0	2.40
7.	<5000	18.8	28.1	23.4	18.8	10.9	3.25
	>5000	14.3	35.7	14.3	21.4	14.3	3.14
	Metro St. John's	--	40.0	40.0	--	20.0	3.00
8.	<5000	47.7	40.0	4.6	--	7.7	4.20
	>5000	39.3	32.1	14.3	7.1	7.1	3.89
	Metro St. John's	--	60.0	40.0	--	--	3.60
9.	<5000	31.8	31.8	13.6	12.1	10.6	3.62
	>5000	14.3	39.3	21.4	7.1	17.9	3.25
	Metro St. John's	--	50.0	25.0	--	25.0	3.00

TABLE A. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Post-Conference for Teacher Evaluation by Sex (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	Male	84.3	11.8	3.9	--	--	4.80
	Female	85.7	10.2	2.0	2.0	--	4.80
2.	Male	34.0	38.0	12.0	6.0	10.0	3.80
	Female	57.1	30.6	8.2	--	4.1	4.37
3.	Male	45.1	43.1	7.8	3.9	--	4.29
	Female	45.8	37.5	8.3	4.2	4.2	4.17
4.	Male	64.7	35.3	--	--	--	4.65
	Female	85.7	12.2	--	--	2.0	4.80
5.	Male	78.0	22.0	--	--	--	4.78
	Female	93.9	4.1	--	2.0	--	4.90
6.	Male	50.0	36.0	8.0	--	6.0	4.24
	Female	55.6	37.8	2.2	--	4.4	4.40
7.	Male	49.0	39.2	2.0	5.9	3.9	4.24
	Female	57.4	31.9	8.5	--	2.1	4.43
8.	Male	72.5	27.5	--	--	--	4.73
	Female	85.1	12.8	2.1	--	--	4.83
9.	Male	74.5	21.6	2.0	2.0	--	4.69
	Female	63.8	31.9	--	2.1	2.1	4.53

TABLE B. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of
Post-Conference for Teacher Evaluation by
Years Teaching (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<10	85.7	9.5	2.4	2.4	--	4.79
	11-20	90.0	10.0	--	--	--	4.90
	>20	78.6	14.3	7.1	--	--	4.71
2.	<10	53.7	31.7	9.8	--	4.9	4.30
	11-20	40.0	36.7	10.0	10.0	3.3	4.00
	>20	39.3	35.7	10.7	--	14.3	3.86
3.	<10	41.5	39.0	12.2	4.9	2.4	4.17
	11-20	60.0	30.0	3.3	3.3	3.3	4.40
	>20	35.7	53.6	7.1	3.6	--	4.21
4.	<10	88.1	11.9	--	--	--	4.88
	11-20	76.7	20.0	--	--	3.3	4.67
	>20	53.6	46.4	--	--	--	4.54
5.	<10	90.5	9.5	--	--	--	4.90
	11-20	90.0	6.7	3.3	--	--	4.83
	>20	74.1	25.9	--	--	--	4.74
6.	<10	59.0	25.6	7.7	7.7	--	4.28
	11-20	55.2	37.9	3.4	3.4	--	4.41
	>20	40.7	51.9	3.7	3.7	--	4.26
7.	<10	52.4	35.7	4.8	2.4	4.8	4.29
	11-20	53.6	28.6	10.7	3.6	3.6	4.25
	>20	53.6	42.9	--	3.6	--	4.46
8.	<10	92.7	7.3	--	--	--	4.93
	11-20	72.4	24.1	3.4	--	--	4.69
	>20	64.3	35.7	--	--	--	4.64
9.	<10	68.3	29.3	2.4	--	--	4.66
	11-20	65.5	24.1	--	6.9	3.4	4.41
	>20	75.0	25.0	--	--	--	4.75

TABLE C. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of
 Post-Conference for Teacher Evaluation by
 Type of School (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	High	71.4	23.8	4.8	--	--	4.67
	Central High	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00
	Junior High	72.7	18.2	--	9.1	--	4.55
	All-Grade	92.9	3.6	3.6	--	--	4.89
	Elementary	76.9	15.4	7.7	--	--	4.69
2.	High	28.6	38.1	14.3	4.8	14.3	3.62
	Central High	31.6	36.8	15.8	10.5	5.3	3.79
	Junior High	45.5	36.4	9.1	--	9.1	4.09
	All-Grade	57.1	28.6	7.1	--	7.1	4.28
	Elementary	61.5	38.5	--	--	--	4.62
3.	High	52.4	42.9	4.8	--	--	4.48
	Central High	45.0	30.0	15.0	10.0	--	4.10
	Junior High	36.4	45.5	9.1	--	9.1	4.00
	All-Grade	40.7	48.1	3.7	7.4	--	4.22
	Elementary	53.8	30.8	7.7	--	7.7	4.23
4.	High	66.7	33.3	--	--	--	4.67
	Central High	70.0	30.0	--	--	--	4.70
	Junior High	81.8	18.2	--	--	--	4.82
	All-Grade	89.3	10.7	--	--	--	4.89
	Elementary	61.5	30.8	--	--	--	4.38
5.	High	70.0	25.0	--	5.0	--	4.60
	Central High	90.0	10.0	--	--	--	4.90
	Junior High	81.8	18.2	--	--	--	4.82
	All-Grade	92.9	7.1	--	--	--	4.93
	Elementary	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00
6.	High	50.0	50.0	--	--	--	4.50
	Central High	31.6	42.1	10.5	--	15.9	3.74
	Junior High	88.9	11.1	--	--	--	4.89
	All-Grade	70.4	18.5	11.1	--	--	4.59
	Elementary	38.5	53.8	--	--	7.7	4.15
7.	High	52.4	38.1	9.5	--	--	4.43
	Central High	50.0	35.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.20
	Junior High	70.0	30.0	--	--	--	4.70
	All-Grade	50.0	39.3	3.6	3.6	3.6	4.29
	Elementary	50.0	33.3	8.3	--	8.3	4.17

(continued)

TABLE C. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
8.	High	85.7	9.5	4.8	--	--	4.81
	Central High	75.0	25.0	--	--	--	4.75
	Junior High	90.0	10.0	--	--	--	4.90
	All-Grade	85.2	14.8	--	--	--	4.85
	Elementary	61.5	38.5	--	--	--	4.62
9.	High	70.0	25.0	5.0	--	--	4.60
	Central High	75.0	20.0	5.0	--	--	4.65
	Junior High	70.0	30.0	--	--	--	4.70
	All-Grade	71.4	28.6	--	--	--	4.71
	Elementary	69.2	23.1	--	--	7.7	4.46

TABLE D. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Post-Conference for Teacher Evaluation by Community Population (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<5000	86.4	10.6	3.0	--	--	4.83
	>5000	85.2	7.4	3.7	3.7	--	4.74
	Metro St. John's	83.3	16.7	--	--	--	4.83
2.	<5000	43.1	32.3	12.3	4.6	7.7	3.98
	>5000	48.1	40.7	3.7	--	7.4	4.22
	Metro St. John's	66.7	16.7	16.7	--	--	4.50
3.	<5000	38.5	47.7	9.2	4.6	--	4.20
	>5000	55.6	29.6	3.7	3.7	7.4	4.22
	Metro St. John's	66.7	16.7	16.7	--	--	4.50
4.	<5000	75.8	24.2	--	--	--	4.76
	>5000	70.4	25.9	--	3.7	--	4.59
	Metro St. John's	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00
5.	<5000	83.3	15.2	--	1.5	--	4.80
	>5000	92.3	7.7	--	--	--	4.92
	Metro St. John's	83.3	16.7	--	--	--	4.83

(continued)

TABLE D. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
6.	<5000	53.8	36.9	6.2	--	3.1	4.38
	>5000	50.0	37.5	4.2	--	8.3	4.21
	Metro St. John's	60.0	20.0	--	--	20.0	4.00
7.	<5000	50.0	34.8	7.6	4.5	3.0	4.24
	>5000	57.7	38.5	--	--	3.8	4.46
	Metro St. John's	80.0	20.0	--	--	--	4.80
8.	<5000	80.0	18.5	1.5	--	--	4.78
	>5000	74.1	25.9	--	--	--	4.74
	Metro St. John's	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00
9.	<5000	69.7	25.8	1.5	3.0	--	4.62
	>5000	63.0	33.3	--	--	3.7	4.52
	Metro St. John's	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00

TABLE A. Frequency of use for Present Practices of Evaluators for Teacher Evaluation by Sex (N=102)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Percent of Respondents</u>					<u>Mean</u>
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	Male	66.7	27.5	5.9	--	--	4.61
	Female	76.5	11.8	5.9	2.0	3.9	4.55
2.	Male	18.4	30.6	16.3	32.7	2.0	3.31
	Female	30.6	12.2	18.4	28.6	10.2	3.24
3.	Male	22.0	24.0	14.0	40.0	--	3.28
	Female	24.0	18.0	18.0	28.0	12.0	3.14
4.	Male	12.2	9.8	9.8	56.1	12.2	2.54
	Female	--	7.1	11.9	52.4	28.6	1.98
5.	Male	4.1	8.2	10.2	75.5	2.0	2.37
	Female	--	2.0	8.0	68.0	22.0	1.90
6.	Male	18.4	36.7	18.4	24.5	2.0	3.45
	Female	32.0	20.0	10.0	26.0	12.0	3.34
7.	Male	4.1	12.2	24.5	59.2	--	2.61
	Female	8.0	18.0	10.0	52.0	12.0	2.58
8.	Male	--	6.1	12.2	81.6	--	2.24
	Female	--	8.2	6.1	67.3	18.4	2.04

TABLE B. Frequency of use for Present Practices of Evaluators for Teacher Evaluation by Years Teaching (N=102)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Percent of Respondents</u>					<u>Mean</u>
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<10	70.5	20.5	6.8	--	2.3	4.57
	11-20	66.7	16.7	10.0	3.3	3.3	4.40
	>20	78.6	21.4	--	--	--	4.79

(continued)

TABLE B. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
2.	<10	38.1	16.7	21.4	19.0	4.8	3.64
	11-20	27.6	13.8	13.8	34.5	10.3	3.14
	>20	--	37.0	14.8	44.4	3.7	2.85
3.	<10	27.9	20.9	9.3	37.2	4.7	3.30
	11-20	16.7	13.3	26.7	30.0	13.3	2.90
	>20	22.2	29.6	14.8	33.3	--	3.41
4.	<10	2.9	2.9	8.8	55.9	29.4	1.94
	11-20	8.3	8.3	8.3	54.2	20.8	2.29
	>20	8.0	16.0	16.0	52.0	8.0	2.64
5.	<10	2.4	2.4	9.5	73.8	11.9	2.10
	11-20	--	6.7	6.7	66.7	20.0	2.00
	>20	3.7	7.4	11.1	74.1	3.7	2.33
6.	<10	31.0	26.2	16.7	16.7	9.5	3.52
	11-20	23.3	23.3	16.7	26.7	10.0	3.23
	>20	18.5	37.0	7.4	37.0	--	3.37
7.	<10	7.1	21.4	14.3	54.8	2.4	2.76
	11-20	--	3.3	23.3	56.7	16.7	2.13
	>20	11.1	18.5	14.8	55.6	--	2.85
8.	<10	--	9.8	9.8	73.2	7.3	2.22
	11-20	--	--	10.0	70.0	20.0	1.90
	>20	--	11.1	7.4	81.5	--	2.30

TABLE C. Frequency of use for Present Practices of
Evaluators for Teacher Evaluation by
Type of School (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	High	68.2	18.2	9.1	4.5	--	4.50
	Central High	85.0	10.0	5.0	--	--	4.80
	Junior High	81.8	18.2	--	--	--	4.82
	All-Grade	72.4	17.2	3.4	--	6.9	4.48
	Elementary	76.9	7.7	15.4	--	--	4.62
2.	High	22.7	9.1	22.7	36.4	9.1	3.00
	Central High	36.8	21.1	5.3	36.8	--	3.58
	Junior High	11.1	33.3	11.1	44.4	--	3.11
	All-Grade	25.0	14.3	32.1	17.9	10.7	3.25
	Elementary	30.8	30.8	--	30.8	7.7	3.46
3.	High	22.7	18.2	9.1	40.9	9.1	3.05
	Central High	26.3	21.1	21.1	26.3	5.3	3.37
	Junior High	18.2	9.1	36.4	36.4	--	3.09
	All-Grade	21.4	17.9	17.9	35.7	7.1	3.11
	Elementary	30.8	23.1	7.7	30.8	7.7	3.38
4.	High	15.8	10.5	5.3	52.6	15.8	2.58
	Central High	--	9.1	18.2	45.5	27.3	2.09
	Junior High	10.0	--	20.0	50.0	20.0	2.30
	All-Grade	3.9	3.8	11.5	61.5	19.2	2.11
	Elementary	--	8.3	8.3	50.0	33.3	1.92
5.	High	--	9.1	4.5	72.7	13.6	2.09
	Central High	--	--	16.7	77.8	5.6	2.11
	Junior High	9.1	--	9.1	63.6	18.2	2.18
	All-Grade	--	3.6	14.3	67.9	14.3	2.07
	Elementary	--	7.7	--	76.9	15.4	2.00
6.	High	31.8	36.4	13.6	18.2	--	3.82
	Central High	22.2	33.3	16.7	16.7	11.1	3.39
	Junior High	18.2	27.3	--	36.4	18.2	2.91
	All-Grade	21.4	17.9	25.0	28.6	7.1	3.18
	Elementary	30.8	23.1	7.7	30.8	7.7	3.38
7.	High	9.1	22.7	18.2	45.5	4.5	2.86
	Central High	5.6	11.1	22.2	55.6	5.6	2.55
	Junior High	--	9.1	18.2	63.6	9.1	2.27
	All-Grade	3.6	10.7	21.4	57.1	7.1	2.46
	Elementary	15.4	23.1	--	53.8	7.7	2.85

(continued)

TABLE C. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
8.	High	--	18.2	13.6	59.1	9.1	2.41
	Central High	--	11.1	5.6	77.8	5.6	2.22
	Junior High	--	--	9.1	72.7	18.2	1.91
	All-Grade	--	--	11.1	81.5	7.4	2.04
	Elementary	--	--	--	84.6	15.4	1.85

TABLE D. Frequency of use for Present Practices of Evaluators for Teacher Evaluation by Community Population (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<5000	71.6	19.4	6.0	--	3.0	4.57
	>5000	75.0	17.9	3.6	3.6	--	4.64
	Metro St. John's	66.7	33.3	--	--	--	4.67
2.	<5000	24.6	20.0	21.5	24.6	9.2	3.26
	>5000	25.9	18.5	11.1	44.4	--	3.26
	Metro St. John's	20.0	40.0	--	40.0	--	3.40
3.	<5000	24.6	18.5	13.8	36.9	6.2	3.18
	>5000	21.4	32.1	17.9	21.4	7.1	3.39
	Metro St. John's	16.7	--	33.3	50.0	--	2.83
4.	<5000	7.5	5.7	7.5	58.5	20.8	2.21
	>5000	4.3	17.4	17.4	43.5	17.4	2.48
	Metro St. John's	--	--	16.7	50.0	33.3	1.83
5.	<5000	1.6	7.8	7.8	73.4	9.4	2.19
	>5000	3.6	--	14.3	67.9	14.3	2.11
	Metro St. John's	--	--	--	66.7	33.3	1.67
6.	<5000	26.6	28.1	20.3	20.3	4.7	3.52
	>5000	28.6	28.6	--	35.7	7.1	3.36
	Metro St. John's	--	33.3	--	33.3	33.3	2.33

(continued)

TABLE D. (continued)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Percent of Respondents</u>					<u>Mean</u>
		<u>Always</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	
7.	<5000	3.1	15.6	20.3	54.7	6.3	2.55
	>5000	14.3	17.9	14.3	50.0	3.6	2.89
	Metro St. John's	--	--	--	83.3	16.7	1.83
8.	<5000	--	7.9	12.7	69.8	9.5	2.19
	>5000	--	7.1	3.6	82.1	7.1	2.10
	Metro St. John's	--	--	--	83.3	16.7	1.83

TABLE A. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Evaluators for Teacher Evaluation by Sex (N=102)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Percent of Respondents</u>					<u>Mean</u>
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	Male	56.0	38.0	6.0	--	--	4.50
	Female	63.3	28.6	8.2	--	--	4.55
2.	Male	18.4	32.7	24.5	22.4	2.0	3.43
	Female	29.8	29.8	23.4	8.5	8.5	3.64
3.	Male	45.1	35.3	11.8	3.9	3.9	4.14
	Female	49.0	36.7	10.2	2.0	2.0	4.29
4.	Male	33.3	37.8	8.9	13.3	6.7	3.78
	Female	14.6	48.8	9.9	9.8	17.1	3.34
5.	Male	12.2	44.9	18.4	22.4	2.0	3.43
	Female	6.1	30.6	14.3	34.7	14.3	2.80
6.	Male	46.9	40.8	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.23
	Female	66.0	30.0	2.0	2.0	--	4.60
7.	Male	8.2	46.9	18.4	22.4	4.1	3.33
	Female	8.2	40.8	22.4	26.5	2.0	3.27
8.	Male	2.0	32.7	16.3	42.9	6.1	2.82
	Female	--	22.9	29.2	41.7	6.3	2.69

TABLE B. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Evaluators for Teacher Evaluation by Years Teaching (N=102)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Percent of Respondents</u>					<u>Mean</u>
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<10	57.1	38.1	4.8	--	--	4.52
	11-20	60.0	33.3	6.7	--	--	4.53
	>20	63.0	25.9	11.1	--	--	4.52

(continued)

TABLE B. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Don't Know	Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never			
2.	<10	32.5	45.0	12.5	7.5	2.5	3.98	
	11-20	27.6	24.1	27.6	10.3	10.3	3.48	
	>20	7.4	18.5	37.0	33.3	3.7	2.93	
3.	<10	57.1	35.7	4.8	2.4	--	4.48	
	11-20	33.3	43.3	13.3	3.3	6.7	3.93	
	>20	46.4	28.6	17.9	3.6	3.6	4.11	
4.	<10	20.6	52.9	2.9	8.8	14.7	3.56	
	11-20	16.0	40.0	16.0	12.0	16.0	3.28	
	>20	37.0	33.3	11.1	14.8	3.7	3.85	
5.	<10	4.9	31.7	17.1	39.0	7.3	2.88	
	11-20	10.0	40.0	16.7	16.7	16.7	3.10	
	>20	14.8	44.4	14.8	25.9	--	3.48	
6.	<10	61.9	31.0	4.8	--	2.4	4.50	
	11-20	60.0	33.3	--	3.3	3.3	4.43	
	>20	44.4	44.4	3.7	7.4	--	4.26	
7.	<10	7.3	51.2	22.0	19.5	--	3.46	
	11-20	6.7	43.3	23.3	16.7	10.0	3.20	
	>20	11.1	33.3	14.8	40.7	--	3.15	
8.	<10	--	31.7	39.0	26.8	2.4	3.00	
	11-20	3.4	27.6	13.8	41.4	13.8	2.66	
	>20	--	22.2	7.4	66.7	3.7	2.48	

TABLE C. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Evaluators for Teacher Evaluation by Type of School (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	High	50.0	45.0	5.0	--	--	4.45
	Central High	73.7	15.8	10.5	--	--	4.63
	Junior High	54.5	45.5	--	--	--	4.55
	All-Grade	65.5	27.6	6.9	--	--	4.59
	Elementary	69.2	15.4	15.4	--	--	4.54
2.	High	19.0	28.6	28.6	9.5	14.3	3.29
	Central High	42.1	15.8	15.8	21.1	5.3	3.68
	Junior High	22.2	11.1	33.3	33.3	--	3.22
	All-Grade	22.2	48.1	22.2	7.4	--	3.85
	Elementary	23.1	15.4	30.8	23.1	7.7	3.23
3.	High	42.9	42.9	9.5	--	4.8	4.19
	Central High	50.0	30.0	10.0	10.0	--	4.20
	Junior High	36.4	36.4	18.2	--	9.1	3.91
	All-Grade	50.0	32.1	10.7	3.6	3.6	4.21
	Elementary	61.5	23.1	15.4	--	--	4.46
4.	High	26.3	52.6	5.3	5.3	10.5	3.79
	Central High	26.7	53.3	--	13.3	6.7	3.80
	Junior High	20.0	20.0	30.0	20.0	10.0	3.20
	All-Grade	26.9	38.5	7.7	11.5	15.4	3.50
	Elementary	18.2	36.4	18.2	9.1	18.2	3.27
5.	High	9.5	47.6	9.5	28.6	4.8	3.29
	Central High	11.1	33.3	11.1	38.9	5.6	3.06
	Junior High	18.2	36.4	18.2	27.3	--	3.45
	All-Grade	3.4	37.9	24.1	24.1	10.3	3.00
	Elementary	8.3	25.0	8.3	33.3	25.0	2.58
6.	High	57.1	42.9	--	--	--	4.57
	Central High	66.7	16.7	--	5.6	11.1	4.22
	Junior High	54.5	36.4	--	9.1	--	4.36
	All-Grade	58.6	34.5	6.9	--	--	4.52
	Elementary	38.5	53.8	--	7.7	--	4.23
7.	High	9.5	52.4	23.8	14.3	--	3.57
	Central High	5.6	44.4	22.2	22.2	5.6	3.22
	Junior High	--	36.4	9.1	45.5	9.1	2.73
	All-Grade	6.9	41.4	24.1	24.1	3.4	3.24
	Elementary	16.7	33.3	16.7	33.3	--	3.33

(continued)

TABLE C. (continued)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Percent of Respondents</u>					<u>Mean</u>
		<u>Always</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	
8.	High	--	38.1	28.6	23.8	9.5	2.95
	Central High	--	33.3	16.7	44.4	5.6	2.78
	Junior High	--	--	18.2	72.7	9.1	2.09
	All-Grade	3.6	17.9	35.7	39.3	3.6	2.79
	Elementary	--	25.0	8.3	58.3	8.3	2.50

TABLE D. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Evaluators for Teacher Evaluation by Community Population (N=102)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Percent of Respondents</u>					<u>Mean</u>
		<u>Always</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	
1.	<5000	60.0	32.3	7.7	--	--	4.52
	>5000	59.3	33.3	7.4	--	--	4.52
	Metro St. John's	50.0	50.0	--	--	--	4.50
2.	<5000	21.9	40.6	20.3	10.9	6.3	3.61
	>5000	26.9	7.7	30.8	30.8	3.8	3.23
	Metro St. John's	40.0	20.0	40.0	--	--	4.00
3.	<5000	47.0	36.4	10.6	3.0	3.0	4.21
	>5000	51.9	25.9	14.8	3.7	3.7	4.19
	Metro St. John's	33.3	66.7	--	--	--	4.33
4.	<5000	22.4	48.3	6.9	10.3	12.1	3.59
	>5000	33.3	33.3	9.5	14.3	9.5	3.67
	Metro St. John's	16.7	33.3	33.3	--	16.7	3.33
5.	<5000	6.2	35.4	18.5	30.8	9.2	2.99
	>5000	15.4	38.5	11.5	26.9	7.7	3.27
	Metro St. John's	16.7	50.0	16.7	16.7	--	3.67
6.	<5000	56.9	33.8	3.1	3.1	3.1	4.38
	>5000	59.3	33.8	3.7	3.7	--	4.48
	Metro St. John's	50.0	50.0	--	--	--	4.50

(continued)

TABLE D. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
7.	<5000	6.2	47.7	21.5	21.5	3.1	3.32
	>5000	15.4	26.9	23.1	34.6	--	3.23
	Metro St. John's	--	66.7	--	16.7	16.7	3.17
8.	<5000	1.6	29.7	26.6	34.4	7.8	2.83
	>5000	--	19.2	19.2	57.7	3.8	2.54
	Metro St. John's	--	33.3	--	66.7	--	2.67

TABLE A. Frequency of use for Present Practices of
Characteristics of Evaluators for Teacher
Evaluation by Sex (N=102)

Item	<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Percent of Respondents</u>					<u>Mean</u>
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	Male	18.0	34.0	22.0	24.0	2.0	3.42
	Female	22.4	18.4	22.4	32.7	4.1	3.22
2.	Male	18.0	44.0	24.0	12.0	4.0	3.56
	Female	30.0	28.0	22.0	14.0	6.0	3.62
3.	Male	8.0	34.0	22.0	22.0	14.0	3.00
	Female	6.1	28.6	28.6	16.3	20.4	2.84
4.	Male	64.0	22.0	2.0	--	12.0	4.26
	Female	60.0	26.0	2.0	4.0	8.0	4.26
5.	Male	30.0	40.0	22.0	6.0	2.0	3.90
	Female	31.4	43.1	13.7	3.9	7.8	3.86
6.	Male	8.0	16.0	34.0	34.0	8.0	2.82
	Female	3.9	17.6	25.5	37.3	15.7	2.57
7.	Male	14.0	20.0	28.0	16.0	22.0	2.88
	Female	10.2	28.6	22.4	14.3	24.5	2.86
8.	Male	22.0	44.0	16.0	4.0	14.0	3.56
	Female	36.7	30.6	6.1	10.2	16.3	3.61
9.	Male	14.0	32.0	30.0	16.0	8.0	3.28
	Female	16.0	34.0	32.0	12.0	6.0	3.42
10.	Male	20.0	54.0	16.0	2.0	8.0	3.76
	Female	28.0	50.0	12.0	4.0	6.0	3.90
11.	Male	24.0	48.0	18.0	6.0	4.0	3.82
	Female	32.0	46.0	14.0	3.0	6.0	3.96

TABLE B. Frequency of use for Present Practices of
Characteristics of Evaluators for Teacher
Evaluation by Years Teaching (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<10	22.7	25.0	22.7	27.3	2.3	3.39
	11-20	22.2	25.9	18.5	25.9	7.4	3.30
	>20	14.3	28.6	25.0	32.1	--	3.25
2.	<10	27.9	34.9	25.6	9.3	2.3	3.77
	11-20	27.6	31.0	20.7	10.3	10.3	3.55
	>20	10.7	42.9	21.4	21.4	3.6	3.36
3.	<10	9.3	23.3	23.3	20.9	23.3	2.74
	11-20	3.4	37.9	24.1	13.8	20.7	2.90
	>20	7.4	37.0	29.6	22.2	3.7	3.22
4.	<10	54.5	27.3	2.3	--	15.9	4.05
	11-20	75.0	14.3	--	3.6	7.1	4.46
	>20	60.7	28.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	4.39
5.	<10	34.1	43.2	13.6	2.3	6.8	3.95
	11-20	37.9	41.4	6.9	6.9	6.9	3.97
	>20	17.9	39.3	35.7	7.1	--	3.68
6.	<10	4.5	22.7	27.3	34.1	11.4	2.75
	11-20	6.9	17.2	27.6	27.6	20.7	2.62
	>20	7.1	7.1	35.7	46.4	3.6	2.68
7.	<10	11.9	21.4	26.2	9.5	31.0	2.74
	11-20	10.3	31.0	24.1	17.2	17.2	3.00
	>20	14.3	21.4	25.0	21.4	17.9	2.93
8.	<10	30.2	34.9	11.6	2.3	20.9	3.51
	11-20	41.4	37.9	3.4	6.9	10.3	3.93
	>20	14.8	40.7	18.5	14.8	11.1	3.33
9.	<10	18.6	27.9	34.9	14.0	4.7	3.42
	11-20	13.8	41.4	17.2	17.2	10.3	3.31
	>20	10.7	32.1	39.3	10.7	7.1	3.29
10.	<10	25.6	58.1	9.3	2.3	4.7	3.98
	11-20	31.0	44.8	10.3	3.4	10.3	3.83
	>20	14.3	50.0	25.0	3.6	7.1	3.61

(continued)

TABLE B. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
11.	<10	32.6	48.8	11.6	2.3	4.7	4.02
	11-20	34.5	48.3	3.4	3.4	10.3	3.93
	>20	14.3	42.9	35.7	7.1	--	3.64

TABLE C. Frequency of use for Present Practices of Characteristics of Evaluators for Teacher Evaluation by Type of School (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	High	31.8	22.7	27.3	18.2	--	3.68
	Central High	20.0	15.0	25.0	40.0	--	3.15
	Junior High	--	36.4	27.3	36.4	--	3.00
	All-Grade	24.1	27.6	13.8	27.6	6.9	3.34
	Elementary	10.0	30.0	40.0	20.0	--	3.30
2.	High	22.7	45.5	18.2	9.1	4.5	3.73
	Central High	40.0	30.0	10.0	20.0	--	3.90
	Junior High	--	54.5	27.3	18.2	--	3.36
	All-Grade	14.3	28.6	35.7	14.3	7.1	3.29
	Elementary	33.3	16.7	33.3	8.3	8.3	3.58
3.	High	4.5	40.9	27.3	13.6	13.6	3.09
	Central High	5.3	31.6	31.6	21.1	10.5	3.00
	Junior High	9.1	36.4	18.2	18.2	18.2	3.00
	All-Grade	10.7	17.9	25.0	21.4	25.0	2.68
	Elementary	8.3	33.3	25.0	16.7	16.7	3.00
4.	High	57.1	28.6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.29
	Central High	80.0	15.0	--	--	5.0	4.65
	Junior High	72.7	18.2	--	--	9.1	4.45
	All-Grade	48.3	34.5	3.4	--	13.8	4.03
	Elementary	75.0	16.7	--	8.3	--	4.58

(continued)

TABLE C. (continued)

...216

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
5.	High	36.4	40.9	4.5	13.6	4.5	3.91
	Central High	45.0	40.0	10.0	5.0	--	4.25
	Junior High	18.2	63.6	9.1	9.1	--	3.90
	All-Grade	20.7	34.5	37.9	--	6.9	3.62
	Elementary	25.0	50.0	16.7	--	8.3	3.83
6.	High	9.1	18.2	13.6	54.5	4.5	2.73
	Central High	10.0	15.0	30.0	25.0	20.0	2.70
	Junior High	--	18.0	36.4	45.0	--	2.73
	All-Grade	3.4	17.2	34.5	31.0	13.8	2.66
	Elementary	--	16.7	41.7	25.0	16.7	2.58
7.	High	13.6	27.3	18.2	13.6	27.3	2.87
	Central High	15.0	30.0	20.0	10.2	25.0	3.00
	Junior High	--	36.4	27.3	27.3	9.1	2.91
	All-Grade	11.1	22.2	25.9	14.8	25.9	2.77
	Elementary	16.7	16.7	33.3	16.7	16.9	3.00
8.	High	31.8	36.4	13.6	9.1	9.1	3.73
	Central High	45.0	25.0	10.2	10.0	10.0	3.85
	Junior High	18.2	45.5	--	18.2	18.2	3.27
	All-Grade	14.8	51.9	11.1	--	22.2	3.37
	Elementary	41.7	33.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	3.92
9.	High	18.2	27.3	40.9	9.1	4.5	3.45
	Central High	15.0	40.0	30.0	10.0	5.0	3.50
	Junior High	9.1	27.3	36.4	27.3	--	3.18
	All-Grade	14.3	32.1	32.1	14.3	7.1	3.32
	Elementary	8.3	50.0	16.7	16.7	8.3	3.33
10.	High	36.4	36.4	9.1	4.5	13.6	3.77
	Central High	30.0	50.0	15.0	--	5.0	4.00
	Junior High	18.2	72.7	--	9.1	--	4.00
	All-Grade	10.7	60.7	17.9	3.6	7.1	3.64
	Elementary	16.7	58.3	25.0	--	--	3.92
11.	High	27.3	45.5	18.2	9.1	--	3.91
	Central High	40.0	45.0	15.0	--	--	4.25
	Junior High	18.2	63.6	9.1	9.1	--	3.91
	All-Grade	25.0	42.9	17.9	3.6	10.7	3.68
	Elementary	16.7	58.3	16.7	--	8.3	3.75

TABLE D. Frequency of use for Present Practices of
Characteristics of Evaluators for Teacher
Evaluation by Community Population (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<5000	25.8	22.7	22.7	25.8	3.0	3.42
	>5000	11.1	33.3	18.5	33.3	3.7	3.14
	Metro St. John's	--	33.3	33.3	33.3	--	3.00
2.	<5000	22.7	36.4	24.3	13.6	3.0	3.62
	>5000	28.6	39.3	10.7	10.7	10.7	3.64
	Metro St. John's	--	16.7	66.7	16.7	--	3.00
3.	<5000	6.2	33.8	23.1	20.0	16.9	2.92
	>5000	7.1	21.4	35.7	17.9	17.9	2.82
	Metro St. John's	16.7	50.0	--	16.7	16.7	3.33
4.	<5000	62.1	22.7	3.0	--	12.1	4.23
	>5000	60.7	25.0	--	7.1	7.1	4.25
	Metro St. John's	66.7	33.3	--	--	--	4.67
5.	<5000	32.8	41.8	17.9	3.0	4.5	3.96
	>5000	28.6	39.3	14.3	10.7	7.1	3.71
	Metro St. John's	16.7	50.0	33.3	--	--	3.83
6.	<5000	9.0	20.9	28.4	32.8	9.0	2.88
	>5000	--	7.1	35.7	39.3	17.9	2.32
	Metro St. John's	--	16.7	16.7	50.0	16.7	2.33
7.	<5000	15.4	23.1	30.8	12.3	18.5	3.04
	>5000	7.1	25.0	14.3	17.9	35.7	2.50
	Metro St. John's	--	33.3	16.7	33.3	16.7	2.67
8.	<5000	34.8	36.4	13.6	3.0	12.1	3.79
	>5000	22.2	40.7	7.4	18.5	11.1	3.44
	Metro St. John's	--	33.3	--	--	66.7	2.00
9.	<5000	19.7	30.0	33.3	12.1	4.5	3.48
	>5000	7.1	39.3	25.0	17.9	10.7	3.14
	Metro St. John's	--	33.3	33.3	16.7	16.7	2.83
10.	<5000	27.3	51.5	13.6	1.5	6.1	3.92
	>5000	21.4	50.0	14.3	7.1	7.1	3.71
	Metro St. John's	--	66.7	16.7	--	16.7	3.33
11.	<5000	31.8	48.5	13.6	1.5	4.5	4.02
	>5000	21.4	42.9	17.9	10.7	7.1	3.61
	Metro St. John's	16.7	50.0	33.3	--	--	3.83

TABLE A. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Characteristics of Evaluators for Teacher Evaluation by Sex (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	Male	64.7	35.3	--	--	--	4.65
	Female	56.3	39.6	2.1	--	2.1	4.48
2.	Male	72.0	22.0	6.0	--	--	4.66
	Female	70.0	30.0	--	--	--	4.70
3.	Male	6.0	18.0	14.0	56.0	6.0	2.62
	Female	8.3	14.6	29.2	39.6	8.3	2.75
4.	Male	94.1	3.9	--	--	2.0	4.88
	Female	93.9	6.1	--	--	--	4.94
5.	Male	92.2	7.8	--	--	--	4.92
	Female	88.0	12.0	--	--	--	4.88
6.	Male	52.0	46.0	2.0	--	--	4.48
	Female	56.0	36.0	--	--	8.0	4.32
7.	Male	56.9	33.3	2.0	2.0	5.9	4.33
	Female	59.2	28.6	8.2	2.0	2.0	4.40
8.	Male	84.3	9.8	2.0	--	3.9	4.71
	Female	89.6	8.3	--	--	2.1	4.83
9.	Male	76.0	20.0	4.0	--	--	4.72
	Female	77.1	16.7	4.2	--	2.1	4.67
10.	Male	90.2	7.8	2.0	--	2.0	4.84
	Female	91.8	6.1	--	--	--	4.90
11.	Male	90.0	8.0	--	--	2.0	4.84
	Female	91.8	6.1	--	--	2.0	4.86

TABLE D. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of
Characteristics of Evaluators for Teacher
Evaluation by Years Teaching (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<10	59.5	38.1	2.4	--	--	4.57
	11-20	58.6	37.9	--	--	3.4	4.48
	>20	64.3	35.7	--	--	--	4.64
2.	<10	69.8	27.9	2.3	--	--	4.67
	11-20	76.7	20.0	3.3	--	--	4.73
	>20	66.7	29.6	3.7	--	--	4.63
3.	<10	7.0	7.0	18.6	58.1	9.3	2.44
	11-20	--	28.6	35.7	25.0	10.7	2.82
	>20	14.8	18.5	11.1	55.6	--	2.93
4.	<10	86.0	11.6	--	--	2.3	4.79
	11-20	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00
	>20	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00
5.	<10	90.7	9.3	--	--	--	4.91
	11-20	93.3	6.7	--	--	--	4.93
	>20	85.7	14.3	--	--	--	4.86
6.	<10	55.8	39.5	--	--	4.7	4.42
	11-20	51.7	41.4	--	--	6.9	4.31
	>20	53.6	42.9	--	3.6	--	4.46
7.	<10	66.7	26.2	7.1	--	--	4.60
	11-20	66.7	23.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	4.47
	>20	35.7	46.4	3.6	3.6	10.7	3.93
8.	<10	90.5	7.1	--	--	2.4	4.83
	11-20	86.7	10.0	--	--	3.3	4.77
	>20	81.5	11.1	3.7	--	3.7	4.67
9.	<10	76.2	21.4	2.4	--	--	4.74
	11-20	75.9	17.2	3.4	--	3.4	4.62
	>20	77.8	14.8	7.4	--	--	4.70
10.	<10	90.5	9.5	--	--	--	4.90
	11-20	93.3	3.3	3.3	--	--	4.90
	>20	89.3	7.1	--	--	3.6	4.79

(continued)

TABLE B. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
11.	<10	88.1	11.9	--	--	--	4.88
	11-20	96.7	--	--	--	3.3	4.87
	>20	88.9	7.4	--	--	3.7	4.78

TABLE C. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Characteristics of Evaluators for Teacher Evaluation by Type of School (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	High	71.4	23.8	--	--	4.8	4.57
	Central High	50.0	45.0	5.0	--	--	4.45
	Junior High	66.7	33.3	--	--	--	4.67
	All-Grade	65.5	34.5	--	--	--	4.66
	Elementary	46.2	53.8	--	--	--	4.46
2.	High	85.0	15.0	--	--	--	4.85
	Central High	75.0	20.0	5.0	--	--	4.70
	Junior High	72.7	27.3	--	--	--	4.73
	All-Grade	62.1	31.0	6.9	--	--	4.55
	Elementary	61.5	38.5	--	--	--	4.62
3.	High	--	23.8	19.0	57.1	--	2.67
	Central High	10.5	15.8	21.1	36.8	15.8	2.68
	Junior High	--	9.1	27.3	54.5	9.1	2.36
	All-Grade	14.3	10.7	17.9	53.6	3.6	2.79
	Elementary	8.3	25.0	25.0	33.0	8.3	2.92
4.	High	95.0	5.0	--	--	--	4.95
	Central High	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00
	Junior High	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00
	All-Grade	86.2	13.8	--	--	--	4.86
	Elementary	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00

(continued)

TABLE C. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
5.	High	90.5	9.5	--	--	--	4.90
	Central High	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00
	Junior High	90.9	9.1	--	--	--	4.91
	All-Grade	86.2	13.8	--	--	--	4.86
	Elementary	84.6	15.4	--	--	--	4.85
6.	High	57.1	38.1	--	4.8	--	4.48
	Central High	40.0	50.0	--	--	10.0	4.10
	Junior High	72.7	18.2	--	--	9.1	4.45
	All-Grade	53.6	46.4	--	--	--	4.54
	Elementary	53.8	38.5	--	--	7.7	4.31
7.	High	66.7	23.8	4.8	--	4.8	4.48
	Central High	80.0	20.0	--	--	--	4.80
	Junior High	72.7	18.2	--	9.1	--	4.55
	All-Grade	39.3	42.9	10.7	3.6	3.6	4.11
	Elementary	46.2	38.5	7.7	--	7.7	4.15
8.	High	95.2	4.8	--	--	--	4.95
	Central High	95.0	5.0	--	--	--	4.95
	Junior High	90.9	--	--	--	9.1	4.64
	All-Grade	81.5	14.8	3.7	--	--	4.78
	Elementary	84.6	15.4	--	--	--	4.85
9.	High	75.0	25.0	--	--	--	4.75
	Central High	85.0	15.0	--	--	--	4.85
	Junior High	70.0	30.0	--	--	--	4.70
	All-Grade	72.4	24.1	3.4	--	--	4.69
	Elementary	66.7	--	25.0	--	8.3	4.17
10.	High	95.2	--	--	--	4.8	4.81
	Central High	95.0	5.0	--	--	--	4.95
	Junior High	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00
	All-Grade	78.6	21.4	--	--	--	4.79
	Elementary	92.3	--	7.1	--	--	4.85
11.	High	90.5	4.8	--	--	4.8	4.76
	Central High	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00
	Junior High	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00
	All-Grade	78.6	21.4	--	--	--	4.79
	Elementary	92.3	--	--	--	7.7	4.69

TABLE D. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Characteristics of Evaluators for Teacher Evaluation by Community Population (N=101)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<5000	65.7	32.8	--	--	1.5	4.61
	>5000	48.1	48.1	3.7	--	--	4.44
	Metro St. John's	75.0	25.0	--	--	--	4.75
2.	<5000	71.6	23.9	4.5	--	--	4.67
	>5000	73.1	26.9	--	--	--	4.73
	Metro St. John's	50.0	50.0	--	--	--	4.50
3.	<5000	7.7	18.5	20.0	47.7	6.2	2.74
	>5000	7.7	11.5	19.2	50.0	11.5	2.54
	Metro St. John's	--	--	50.0	50.0	--	2.50
4.	<5000	90.9	7.6	--	--	1.5	4.86
	>5000	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00
	Metro St. John's	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00
5.	<5000	88.1	11.9	--	--	--	4.88
	>5000	92.6	7.4	--	--	--	4.93
	Metro St. John's	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00
6.	<5000	50.0	48.5	--	--	1.5	4.45
	>5000	63.0	25.9	--	3.7	7.4	4.33
	Metro St. John's	66.7	16.7	--	--	16.7	4.17
7.	<5000	57.6	34.8	4.5	1.5	1.5	4.45
	>5000	59.3	22.2	7.4	--	11.1	4.18
	Metro St. John's	66.7	16.7	--	16.7	--	4.33
8.	<5000	86.4	10.6	1.5	--	1.5	4.80
	>5000	88.5	7.7	--	--	3.8	4.77
	Metro St. John's	83.3	--	--	--	16.7	4.33
9.	<5000	76.1	20.9	3.0	--	--	4.73
	>5000	76.0	12.0	8.0	--	4.0	4.56
	Metro St. John's	80.0	20.0	--	--	--	4.80
10.	<5000	89.4	10.6	--	--	--	4.89
	>5000	92.6	--	3.7	--	3.7	4.78
	Metro St. John's	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00
11.	<5000	89.4	10.6	--	--	--	4.89
	>5000	92.3	--	--	--	7.7	4.69
	Metro St. John's	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00

TABLE A Frequency of use for Present Practices of Organizational Context for Teacher Evaluation by Sex (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	Male	50.0	30.0	10.0	6.0	4.0	4.16
	Female	56.9	23.5	9.8	3.9	5.9	4.22
2.	Male	18.4	8.2	30.6	24.5	18.4	2.84
	Female	14.0	20.0	30.0	10.0	26.0	2.86
3.	Male	16.0	44.0	26.0	6.0	8.0	3.54
	Female	14.0	44.0	16.0	10.0	16.0	3.30
4.	Male	22.0	42.0	28.0	8.0	--	3.78
	Female	19.6	35.3	23.5	19.6	2.0	3.51

TABLE B. Frequency of use for Present Practices of Organizational Context for Teacher Evaluation by Years Teaching (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<10	47.7	31.8	9.1	6.8	4.5	4.11
	11-20	51.7	24.1	13.8	3.4	6.9	4.10
	>20	64.3	21.4	7.1	3.6	3.6	4.39
2.	<10	7.1	14.3	33.3	14.3	31.0	2.52
	11-20	20.7	17.2	24.1	17.2	20.7	3.00
	>20	25.0	10.7	32.1	21.4	10.7	3.18
3.	<10	14.0	41.9	18.6	7.0	18.6	3.26
	11-20	20.7	37.9	24.1	10.3	6.9	3.55
	>20	10.7	53.6	31.4	7.1	7.1	3.54
4.	<10	18.2	38.6	27.3	13.6	2.3	3.57
	11-20	20.7	41.4	20.7	17.2	--	3.66
	>20	25.0	35.7	28.6	10.7	--	3.75

TABLE C. Frequency of use for Present Practices of
Organizational Context for Teacher
Evaluation by Type of School (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	High	50.0	27.3	13.6	4.5	4.5	4.14
	Central High	60.0	35.0	--	--	5.0	4.45
	Junior High	72.7	18.0	9.1	--	--	4.64
	All-Grade	37.9	31.0	13.8	10.3	6.9	3.83
	Elementary	75.0	16.7	8.3	--	--	4.67
2.	High	31.8	22.7	13.6	27.3	4.5	3.50
	Central High	15.8	--	36.8	5.3	42.1	2.42
	Junior High	18.2	9.1	36.4	18.2	18.2	2.91
	All-Grade	3.6	14.3	32.1	25.0	25.0	2.46
	Elementary	16.7	25.0	33.3	--	25.0	3.08
3.	High	18.2	31.8	22.7	18.2	9.1	3.32
	Central High	20.0	55.0	15.0	5.0	5.0	3.80
	Junior High	9.1	54.5	18.2	--	18.2	3.36
	All-Grade	7.1	39.3	25.0	10.7	17.9	3.07
	Elementary	25.0	50.0	16.7	--	8.3	3.83
4.	High	36.4	36.4	9.1	18.2	--	3.91
	Central High	35.0	30.0	25.0	10.0	--	3.90
	Junior High	18.2	9.1	45.5	27.3	--	3.18
	All-Grade	6.9	44.8	34.5	10.3	3.4	3.41
	Elementary	--	58.3	25.0	16.7	--	3.42

TABLE D. Frequency of use for Present Practices of
Organizational Context for Teacher
Evaluation by Community Population (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<5000	47.8	29.9	11.9	6.0	4.5	4.10
	>5000	67.9	21.4	3.6	3.6	3.6	4.46
	Metro St. John's	50.0	16.7	16.7	--	16.7	3.83

(continued)

TABLE D. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
2.	<5000	16.9	15.4	29.2	20.0	18.5	2.92
	>5000	17.9	14.3	28.6	10.7	28.6	2.82
	Metro St. John's	--	--	50.0	16.7	33.3	2.17
3.	<5000	19.7	39.4	22.7	9.1	9.1	3.52
	>5000	7.1	57.1	14.3	3.6	17.9	3.32
	Metro St. John's	--	33.3	33.3	16.7	16.7	2.83
4.	<5000	23.9	41.8	22.4	10.4	1.5	3.76
	>5000	17.9	39.3	32.1	10.7	--	3.64
	Metro St. John's	--	--	33.3	66.7	--	2.33

TABLE A. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Organizational Context for Teacher Evaluation by Sex (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	Male	94.1	5.9	--	--	--	4.94
	Female	98.0	2.0	--	--	--	4.98
2.	Male	82.0	16.0	2.0	--	--	4.80
	Female	76.0	16.0	4.0	--	4.0	4.60
3.	Male	56.0	40.0	2.0	--	2.0	4.48
	Female	55.1	34.7	8.2	2.0	--	4.43
4.	Male	78.4	21.6	--	--	--	4.78
	Female	82.4	17.6	--	--	--	4.82

TABLE B. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of Organizational Context for Teacher Evaluation by Years Teaching (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<10	97.7	2.3	--	--	--	4.98
	11-20	93.3	6.7	--	--	--	4.93
	>20	96.4	3.6	--	--	--	4.96
2.	<10	69.0	23.8	4.8	--	2.4	4.57
	11-20	86.7	10.0	--	--	3.3	4.77
	>20	85.7	10.7	3.6	--	--	4.82
3.	<10	64.3	33.3	--	2.4	--	4.60
	11-20	50.0	40.0	10.0	--	--	4.40
	>20	48.1	40.7	7.4	--	3.7	4.30
4.	<10	79.5	30.5	--	--	--	4.80
	11-20	80.0	20.0	--	--	--	4.80
	>20	82.1	17.9	--	--	--	4.82

TABLE C. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of
Organizational Context for Teacher
Evaluation by Type of School (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	High	95.2	4.8	--	--	--	4.95
	Central High	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00
	Junior High	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00
	All-Grade	96.6	3.4	--	--	--	4.97
	Elementary	84.6	15.4	--	--	--	4.85
2.	High	81.0	19.0	--	--	--	4.81
	Central High	78.9	5.3	10.5	--	5.3	4.53
	Junior High	90.0	9.1	--	--	--	4.91
	All-Grade	79.3	17.2	3.4	--	--	4.76
	Elementary	76.9	15.4	--	--	7.7	4.54
3.	High	45.0	45.0	10.0	--	--	4.35
	Central High	70.0	30.0	--	--	--	4.70
	Junior High	72.7	27.3	--	--	--	4.73
	All-Grade	57.1	39.3	--	3.6	--	4.50
	Elementary	46.2	30.8	23.1	--	--	4.23
4.	High	90.9	9.1	--	--	--	4.91
	Central High	90.0	10.0	--	--	--	4.90
	Junior High	90.9	9.1	--	--	--	4.91
	All-Grade	75.9	24.1	--	--	--	4.76
	Elementary	61.5	38.5	--	--	--	4.62

TABLE D. Frequency of use for Preferred Practices of
Organizational Context for Teacher
Evaluation by Community Population (N=102)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know	
1.	<5000	97.0	3.0	--	--	--	4.97
	>5000	96.3	3.7	--	--	--	4.96
	Metro St. John's	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00

(continued)

TABLE D. (continued)

Item	Independent Variable	Percent of Respondents					Don't Know	Mean
		Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never			
2.	<5000	77.3	18.2	3.0	--	1.5	4.70	
	>5000	81.5	11.1	3.7	--	3.7	4.67	
	Metro St. John's	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00	
3.	<5000	55.4	40.0	3.1	1.5	--	4.49	
	>5000	55.6	29.6	11.1	--	3.7	4.33	
	Metro St. John's	66.7	33.3	--	--	--	4.67	
4.	<5000	79.1	20.9	--	--	--	4.79	
	>5000	82.1	17.9	--	--	--	4.82	
	Metro St. John's	100.0	--	--	--	--	5.00	



