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Problem

Most school administrators and teachers deem teacher evaluation systems to be extremely stressful, of little or no value, and a barrier to high staff morale. The purpose of this study was to investigate the current teacher evaluation policies and practices and the perceptions held toward these policies and practices by selected elementary and secondary teachers and their supervisors in the Adventist schools in Canada.

Method

The population of this study consisted of selected elementary and secondary teachers and their supervisors in the Adventist schools in Canada. Two hundred and
twenty-five teachers and 48 supervisors were surveyed. The survey instrument used in
the study was adapted from the one used by Hauge (1981). The instrument was designed
to reflect the teachers' evaluation policies and practices as perceived by elementary and
secondary teachers and their supervisors. The survey instrument and the cover letters
were sent to the supervisors and the teachers by first-class mail.

The 47 hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance using t-tests and
chi-square to determine whether a significant difference existed between variables by
comparing the group means and whether or not an association existed between variables
by calculating discrepancies between observed and expected cell frequencies,
respectively.

Results

The findings of this research study generally confirm that:

1. The supervisors thought they had a better knowledge of their teachers' teaching
capabilities than their teachers thought they had.

2. Both supervisors and teachers perceived the evaluation process to be a useful
one.

3. Both teachers and supervisors viewed the improvement of teaching
performance as the main purpose of performance evaluation.

4. While supervisors and teachers agreed in their perception concerning the
implementation of four basic components of the evaluation process, they disagreed on
another four. The general picture, however, indicates that supervisors tended to view
themselves as implementing the basic components of the evaluation process to a greater
extent than teachers viewed them as doing.
5. Most supervisors reported having had formal training in performance evaluation before and after assuming the supervisory role. Supervisors reported that they felt competent and at ease in the evaluator's role, and teachers concurred.

6. Both teachers and supervisors felt there was a need for more administrative assistance for supervisors so that they could have the time to conduct more frequent and more effective evaluations. They also felt that the evaluation process ought to include greater teacher involvement.

Conclusion

From this study it can be concluded that most teachers and supervisors in Adventist schools in Canada deemed teacher evaluation policies and practices to be helpful. As well it was not as stressful, nor of little value as reported in the literature and pertinent research studies.
To my
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

Mary anticipated her first evaluation as a teacher with anxiety, but her colleagues told her there was nothing to fear about the process. The Superintendent of Schools, who had to drive 3 hours to Mary's school, would come into her room unannounced one day, and stand in the back to observe her for 20 minutes at the most. If her students liked her, they would make her look good, waving their hands to answer questions and participating enthusiastically. That is exactly what happened, and she remembers the experience fondly. Her evaluation rating was satisfactory. The only criticism was that her window shades in her multi-grade classroom had not been at the same level. Did this experience improve Mary's teaching?

Principals and other administrators who evaluate teachers have high hopes for their roles (Drake & Roe, 1986; Greenfield, 1987). They want to exert leadership that supports successful instruction and curriculum, enables quality teacher performance, creates a school that functions as a learning community, and (ultimately) fosters pupil growth and achievement in knowledge, skills, and attitudes. It is clear to practitioners and scholars alike that the principal can make these differences in school quality (National Association of State Boards of Education, 1984; Wiles & Bondi, 2000). A key role for
principal leadership is that of teacher evaluation. Although it is only one administrator's duty and only one part of the whole picture of school operation, teacher evaluation is a central educational function. In this important school role, no other player has such a range of involvement, as does the principal and/or superintendent. No other single participant can tip the balance between perfunctory, non-effective teacher evaluation and practices that foster the best in teacher performance, student learning, and school well being.

It is important to emphasize the potential good of the administrator's role in teacher evaluation. However, it is also necessary to recognize that in the real world, few tasks diminish leadership opportunities like teacher evaluation. Administrators face conflicting roles, instances of overwhelming demands of time, behind-the-scenes power struggles, and feelings of frustration. Scarce administrator time and influence can be squandered by ritualistic, required classroom visits and conferences that neither administrators nor teachers respect (Johnson, 1990; Kauchak, Peterson, & Driscoll, 1985; Lortie, 1975).

The Problem

The Seventh-day Adventist Church operates one of the largest, worldwide protestant Christian education systems ranging from preschool through university level. According to Seventh-day Adventist Education – World Statistics (2001, p. 15) there are a total of 1,065,092 students preschool through university enrolled in 6,064 schools. Of that total, 732,698 are elementary students and 257,937 are secondary students enrolled in 5,935 schools. Of these schools, sixty-seven are located in Canada.
The Seventh-day Adventist Church recognizes that quality education is important if its youth are to receive training that makes them effective workers in both the church and public sectors.

It is also recognized that education is a complex task in which the teacher plays a significant role. The Adventist view of the teacher as the key person in the education of children is supported by White (1943) in the statement that "to the teacher is committed a most important work... work upon which he should never enter without careful and thorough preparation. He should feel the sacredness of his calling, and give himself to it with zeal and devotion" (p. 229). Therefore, each teacher in the Adventist church school system is considered to be an educational resource person who should provide the best possible education for each student. To facilitate this, an effective program of supervision of instruction is important.

The General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists Manual For Supervision in Seventh-day Adventist Schools (1985) defines supervision as "an on-going, participating, diagnostic and cooperative process or transaction between the supervisor and the teacher. It provides new insights and practices which are aimed at improving instruction that ultimately have an effect on the learning of students" (p. 7).

Evaluation of teachers is a growing concern in education. Both the public and parochial school systems are pressured from all sides to evaluate teachers. Hence, the need for evaluation of teachers is not limited to Adventist schools only. Janet Ecker, Ontario Education Minister observes that an excellent teacher can make a difference to a child's education. She also indicated that one of her goals is to ensure that every teacher standing in front of a classroom in Ontario is as good as he or she can be (Ray, 2000).
According to Alberta Learning (2001) the approach to teacher development and supervision recently mandated in Alberta aims to ensure that each teacher's actions, judgments, and decisions are in the best educational interests of students and support optimum learning. The article stated that the evaluation system should give teachers useful feedback on classroom needs, the opportunity for teachers to learn new teaching techniques, and should obtain counsel from principals and other teachers on how to make changes in their classrooms.

With this view of the teacher's role in the educational process of children, the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Canada, Office of Education charges each educational administrator, the principal and superintendents to provide leadership that will enable each teacher to grow professionally so as to improve instruction in the classroom. One of the ways by which the principal and/or superintendent can help a teacher improve instruction is to observe him or her in the classroom and then provide constructive feedback. On this point, Hauge (1981) stated:

The observation of the classroom instruction is a component of the process to instructional improvement. The evaluation of teaching requires certain skills, knowledge and abilities on the part of the administrator. (p. 30)

The research on teacher evaluation however, shows that there are problems with current direction and practice. According to Peterson (2000) teachers mistrust evaluation and they feel that current evaluation procedures fall short of collecting information that accurately characterizes their performance. Furthermore, they perceive that the ratings they receive are based more on the idiosyncrasies of the evaluator than on their own behavior in the classroom.
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To assist evaluators in the task of evaluating teachers, an inquiry into how evaluators perceive current direction and practice can serve as a means of feedback on their performance. Such an inquiry, according to the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Canada, Office of Education, has not been done on its teachers and administrators. This researcher, therefore, has undertaken the task of making such an inquiry.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the current practices of teacher evaluation and the perceptions held toward those practices by teachers and their supervisors (the person, principal, or superintendent who completes formal evaluation of teachers) in the Adventist elementary and secondary schools in Canada.

**Research Questions**

1. To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the supervisor's knowledge of their teachers' teaching capabilities and the sources that gave the most influential information about the quality of teachers' teaching performance?

2. To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the usefulness of the evaluation process?

3. To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the main purpose of evaluation of teaching performance?
4. To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning knowledge of current teacher evaluation processes (i.e., classroom observation, instruments used, criteria used, and follow-up procedures)?

5. To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the supervisors’ level of competence and how at ease they feel in some of their administrative roles?

6. What steps do teachers and supervisors recommend for improving the evaluation of teachers’ teaching performance in Adventist schools in Canada?

7. What formal training in evaluation of teaching performance did supervisors acquire before becoming evaluators of teachers’ teaching performance?

8. What formal training in evaluation of teaching performance did supervisors acquire since becoming evaluators of teachers’ teaching performance?

Assumptions

The following assumptions underlie this study:

1. Evaluation practices are not standard across Adventist schools in Canada.

2. The respondents answered the surveys honestly and objectively.

3. Although retired principals and superintendents may not have evaluated teachers during the 1999-200 school year, it is assumed that their past experience would qualify them to participate in the study.
Delimitations

1. This study was delimited to Adventist elementary and secondary teachers and supervisors (the person—principal or superintendent—who completes formal evaluation of teachers) in the Adventist schools in Canada.

2. This study dealt with the congruency between the perceptions of teachers and supervisors with regard to the current teacher evaluation practices in the Adventist schools in Canada.

3. The study dealt with the classroom observation of teachers’ teaching performance for the 1999-2000 school year, with the proviso that teachers who participated in this study had taught at least 1 year or more in the Adventist schools in Canada.

4. The focus of this study is limited to formative evaluation practices that are concerned more with providing information, which helps the improvement of instruction and not summative evaluation.

Limitations

1. The conclusions drawn from this study may apply with meaningfulness only to Adventist schools in Canada.

2. Individual respondents may not have perceived each questionnaire item in the same manner. The total responses, however, should provide an acceptable representation of perceptions of the group.

3. In order to increase the number of supervisors (the person—principal or a superintendent—who completes formal evaluation of teachers) in the Adventist schools in Canada.
Canada, recently retired principals and superintendents were included in the sample, which may affect the accuracy of the data collected.

4. The study examines the perceptions held toward current teacher evaluation, and it is therefore limited to the interpretation of evaluation as perceived by the respondents.

**Rationale for the Study**

Teacher evaluation is one of the most controversial issues in education. It is a complex and highly debated subject that raises many diverse and difficult questions. In order for teachers to benefit from their evaluation, the process must be up-to-date with the changes that affect classroom instruction and education at large. This can be accomplished if the evaluators—the principal and others—utilize current research findings on teacher evaluation. On this point, Peterson (2000) stated:

> Those who design and use teacher evaluation systems should inform themselves about the research evidence already available and should resolve to keep abreast of the ongoing and current research on teacher evaluation. The evaluation of teachers is an extremely complex activity and the execution of this task in a professionally responsible and legally defensible manner requires great resources in professional expertise and time. (p. 9)

Various models of teacher evaluation have been identified in the literature.

1. Madeline Hunter (1976) believes teacher evaluation should be proactive rather than reactive and that the validity of evaluation depends on what happens before the evaluation. She sees evaluation as a way to show the teacher how to grow professionally rather than as just an obligatory part of the process.

2. Michael Scriven (1988) developed a duties-based approach to teacher evaluation. In his system, a district must first decide what a teacher is hired to do and then go about deciding whether it has been done adequately or with excellence. He
suggests that mentors and outside consultants can be used to provide teachers with assistance and professional growth.

3. Stanley and Popham (1988) developed a plan called “judgment-based teacher evaluation” as an option to the traditional teacher evaluation system. They are convinced that there is no escape from professional judgment in teacher evaluation, but that one can make the necessary decisions soundly and with a high degree of consistency if multiple data are collected and a high degree of objectivity is established. They call for inclusion of numerous sources: a minimum of three classroom observations by different observers, student evaluations, reviews of teacher prepared materials, and evidence of student growth.

4. Lee Schulman (1988) also believes that a combination of methods, i.e., portfolios (artifacts-materials), direct observation, better certification tests, and assessment centers, can compensate for the shortcomings of using one method alone. These methods also offer the advantage of reflecting on the richness and complexity of teaching.

What Is Teacher Evaluation?

Teacher evaluation is a complex process, which involves preparation, observation, data collection, reporting and follow-up. Data collection normally entails a formal observation, which is preceded by a pre-conference and followed by a post conference. Teacher evaluation can reassure teachers that they are doing a valuable, worthwhile, and a needed job, give security and status to well-functioning teachers, spread innovative educational ideas, and reassure the public that teachers are successfully contributing to society (Peterson, 2000).
Teacher evaluation, if not understood, can be characterized by an artificial and routine quality, which makes it a process that becomes an end in itself. In other words, evaluation may be used mainly as a disguised weapon for slashing budgets, for getting rid of militant or nonconformist teachers, or only for making decisions about certification or dismissal with just cause (Danielson, 2001). As legitimate as these purposes may be, they should not constitute the major purpose for evaluating teachers. It is easy to emphasize subsidiary reasons for evaluating teachers if there is no proper understanding of the process. Many authors have attempted various approaches to define evaluation.

Redfern (1963) stated:

Evaluation is a means to an end. It is a tool to help the teacher to become more competent in the performance of his duties and responsibilities. These duties and responsibilities must be continually evaluated in relationship to the primary task of the school that of improving learning opportunities for boys and girls. (p. 15)

Darling-Hammond, Wise, and Pease (1983) define teacher evaluation as collecting and using information to judge. Teacher evaluation has two major uses. On the one hand, assessment may be used as feedback to shape performance, build new practice, or alter existing practice. For example, if a school system institutes a system of assessment in order to encourage professional growth and development of teachers, it is engaged in formative evaluation. On the other hand, if a school system establishes an accountability system of evaluation in order to select teachers to license, hire, give tenure, promote, demote or dismiss, it is engaged in summative evaluation.

Most commentators argue that the same procedures, and information gathered using them, cannot be used for the two purposes. For instance, teachers who may well benefit from assessment for formative reasons will not expose their deficiencies if there is
a risk that summative judgments might be made about them on the basis of the
information obtained for formative purposes (Darling-Hammond et al., 1983; Stiggins &
Duke, 1990). Stiggins and Duke (1990) commented on the value of each of these two
types of evaluation from the point of view of their contribution to overall school quality:

Accountability systems strive to affect school quality by protecting students from
incompetent teachers. However, because nearly all teachers are at least minimally
competent, the accountability system directly affects only a very few teachers
who are not competent.
Thus, if our goal is to improve general school quality—and we use only those
strategies that affect a few teachers, overall school improvement is likely to be a
very slow process. Growth oriented systems, on the other hand, have the potential
of affecting all teachers—not just those few who are having problems. There is no
question that all teachers can improve some dimension(s) of their performance.
(p. 53)

The survey of teacher evaluation that was conducted by Stiggins and Duke (1990)
led them to suggest that there were several necessary conditions for the professional
growth and development of teacher evaluation to succeed. The first was that any
summative approach should remain largely independent of the formative approach. They
were not dismissive of summative evaluation, rather, they argued that highly developed
accountability-based evaluation protects teachers’ property and rights to due process and
protects the public from incompetent teachers.

Any attempt to define or to clarify the meaning of teacher evaluation should not
be taken for granted. Those who are evaluators of teaching performance need to
understand and broaden their views of what is involved in the process. On this point.
Rose and Nyre (1977) have stated:

The attempt to clarify the meaning of evaluation is not an idle exercise. It is of
major importance since no one has agreed upon a definition and the different
definitions people accept carry with them different advantages and disadvantages
each affecting the way in which evaluators approach and carry out their tasks.
(p. 7)
It is possible that a lack of consensus as to what constitutes teacher evaluation could be a contributing factor to the various problems that the process faces. When evaluators have different definitions of or views about teacher evaluation, they are bound to differ in their approaches to the task. With this kind of variation in teacher evaluation procedures, teachers tend to think, in general, that the evaluator's interest, not theirs, is served in the process.

**A Description of Evaluation Practices in Adventist Schools**

The supervision of instruction in Adventist schools poses unique challenges because of three problems inherent in the system:

1. Many conferences cover extensive geographic areas. This makes frequent visits especially from conference superintendents to classrooms difficult.

2. Unlike the public school system, Adventist supervisors often carry heavy administrative and/or teaching responsibilities that require a large percentage of their time.

3. Supervisory responsibilities are sometimes assigned to people whose experience and/or formal education has not prepared them to supervise instruction.

Grant Macaulay (1977), an authority on supervision in the Adventist school system, stated:

Many Adventist principals are reluctant to engage in evaluation because (1) they mistakenly feel that the goal of the process is to render a judgment about teacher competence, and (2) that they also fail to understand that evaluation is something that you do with a teacher, not to him or for him. (p. 7)

He also mentioned that because many Adventist teachers have never had their instructional performances evaluated by their supervisors, they view with suspicion the
supervisor's sporadic and sometimes inept attempts to evaluate their teaching
performance. He went on further to list six reasons that are most frequently advanced by
Adventist principals for not evaluating instruction. They are:

1. I don't have the time.
2. That's an instructional matter and not my problem.
3. My teachers are disturbed by evaluation. It lowers their morale.
4. Adventist schools are small and we are like a family. We are too close for
   evaluation.
5. Who am I to evaluate my teachers? They are just as good teachers as I am.
6. I don't know how to evaluate. (p. 7)

Ongwela's (1986) findings corroborate with Macaulay (1977). She observed that
principals in the Adventist schools in Michigan were not as involved in the process of
evaluation as they should be. The response from her study indicated “principals were
actually involved in only 18% of the schools” (p. 170).

Several people might be involved in classroom supervision in Adventist schools.
The improvement of instruction in K-12 schools is ultimately the responsibility of the
superintendent and requires supportive on-site supervision. The superintendent may have
one or more associates to whom is delegated a part or all of the responsibility for
supervision of instruction. The associate however, maintains communication with the
superintendent relative to the major recommendations resulting from supervisory visits.
Others, whose help might be solicited, especially when there are no associate
superintendents in the conference, include retired supervisors and master teachers who
are oriented to the current curriculum.

The principal in an academy or a large elementary school is responsible for
supervision of instruction. He or she works closely with conference personnel in
scheduling classroom visits and follows recommendations relative to the improvement of
instruction at his or her school.

Research Questions and Related Hypotheses

Following are the research questions and corresponding research hypotheses
associated with this study:

Research Question 1: To what degree is there congruence between the
perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the supervisors’
knowledge of their teachers’ teaching capabilities and the sources that gave the most
influential information about the quality of teachers’ teaching performance?

Hypothesis 1. There is a significant difference (or discrepancy) between teachers
and their supervisors (i.e., principals and superintendents) in their perceptions of the
extent to which supervisors know their teachers’ teaching capabilities.

Hypothesis 2. There is a significant difference between teachers and their
supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of using the students’ performance on
standardized tests as a source of information about the quality of teachers’ teaching
performance.

Hypothesis 3. There is a significant difference between teachers and their
supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of the supervisors using their intuition
as a source of information about the quality of teachers’ teaching performance.

Hypothesis 4. There is a significant difference between teachers and their
supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of the supervisors using their subjective
observation and evaluation as a source of information about the quality of their teachers’
teaching performance.
Hypothesis 5. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of supervisors using input from parents as a source of information about the quality of teachers' teaching performance.

Hypothesis 6. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of supervisors using input from students as a source of information about the quality of teachers' teaching performance.

Research Question 2: To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the usefulness of the evaluation process?

Hypothesis 7. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the real issues involved in the formal observation of teachers' teaching performance as it is presently conducted.

Research Question 3: To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the main purpose of evaluation of teaching performance?

Hypothesis 8. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions that one of the main purposes of evaluation is to ensure the integration of faith and learning.

Hypothesis 9. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions that one of the main purposes of evaluation is to distinguish between effective and ineffective teachers.
Hypothesis 10. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions that one of the main purposes of evaluation is to improve the quality of the teachers’ teaching performance.

Hypothesis 11. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions that one of the main purposes of evaluation is to maximize the learning opportunities for students.

Research Question 4: To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning knowledge of current teacher evaluation processes (i.e., classroom observation, instruments used, criteria used, and follow-up procedures)?

Knowledge concerning classroom observation is addressed by hypotheses 12-18.

Hypothesis 12. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how much time supervisors have to evaluate the teaching performance of their staff.

Hypothesis 13. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the main reasons for not observing and evaluating teachers’ as supervisors would like.

Hypothesis 14. There is a significant difference between probationary teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the frequency with which teachers are evaluated.

Hypothesis 15. There is a significant difference between regular teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the frequency with which teachers are evaluated.
Hypothesis 16. There is a significant difference between professional teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the frequency with which teachers are evaluated.

Hypothesis 17. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of their satisfaction with the frequency with which supervisors observed their teachers' teaching performance.

Hypothesis 18. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the length of time supervisors spend in observing teachers' teaching performance.

Knowledge concerning the instruments used in teacher evaluation is addressed by hypotheses 19 and 20.

Hypothesis 19. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how frequently a standardized form is used by their supervisors to evaluate teachers' teaching performance.

Hypothesis 20. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the kind of standard form supervisor's use to evaluate their teaching performance.

Knowledge concerning the criteria used to judge teaching performance is addressed by hypotheses 21-27.

Hypothesis 21. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of teachers' general appearance and bearing as it relates to their teachers' teaching performance.
Hypothesis 22. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of the quality of teachers' interaction with students as it relates to their teachers' teaching performance.

Hypothesis 23. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of teachers' use of behavioral objectives as it relates to their teachers' teaching performance.

Hypothesis 24. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of teachers' ability to control the class as it relates to their teachers' teaching performance.

Hypothesis 25. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of teachers' use of a variety of teaching materials as it relates to their teachers' teaching performance.

Hypothesis 26. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of teachers' verbal and writing skills as it relates to their teachers' teaching performance.

Hypothesis 27. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of teachers' ability to meet diverse needs of students as it relates to their teachers' teaching performance.

Knowledge concerning evaluation follow-up procedures is addressed by hypotheses 28-31.

Hypothesis 28. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the frequency of conducting a pre-observation conference during the formal observation of teaching performance.
Hypothesis 29. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the frequency post-observation evaluation conferences are conducted.

Hypothesis 30. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the time supervisors conduct post-observation evaluation conferences.

Hypothesis 31. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the actions that most often follow the supervisor's formal observation of teachers' teaching performance.

Research Question 5: To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the supervisors' level of competence and how at ease they feel in some of their administrative roles?

Hypothesis 32. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as disciplinarian—guiding the students through the difficulties of growth and demonstrating their sincere love and concern for their students' well-being.

Hypothesis 33. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as evaluator of teachers' teaching performance.

Hypothesis 34. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as manager of the school budget.
Hypothesis 35. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as spiritual leader of the school.

Hypothesis 36. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as director of school public relations.

Hypothesis 37. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as counselor of students.

Hypothesis 38. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as secretary of the school board.

Hypothesis 39. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as counselor of faculty and staff.

Hypothesis 40. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as director of school public relations.

Hypothesis 41. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as counselor of students.

Hypothesis 42. There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as
disciplinarian - guiding the students through the difficulties of growth and demonstrating their sincere love and concern for their students' well-being.

*Hypothesis 43.* There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as evaluator of teachers' teaching performance.

*Hypothesis 44.* There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as spiritual leader of the school.

*Hypothesis 45.* There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as manager of the school budget.

*Hypothesis 46.* There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as secretary of the school board.

*Hypothesis 47.* There is a significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as counselor to faculty and staff.

**Research Question 6:** What steps do teachers and supervisors recommend for improving the evaluation of teachers' teaching performance in Adventist schools in Canada?

**Research Question 7:** What formal training in evaluation of teaching performance did supervisors acquire before becoming evaluators of teachers' teaching performance?
Research Question 8: What formal training in evaluation of teaching performance did supervisors acquire since becoming evaluators of teachers' teaching performance?

Definitions of Terms

Formative Teacher Evaluation: An evaluation conducted primarily for the purpose of improving the teacher through identifying that teacher's strengths and weaknesses.

Local Conference: The Seventh-day Adventist denomination designates geographical areas, such as a group of provinces, as a local conference.

Probationary Teacher: A non-tenured teacher who has had prior teaching experience but has relocated to a new school.

Professional Employment Status (Professional Teachers): Employment status given a teacher or administrator who has completed 6 years of satisfactory service and holds a Professional or Administrators Certificate or has served satisfactorily for ten years and holds a Standard Teaching Certificate.

Provisional Employment Status (Provisional Teachers): The status given to a teacher who has been granted an initial period of employment to prove his/her ability.

Regular Employment Status (Regular Teachers): Employment status given to a teacher who has completed certification requirements and served satisfactorily during the provisional period.

Superintendent of Education: The individual who supervises elementary and secondary education within the local conference is called a superintendent of education.
Summative Teacher Evaluation: An evaluation conducted primarily for the purpose of making personnel decisions.

Overview of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 is an introduction to the study. It includes the nature and scope of the problem, the problem, purpose of the study, assumptions, delimitations, limitations, rationale for the study, what is teacher evaluation, a description of evaluation practices in Adventist schools, research questions and related hypotheses, definition of terms and an overview of the study.

Chapter 2 gives the review of the literature related to evaluation of teaching performance. It focuses on major elements of teacher evaluation and the supervisors' roles in teacher evaluation. In addition, a synthesis of the research on teacher evaluation is given.

Chapter 3 describes the methodology used in the study. Details are given about the population of the study, the surveys used for obtaining the data, data collection procedures, and the methods used for data analysis.

Chapter 4 presents the survey data, the analysis of the data from the survey, and a discussion on the findings.

Chapter 5 offers a summary of the study, conclusions, and recommendations for further study of teacher evaluation.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of the literature has been developed to provide a background of information that relates to the practice of teacher evaluation in elementary and secondary schools. However, other than two manuals on supervision and evaluation, the research literature is surprisingly empty on supervision practices in Adventist schools. The review is divided into the following sections: (1) introduction. (2) historical perspective of teacher evaluation. (3) purpose of evaluation. (4) teacher evaluation procedures. (5) the role of the principal as instructional leader. (6) the role of the superintendent in teacher evaluation. (7) climate and relationship conducive to teacher evaluation. (8) current evaluation procedures and. (9) synthesis of the research on teacher evaluation.

Introduction

Teacher evaluation is a crucial factor in any effort to validate teaching and learning and the success of schools. Teachers play an essential role in the success of schools and schooling. Research supports the premise that teachers are among the most powerful determinants of student learning (Goodlad, 1984).

Evaluation practices have been labeled as seriously deficient (Haefele, 1992). chaotic (Medley, Coker, & Soar, 1984), and a disgrace (Scriven, 1981). Regarding the state of the art of teacher evaluation, Frase and Streshley (1994) summarize the opinion
of several writers when they state. "Research and learned opinion strongly support the contention that teacher evaluation has been of little value" (p. 48).

In an era when accountability is the mantra, educational policy makers, educational leaders, legislators and the public in general view improving teacher assessment as an important step toward ensuring educational quality.

The school, as an organization, must see itself as a growing organism, a learning community, and an open living system. It should be a place where teachers have the opportunity to grow professionally and children are able to express their potentials through learning. Teacher evaluation when properly conducted can be an educational aspect of the entire school program that improves teacher performance and student learning. Peterson (1982) indicated:

Evaluation, along with all other major aspects of the educational system, has as its goal the improvement of learning for all those who take part in an educational program. Evaluation focuses upon the improvement of instruction. It is concerned with the continuous redefining of goals, with the wider realization of the human dynamics for learning and for cooperative effort, and with the nurturing of a creative approach to the problems of teaching. (p. 68)

In order to accomplish what is stated above, teacher evaluation must be an aspect of a comprehensive plan for career development, school improvement, and improving total teacher performance. When teacher evaluation is viewed in this way and plans are made with the learning of children in mind, the teacher evaluation process becomes beneficial to teachers. According to McNergney and Carrier (1981, p. 73), the process:

1. Provides indications for teachers' needs and abilities as they are revealed in their work with students.

2. Yields information that helps teachers become more aware of their own behaviors and those of their students.
3. Provides data that enables teachers to compare and contrast their behaviors with those of their students and to decide on what changes in teaching styles might be appropriate.

4. Documents classroom behaviors that teacher educators can use to encourage change based on facts.

On the other hand, teacher evaluations, if not conducted with care, can easily turn out for the worse for those involved. It can be a very sensitive issue between the evaluator and the one being evaluated. However, there need not be any misunderstanding when there is proper planning and execution of the teacher evaluation process. Peterson (1982) stated:

"It should be emphasized that teacher evaluation is a strategic procedure. Improperly handled, it can destroy staff morale and seriously hamper the efficient operation of the school. On the other hand, cooperative planning of a purposeful program in the appraisal of teacher effectiveness, conceived as a guidance procedure, offers unusual opportunities for better understandings, more satisfying relationships, and a truly cooperative atmosphere between the teaching staff and administration." (p. 87)

**Historical Perspectives of Teacher Evaluation**

Shinkfield and Stufflebeam (1995) present a historical perspective on teacher evaluation in the United States, tracing it back to Colonial times. They found that the first coordinated attempt to assess teachers and reward them accordingly had occurred in England during the Victorian era. According to Medley (1977) official instruments and rating scales used in the evaluation of teachers began to appear in America around 1915. Those responsible for evaluation of teachers were called inspectors, and their primary role was to observe and assess teachers in the classroom and to work with them on the improvement of teaching. Nutt (1928) makes this point rather clear:
The primary function of the school principal will be to carry an effective program of instructional supervision in his building. He will devote not less than two thirds of the regular school day to personal visitation and study of the work of teachers in his building. . . . He will select the number of teachers and the subjects that he will be able to work with intensively, and he will visit each teacher not less than two class periods in each subject selected during each week for a period of not less than four weeks. At the end of this period of intensive supervision, he will select either a new group of subjects with the same teachers, or a new group of teachers with the same subjects and continue as before. . . . He will continue this plan throughout the school year. (p. 524)

According to Good and Mulryan (1990), in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, the era of teacher effectiveness in American classrooms boomed. As a result, the availability of assessment instruments for evaluating teachers, using a variety of methodologies such as narrative records and rating scales, proliferated.

According to Brophy (1986), classroom-based observation, aimed at identifying characteristics of effective teachers during the 1980s, developed into large-scale, state-mandated programs to evaluate and license teachers based on what they actually do in the classrooms. Ellett (1987) points out that during the same period, the professional legitimacy of principals as instructional leaders and supervisors, particularly from the perspective of the principal’s roles in assessing and assisting teachers to improve the quality of teaching and learning in the classroom, was greatly increased.

Purposes of Teacher Evaluation

Teacher evaluation has two major purposes (Scriven, 1981). First, assessment data may be used as feedback to shape performances, build new practice, or alter existing practice. For example, information from a student survey indicating that not enough practice time was provided in class calls for a change in instructional timing. This
purpose of evaluation is called *formative*. The second purpose for evaluation is to make decisions or judgments, for example, to retain teachers. This purpose is called *summative*.

Teacher evaluation cannot be successful without the establishment of a simple, clear purpose. The statement of purpose is a major element to a teacher evaluation process. A statement of purpose clarifies the function of the evaluation process in relation to the needs of the school program. It also specifies the reason for the process. When the purpose of teacher evaluation is stated clearly, teachers are likely to feel a sense of partnership and less threatened (Peterson, 2000). Without a definite statement of purpose of a teacher evaluation process, Danielson (2001) saw the possibility of the evaluator’s efforts being focused on the instrument rather than on what is to be accomplished. Hawley (1976) stated that “the most important principle is to recognize the clear relationship between the purpose of evaluation and the means of conducting the evaluation” (p. 11).

In their research, Ryan and Hickcox (1980, pp. 10-11) identified the following purposes for teacher evaluation:

1. Assist the teacher in identifying areas that need improvement.
2. Recommend probationary teachers for permanent status.
3. Assess effectiveness of instructional program.
4. Comply with central office, board, or provincial policy.
5. Stimulate improvement in classroom performance.

Peterson (1982) summarized the multiple purposes of teacher evaluation as:

(a) to improve instruction; (b) to improve performance of teachers by correcting teaching, management or other deficiencies; (c) to humanize instruction; (d) to increase overall accountability on the part of teachers and school administrators and to improve the overall growth of the staff. (p. 81)
In the literature, educators generally agree that the most discussed purpose of teacher evaluation is to safeguard and improve instruction received by students (Bolton, 1973; Peterson, 2000; Ryan & Hickcox, 1980; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1983).

**Principles of Teacher Evaluation**

The evaluation of teachers is a complex activity and educators need to think through the assumptions, procedures, expectations, and relationships associated with this process. In order for evaluations to be effective, competent professionals who should use thorough and open methods must conduct the process. The methods should promote ongoing communication and mutual support. Shannon (1982) identified the following 11 principles of teacher evaluation:

1. The criteria used in evaluation should be based on the stated (district) goals and objectives and relate to staff members' job descriptions.
2. Evaluation procedures, forms, job descriptions, guides, and criteria should be developed cooperatively by the board, administration, and instructional staff.
3. Evaluative criteria should be explicit, encourage objective judgments, and relate as much as possible to behaviors that bear directly on the performance of administrators, teachers, and students.
4. The evaluative process should be carried out on a regular, continuing basis and should include opportunities for both formal and informal evaluations.
5. The process should employ a variety of techniques for assessing performance.
7. Each observation and evaluation should include follow-up consultations between the staff member and his or her evaluator, and the staff member should receive a signed copy of any written evaluation of his or her job performance.
8. Staff members should be made aware of their right to appeal unfavorable evaluations through channels to the superintendent and, ultimately, to the school board.
9. Evaluators (school board members and administrators) should be trained in techniques and skills of evaluation.
10. The evaluation program should include reliable measures for evaluating the performance of the evaluators.
11. The information gained from the evaluation should be applied in the planning of professional staff development and in-service training activities. (p. 18)
Teachers need to take an active, decision-making role in their own evaluation (Peterson & Chenoweth, 1992). The reason for this involvement is that teachers are in the best position to know the key indicators of impact for their own individual cases. Thus they are able to select the best combination of data sources for their own evaluation. The evaluation process should establish an atmosphere where the teacher feels that he/she is accepted and belongs and provide opportunities for teachers to define problems, seek solutions, and solve problems.

Teacher Evaluation Procedures

The first step in a teacher evaluation procedure is that a teacher must be informed of the duties and responsibilities that his/her performance of the assignment requires. On this, Herman (1973) has pointed out:

It is basic that an employee must know what is expected of him in order that he is able to attempt to perform in a satisfactory manner. It is unreasonable to criticize an employee for not performing his job in a satisfactory manner if he is not informed of his duties. It is only as these expectations are detailed, discussed, and put in writing can evaluation become possible. [Sic] The primary means of letting an employee know what is expected are by developing clear, written job descriptions, and by priority performance objectives. (p. 33)

Stronge (1997) maintains that a handbook describing the entire evaluation system should be distributed to all teachers before implementation. Such a handbook should provide notice of both the expectations and possible rewards or disciplinary action for performance. To this Sergiovanni and Starratt (2001) add that evaluation procedures should be “clearly articulated and uniformly applied to meet the judicial standard of reasonableness and fairness” (p. 55). It is evident therefore, that informing the teacher of his/her job expectations is absolutely essential to a successful teacher evaluation process.
Another element is to identify the needs of the teacher at the beginning of the process. Both the teacher and the evaluator should spend time together so as to determine the areas of need. These areas should include both weaknesses and strengths. During such meetings, those involved should remember that there is always room to improve areas of strength to enhance the overall teaching performance. Redfern (1980) indicated “that a useful way to identify needs is to regard them as areas to emphasize in order to attain the maximum degree of improvement in performance” (p. 24). Involving the teacher in needs assessment makes him/her more committed to the entire evaluation process. The teacher becomes more aware of what will be evaluated and what needs to be done to prepare for evaluation. Hawley (1976) pointed out that the key to successful evaluation of teaching lies in the teachers themselves, and “the more teachers are involved in a real and meaningful way in both planning and conducting the evaluation, the more likely it is to succeed in its purpose” (p. 18).

Teacher evaluation should not be done in isolation. It should be related to the entire school program. Bolton (1973) points out “that the evaluation of teachers is a part of a total effort a school system makes to assess its total program” (p. 127). Wiles and Bondi (2000) explained how the teachers’ evaluation process could be related to the entire school program:

It must not be a treatment that is applied to teaching alone. Teachers cannot be expected to participate wholeheartedly in the evaluation of teaching unless it follows or goes concurrently with the school’s goals, administrative procedures, and supervisory techniques. It cannot be something forced on them. It is a part of a total process of involvement. (p. 231)

It can be seen from the statement above that teacher evaluation must represent an aspect of broad supervisory service that begins with sound standards of teaching and
embraces the entire school program. Its planning should be systematic and based on a set of guidelines and procedures that reflect the school’s goals. The process should be closely related to school activities in which teachers are encouraged to state their problems and then devise ways of seeking solutions, and to participate in decision-making and then accept responsibility for the outcome. On this major element of teacher evaluation. Noonan (1981) adds:

A positive appraisal system is more than a method or an instrument. The basic philosophy of the school district needs to be involved. This philosophy should recognize that teachers and principals need to work together in an atmosphere of mutual understanding, which involves mutual preplanning, goal setting, and suggestions for improvement. (p. 8)

In conclusion, it can be said that an attempt to relate teacher evaluation to the entire school program requires a more productive and realistic approach that will make it relevant to the educational needs of the school. Teacher evaluation, therefore, should be viewed as a process of appraisals in which all elements that constitute the teaching process are given appropriate consideration (Scriven, 1994).

Data Sources

Plans for the evaluation process should include many sources of evidence to be used and a variety of instruments and techniques employed in gathering data on teacher behavior, satisfaction of pupil needs, pupil-teacher relationships, and other factors affecting the teacher’s efficiency (Peterson, 1982, p. 87). The teacher should be fully aware of the procedures to be used in the evaluation process and the division of responsibility for carrying out those procedures. The teacher has the responsibility to carry out the activities planned while the evaluator monitors the performance. In regards to monitoring a teacher’s performance, Redfern (1980) said:
Basic to the plan of action is the monitoring of the evaluatee's performance. The evaluator should monitor the evaluatee's performance to collect data and information that relate to the objectives being pursued. Monitoring is concerned with performance outputs: it is the evidence-gathering part of the total evaluation process. The parties involved must discuss it and, it is to be hoped, agree upon certain matters concerning the monitoring (i.e., the data gathering, forms to be used, kinds of and frequency of visitations, conferences, and other types of contracts). . . . Information from monitoring should never be stored away when prompt feedback will enhance performance. (p. 16)

Scheduling

How often teacher evaluation is done should be an important component of the school district's plan. This is a major element that should be given careful consideration by school administrators. The literature offers specific guidelines regarding this element. In their study, Wiles and Bondi (2000) offered a general statement that teacher evaluation should not be viewed as a one-time prediction activity but rather, as continuous. Peterson (1995) stated: "teacher evaluation should be a continuous process comprised of frequent discussions, cooperative planning, and supervisor-teacher conferences throughout the school year" (p. 69). The process should grow out of the normal program of supervision and in-service training that contributes to the effectiveness of a teacher's classroom instruction. Throughout a teachers' career, evaluation of teaching should reflect the spirit of in-service development and not a detailed inspection and counting of teaching effort (Shannon, 1982). If instructional improvement is made the central factor for teacher evaluation, school administrators are to work constantly with teachers in establishing ways for professional growth. The continuous assessment permits inspection of the teaching process and allows the evaluator to assess a teacher's progress relative to achieving goals: the effectiveness of teaching strategy: the acquisition of desired behavior.
change(s): making decisions concerning alternative goals and the teaching strategy or method, if necessary Good and Mulryan (1990).

In his study, Shinkfield (1977) reported that teachers support the idea that evaluation of teaching should be continuous throughout the year. It should be an integral part of school activities and not just a one-shot burdening experience to a teacher. Evaluators need to bear in mind that "teachers will respond to an evaluation process which allows for their participation, recognition, and self-growth (Noonan, 1981, p. 40). In addition, teachers want to know the level of their performance in teaching whether or not the students are learning, and how they can improve their teaching performance. Thus, the teachers welcome any efforts made to strengthen their professional repertoire by identifying additional competencies needed. Peterson (1982) further observed, "teachers perceive more value in an evaluation system that develops professional competency rather than judgment rating" (p. 85). Such an evaluation should be continuous and systematic. On this point, Lewis (1982) suggested that "evaluation should be an ongoing, long-term process that takes into account all of a teacher's over-all performance and of progress between periods of evaluation—not a one-shot, stand-or-fail rating" (p. 57). The value of systematic teacher evaluation, according to Redfern (1963) is that it enables a teacher to:

1. Understand more completely the scope of duties and responsibilities.
2. Establish long and short-term goals.
3. Place priorities upon certain tasks, which are more critical in work performance.
4. Clarify working relationships with peers, subordinates and supervisors.
5. Understand better how those to whom the individual looks for advice, counsel, and guidance view the quality of performance.

As a whole, systematic, continuous teacher evaluation serves a multi-dimensional activity that establishes directions, which enable a teacher to grow in his or her profession. It serves as a means to obtain and use information for generating and establishing teaching goals, strategies, and effectiveness.

**Classroom Observation**

If a list of the supervisor's tasks that require specialized skills were to be drawn up, classroom observation would probably head the list. This technique, usually performed by the principal, is the most common form of teacher evaluation (Lewis, 1982; McGeal, 1983; Peterson, 2000). Evertson and Burry (1989) said "that the classroom observation is probably the single most important element in systems that assesses the competence of classroom teachers" (p. 297). The intuitive appeal of classroom observation is great. A direct look at the teacher in action with students affords good information for judging the quality of teaching. Evertson and Holley (1981) claimed that the "views of classroom climate, rapport, interaction, and functioning are provided by systematic observation better than by any other data source" (p. 105). Herman (1973) highlighted the value of classroom observation to the teacher evaluation process as follows:

To observe is much more than mere seeing. Observing involves the intentional and methodological viewing of the teacher and students. Observing involves planned, careful, focused, and active attention by the observer. Observing involves all the senses and not just sight or hearing. . . . Observing is a critical task for the supervisor. (p. 23)
Herman (1973) further indicated that classroom observation is valuable to the teachers' evaluation process because:

1. It helps teachers by providing precise and systematic feedback.
2. It offers an opportunity to assess the changes a teacher makes over time.
3. It makes it possible to gather evidence needed for teacher evaluation.
4. It enables the evaluator to reflect his/her concern for the teacher and the students. It is a demonstration of interest in the teacher and students. It reveals caring to know firsthand what is going on in the classroom. (p. 25)

Classroom observation is considered to be one of the factors that contribute positively to teacher evaluation (Shinkfield, 1977). Peterson (2000) indicated, "Measurement of behavior by observation appears to be the most promising technique to date for assessing teacher effectiveness" (p. 181). A study by Noonan (1981) stated that classroom "observation is the proper technique for data collecting" (p. 42). Scriven (1981) gave an opposite view. He noted that "visits are disruptive to normal class operation, student participation and teacher behavior" (p. 36). What you see in classroom visits is not what you get in routine teacher performance (McLaughlin, 1990).

Peterson (2000) noted: "classroom observation reports most often are inaccurate because of observer style preferences, sociological role conflicts, social biases, and political axes to grind" (p. 186). Good (1980), a teacher effectiveness researcher noted a great number of problems using classroom observation to evaluate teachers. First, he reported that most observation systems in use are far too simple to capture the complexity of real classrooms. Second, there is a tendency to over interpret the findings and make them mean more than their actual limited scope. Third, many teachers proactive behaviors are ignored or not visible during the observation period. Good (1980) stated: "there are some [teacher] behaviors that simply cannot be explained in terms of the
present, ongoing situation by an outsider who has missed most of the interactions that have occurred in a classroom earlier in the year” (p. 33).

**Pre- and Post-Evaluation Conferences**

Another element, which must be a part of teacher evaluation, is the assessment of its results. Without this aspect, the process is worthless. On this, Redfern (1980) said. “Interpreting the meaning and significance of monitored data is a very important part of the total process of evaluation” (p. 24) The evaluator should be knowledgeable of how to analyze, interpret, and present the data.

Stronge (1997) noted. “The most fruitful source of any appraisal, either written or oral, is a teacher-supervisor conference that reflects a wholesome atmosphere” (p. 257). The final conference should give a clear indication that the evaluator has a continued concern and interest in the teacher and his or her work. As the discussion focuses on the objectives set at the beginning or pre-evaluation conference, the evaluator should help the teacher to view the results of evaluation from a constructive rather than a negative perspective. Both the evaluator and the evaluatee should ultimately find out from the information gathered whether the objectives have been met. From the data analysis, the evaluator should carefully present the strengths and weaknesses of the teacher. When this is done, the evaluator should remember that the prevailing atmosphere and the way he or she presents the results of the evaluation will determine the teacher’s acceptance or rejection of it. The teacher should have an opportunity to respond or comment on the evaluation outcomes. When the teacher’s weaknesses are revealed, there should also be remedies suggested. The evaluator should accept the responsibility to assist the teacher and to make plans for activities like in-service education for the improvement of
weaknesses. A plan for a consistent follow-up should be set by both the evaluator and teacher to ensure improvement.

When the evaluator has developed the final report for evaluation, the teacher should see it and be given a chance to reply to it, if she or he wishes, before the filing takes place. The school should make a provision whereby the teacher may request the removal from the file of any information considered obsolete.

The Principal as Instructional Leader

Fullan (1991) makes the statement that the role of the principal has become dramatically more complex, overloaded, and unclear over the past decade. Indeed, the role of the principal has been in a state of transition, progressing from principal as an instructional leader or master teacher, to the principal as a transactional leader and, most recently, to the role of a transformational leader.

Lutzow (1998) asked the question: Should principals coach as well as evaluate? He summarized by making the point that principals should both coach and evaluate teachers because the two functions are linked. Coaching, he states, “is an essential precursor to evaluation, with the level of interaction between the principal and teacher throughout the year determining the accuracy of the evaluation” (p. 4).

Much has been written in the literature (Berlin, Kavanagh, & Jensen, 1988; Flath, 1989; Fullan, 1991; McNally, 1992; Peterson, 2000; Stronge, 1997) concerning the importance of the instructional leadership responsibilities of the principal. Clearly, improved education for our children requires improved instructional leadership.

The evaluation of teaching performance is an integral part of the entire school program and its management. Like any other organizations, schools are accountable to
the public that supports them. In order for a school to know what goes on in general and the level of its instructional performance, the teaching personnel must be evaluated. The primary purpose of teacher evaluation is to provide feedback that helps teachers in their professional growth and improvement of instruction (Dyer & Carothers. 2000; Hauge, 1981; Peterson, 1995).

Many researchers (Brookover & Lezotte. 1982; Edmonds. 1979; Flath. 1989; Kroeze. 1984, as cited in Flath. 1989) stress the importance of the instructional leadership responsibilities of the principal. However, the consensus in the literature regarding this issue is that it is seldom practiced (Flath. 1989).

Stronge (1988) calculates that 62.2% of the elementary principal’s time is focused on school management issues, whereas only 6.2% of their time is focused on program issues. He adds: “that a typical principal performs an enormous number of tasks each day- but only 11% relate to instructional leadership” (p. 32). Berlin et al. (1988) conclude that, if schools are to progress, “then the principal cannot allow daily duties to interfere with the leadership role in curriculum” (p. 49).

Although McNally (1992) points out that practitioners and researchers agree that certain principals are effective. Fullan (1991) adds: “that effective instructional leaders are distinctly in the minority” (p. 151). Stronge (1988) concludes “that if principals are to heed the call from educational reformers to become instructional leaders it is obvious that they must take on a dramatically different role” (p. 33).

Evidently, there is a gap between what is and what needs to be. The question has been raised, why are we experiencing this dilemma? In response, Flath (1989) outlines what most researchers have to say concerning this dilemma. Mention is made of the lack
of education, training, and time for the instructional leadership role: of leadership activities being set aside for more immediate problems; and of an increasing volume of paper work. Also, public expectations for the principal’s role are mainly managerial and to a principal. this is a safe and comfortable role.

In elementary schools, “the principals are regarded as the primary evaluators (Noonan, 1981. p. 160). Redfearn (1980) observed. “The principals are obligated to make evaluative judgments about teaching effectiveness” (p. 64). The degree to which they are able to make good evaluation judgments is often considered to be a mark of their competence. Peterson (1982) noted:

Today’s principal must be familiar with current technical capabilities to evaluate teachers for evaluation is part of his responsibilities. At the end of the year, he is usually required to turn into the district officials some type of evaluation on teacher effectiveness. He should take the opportunity to visit classrooms, to observe teachers and classes, using some teacher approved rating scale, and hold post-conferences with teachers. (pp. 76-77)

In today’s world, Hanny (1987) perceives “that effective principals are expected to be effective instructional leaders. . . . The principal must be knowledgeable about curriculum development, teacher and instructional effectiveness, clinical supervision, staff development and teacher evaluation” (p. 209). Bryce (1983) and Fullan (1991) agree with the holistic view of the principal’s role. However, Fullan expands this holistic definition of leadership and management to be an active, collaborative form of leadership where the principal “works with teachers to shape the school as a workplace in relation to shared goals, teachers’ collaboration, teacher learning opportunities, teacher certainty, teacher commitment, and students’ learning” (p. 161).

Sackney (1980) and Johnson (1983) described research conducted in Saskatchewan, Canada, which assessed the nature of current supervisory behavior of
principals in terms of what is and what should be. They consulted not only with principals but also teachers and found that both teachers and principals want more classroom supervision. Johnson concluded "that principals want to supervise more than they actually do but few principals formally plan to supervise teachers" (p. 40). The type of supervision expected of principals by teachers is that which will help them improve professionally. Both teachers and principals repeated that supervision, to be effective must be direct and purposeful. The importance of developing an honest and trusting relationship between supervisor and the teacher cannot be overemphasized. Bryce (1983) contended that the principals are in the most strategic position from which to provide supervision of teachers because of their closeness to the classroom, their ability to meet the needs of teachers, their knowledge of the students with whom the teacher works, and their control of information to and from the school, the public, and central office. Bryce’s arguments are centered on the basic commitment to the clinical approach to supervision but are equally as applicable to any approach which has as it fundamental tenet and belief that supervision fosters teacher growth.

Fullan (1991) perceives that the role of the principal, in models of the future, will be to encourage collaborative groupings of teachers to play a more critical role in the instructional leadership of the school. This, however, will require active participation of the principal to facilitate change by motivating the staff and students, by reaching out to the community, and by continually improving the school. The assumption inherent, here, is that effective leaders manage and lead (Fullan, 1991; Moorthy, 1992). Highsmith and Rallis (1986) appear to disagree with the above statements by stating "that school management and instructional leadership are two separate tasks that cannot be performed
by a single individual” (p. 300), but they strongly agree with the idea of teacher empowerment where teachers have significant input into decisions concerning instruction, arguing “that well managed schools enable real instructional leaders to empower teachers who can create the effective school reformers are seeking” (p. 304).

The task of evaluating teachers is not an easy one. It involves different stages that require a variety of skills and experiences from the principal. Thus, the principal needs to acquire knowledge about teacher evaluation through training. In order to know what to do, evaluators must be knowledgeable. They should be trained for their task. Hill (1979) stated, “that those who do evaluating should be trained for the job and must themselves be evaluated regularly” (p. 12). A trained evaluator is in a position to approach his/her duty in a professional manner. It should often be remembered that teaching is a complex process and there is no easy formula to evaluate it without proper skills and knowledge (Peterson, 2000). With the knowledge of what teacher evaluation requires for its success, a trained evaluator will attempt to develop an atmosphere in which creativity and teamwork between the teacher and the evaluator are the basis for all plans. Peterson (2000) sees training for evaluators for their job as crucial to the success of the teachers’ evaluation process. He suggests some ways by which evaluators could be trained: 1. elective in-service course or courses at universities 2. a principal’s meeting devoted entirely to evaluation 3. a general explanation given at principals’ meetings and 4. workshops or seminars lasting from 1 to 3 days, using the assistance of an outside consultant, observation of videos of live classrooms, and discussions.

The training of evaluators is a likely means to bring professionalism into teacher evaluation. It may be a means to eliminate certain problems, which often beset the
teachers' evaluation process due to an evaluator's lack of skills or knowledge. When teachers deal with those who know what teaching and its evaluation are all about, instructional improvement will be attained more easily and effectively.

The literature reveals that inadequate preparation of principals in the area of teacher evaluation can be detrimental to teachers' professional growth, which, in turn, may lead to poor instruction in the school. Hill (1979), who surveyed 26 elementary principals to identify formal and informal evaluation practices used by principals to improve teaching effectiveness of individual teachers, found this to be true. He found "that principals do not adequately possess supervisory skills and this deficiency contributed significantly to their perceived inability to successfully improve instruction" (p. 13).

In conclusion, the professional expertise of the principal in teacher evaluation is a must. It cannot be overemphasized. It must be understood and acted upon if the teachers' evaluation process is to fulfill its purpose. With proper training, the principal can successfully play a significant role in the stages of the teacher evaluation process.

The Role of the Superintendent in Teacher Evaluation

It is interesting to note that the word superintendent has a Latin derivation. It comes from the Latin words super, meaning over, and intendo, meaning direct. This fits the description of the responsibilities of the early superintendents, which were to oversee and direct the school operations. However, the derivation does not address the leadership and change functions. Perhaps history and even the name itself serve to make the leadership and change functions so difficult for today's superintendents (Konnert & Augenstein, 1990, pp. 3-6).
Cremin and Butts (1953) describe early superintendents as individuals "who were expected to be reporters, and managers but not leaders" (p. 15). To a large extent this is not true today. A superintendent must possess a great deal of leadership acumen, and be able to look at the big picture processes, as well as to have patience if he/she is to truly function as the instructional leader of the school system. The superintendent has to be concerned not only with the activities at the various schools in his/her jurisdiction, but also with the overall fiscal and political implications of these activities (Bass, 1997).

According to Konnert and Augenstein (1990) the primary function of the superintendency is to provide planning and direction for the school system (p. 50). The planning and direction should include the evaluation and supervision of the teachers in the school system. Although superintendents may not be personally required to perform evaluation and supervision of classroom teachers in their school systems, they are, and should be, concerned with the evaluation procedures in each of the schools. In other words, the superintendent must be concerned about what determines the organizational culture or, as Konnert and Augenstein (1990) say, "This is how things are done around here" (p. 70).

Sergiovanni (1989) describes the superintendent "as empowerer" (p. 5). Konnert and Augenstein (1990) emphasize that the efficiency of empowerment is very dependent on the superintendent's direct relationship with school principals and indirectly with teachers, aides, and staff. They summarize by stating "that excellent schools are led by excellent principals." Excellent principals are leaders by empowerment, and it is the superintendent who empowers the principals" (p. 104). It follows then that the school principal must empower the staff because these individuals articulate the vision and the
mission which include effective supervision and evaluation of teachers, all of which makes a positive school atmosphere and environment.

Climate and Relationship Conducive to Teacher Evaluation

The principal is the key figure in promoting an environment within the school that is conducive to student learning. Such an environment is positive and Buffie (1989) expresses how the school's environment impacts on all, not just the students, by stating, "that good teacher morale and high student achievement go hand-in-hand" (p. 11). According to Buffie, the creation of such a setting does not just happen. It takes the combined effort of both the principal and the staff to identify factors that create and, also, those that inhibit the development of a positive climate.

Harden (1988) identified five critical components of teacher morale over which the principal exercises some control. These are administrative leadership, administrative concern, personal interaction, opportunity for input, and professional growth. Peterson (2000) pointed to trust as a major factor in teacher-principal relationships. Mutual trust is characterized by predictability and consistent care in decision making by all parties. Humaneness was identified as an essential management component that the principals should have (Lall, 1994).

Krajewski (1987) identified proactive and reactive practices that are helpful for principals in establishing good principal-teacher relationships. The proactive practices are: knowing the teacher well enough to establish rapport and to anticipate professional growth needs, praising teachers as frequently as they deserve it, liking teachers, getting teachers involved with decision-making activities which affect them, and supporting teachers who have problems with students or others combined with providing in-service
activities which will help them avoid the problem in the future. The reactive practices include listening when teachers need or want to talk, respecting confidences, advising only when necessary, being judicious after emotional peaks have been reached, and disciplining when necessary.

The atmosphere in which the process of teacher evaluation is conducted is a major factor that must be considered. It should be conducive to a cooperative effort between the teacher and the evaluator. Flexibility, honesty, and openness must characterize each phase of the process. At no stage, there should be any indication of the exercising of authority by the evaluator. Redfern (1980) pointed out:

Evaluation must take place in a constructive and non-threatening atmosphere. The teacher must feel that improvement of his performance is a cooperative effort involving him, his evaluator and others on the school staff. No matter how well designed - in the abstract - an evaluation program may be seen, if it is perceived by teachers as negative or punitive, it will not improve teaching, but will lower teacher effectiveness because of teacher fears and lowered morale. (p. 27)

The importance of maintaining a positive school climate can hardly be overstated, for a school's climate has a powerful impact upon the teachers' and students' feelings of self-worth and mutual respect, which promote effective teaching and learning.

Teacher-Principal Relationships

The teacher evaluation process requires a climate in which the principal and the teacher can work as a team. The principal-teacher relationship should be on a sound, mutual understanding for teacher evaluation to be successful. The principal can establish the necessary working atmosphere from the beginning of a school year when a meeting is held to acquaint teachers with each other and to orient them to the school program.

During the meeting, the experienced or veteran teachers will, of course, be updated on
any new changes from the previous year, while the new teachers' orientation may include information on school plant, school personnel, school policies, pupils, parent groups, and overall nature of school community (Redfern, 1980).

During the school year, the principal should have personal contacts with each teacher. In order to build a good evaluation climate, the principal should show a daily genuine interest in helping and working with teachers. Redfern (1963) cautions principals “that the rigid superior-subordinate relationships detract from a good evaluation climate” (p. 68). Through his/her role as a personnel manager, communicator, and a public relations person, the principal should be able to establish relationships with teachers that are conducive to the evaluation process.

According to Redfern (1963) rapport with teachers is essential if the principal is to achieve maximum results. Teachers need to feel that the principal genuinely respects them, and is interested in them as persons and as professional colleagues. While a peer relationship may not be totally possible or desirable, a rigid superior-subordinate relationship usually detracts from a good appraisal climate. Best results are obtained when "a climate of confidence" (p. 64) prevails in teacher-principal relationships.

The teacher evaluation process requires a climate in which the principal and teacher can work together as a team. The principal-teacher relationship should be on a sound, mutual understanding for teacher evaluation to be successful.

The Principal as a Personnel Manager

The principal’s skills in personnel management can be an asset to the teachers’ evaluation process. As he or she plays this role, the principal can establish a working relationship with the teachers that will set the right atmosphere for the evaluation process.
In order to establish such a climate, the principal should recognize the human diversity in his staff, whether it is in terms of personality, experience, beliefs, or cultural heritage (Wiles & Bondi, 1980). In other words, the principal must accept the individual teachers as they are with no conditions attached for personal gain. He or she must be willing to work with individual teachers wherever they are in their development. The principal should recognize the diversity in teachers and also be sensitive to their potentials that could be used to improve the educational program of the school.

The principal, as a personnel manager, makes evaluation of teachers a smooth process if “he or she builds and maintains the group, gets the job done, helps the group feel comfortable and at ease, helps set and clearly defines goals and objectives, and cooperatively works toward those goals and objectives” (Wiles & Bondi, 1980, p. 141).

In order for principals to develop a school environment suitable for meaningful teacher evaluation, Redfern (1980) recommends the following procedures:

1. Treat each other as individuals
2. Tailor needs of individual teachers
3. Make assignments equitable
4. Enlist teachers to contribute ideas and to share in problem solving
5. Be available when problems arise and help is needed
6. Promote peer-level interaction
7. Be consistent and fair
8. Anticipate problems and face them realistically
9. Give credit where due and be sparing in allocating blame
10. Give criticism only in example
11. Lead by example. (p. 76)

When the principal of the school applies the procedures mentioned above, the formal or informal evaluation of the teachers will be more easily facilitated. Also, a positive principal-teacher relationship will make it easier for the principal to help teachers both inside and outside the classroom.
The Principal as a Communicator

Without communication between the principal and the teachers, evaluation of teachers becomes an impossible task. There must be effective daily communication between the principal and teachers in such a way that the "receiver interprets the message he has received in a way the sender intended him to" (Hyman, 1975, p. 160). Effective communication between the principal and teacher should involve mutual trust, confidence, and empathy; accurate sending and receiving verbal messages mixed with nonverbal ones; and listening to each other. Bolton (1973) has this to say about principal-teacher communication in relation to teacher evaluation:

Continuous interaction between teacher and principal assists both to analyze information. This does not negate the use of formal written feedback at stipulated periods. To be most effective, the communication must be two-way, requiring that each person listen to the other. Effective evaluation of teachers is dependent on both adequate quality and quantity communication between teachers and principals. (p. 97)

When principal-teacher communication is effective, teacher evaluation becomes an ongoing process not limited to set times and convenience. Cogan (1973) shared the same view. He stated:

The evaluation of teachers is an ongoing process in school systems and is not limited to or totally governed by formal evaluation procedures. Principals obtain considerable evaluative data informally during normal operations of schools, and this data affects the principal's perception of a given teacher's performance. (p. 133)

When proper communication does not exist between principal and teachers the "value of supervisory and appraisal relationships is diminished" (Redfern, 1963, p. 77). It is the principal's duty to maintain open communication with teachers. She/he must be willing to listen to what teachers have to say. The principal must communicate to teachers, in every instance, whatever is needed and why it is needed. If the principal
makes effective communication with teachers a routine part of his/her job, the task of evaluating teachers would not be difficult.

**Human Relationships: An Asset to Principals in Teacher Evaluation**

A principal may encounter difficulty in the teachers' evaluation process if she/he lacks skills in human relationships. Perceiving teachers and other personnel as human resources in the educational process, and perfecting skills in a wide spectrum of interpersonal relationships are some of the imperatives of the principal’s leadership responsibilities as an effective evaluator.

Human relations “involve one’s ability and judgment in working with people” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1983, p. 286). Self-understanding and acceptance are the avenues of human relations which, when extended from one to others, leads to considering their needs as people. To develop such a relationship with teachers, principals, according to Redfern (1963), should:

1. Avoid “the boss complex” wherever possible. Help the teacher feel that evaluation is a means to help, not hinder.
2. Seek to establish that evaluation is a means to enhance teachers’ effectiveness.
3. Be aware that the principal’s personality as well as that of the teacher has influence upon the evaluation relationship.
4. Be willing to allow the teacher to express him/herself without fear of censure or reprisal even if that opinion is markedly different from the views of the principal.
5. Strive for a climate of mutual respect.
6. Be prepared to take as well as to give.
7. Be committed to the concept that the teacher and principal are members of a team working for the best interest of a good educational program.
8. Invite constructive criticism.
9. Avoid giving the teacher “the brush-off” when problems are presented.
10. Be genuinely interested in the teacher as a person, willing to take time to help work through problems. (p. 67)
The day-to-day interactions between the principal and teachers should be such that the above suggestions are incorporated. Peterson (2000) asserts “the benefits as changing a worker from a pawn — (one to whom evaluation is done) to an author — (one who assumes responsibility in evaluation)” (p. 73).

In his daily contacts with teachers, the principal can set a climate that makes the teacher evaluation process possible and helpful to teachers. When the principal is able to communicate with teachers and to establish good human relations, teachers often cooperate more positively during the evaluation process.

Current Evaluation Procedures

The evaluation of teachers can be done through different methods and techniques. This section discusses the current evaluation procedures found in the literature. The current directions and practices are student reports, peer review, student achievement, parent reports, and documentation of professional activity, systematic observation, administrative reports, and teacher tests.

Student Evaluation of Teachers

Students can provide reliable and useful measures of teaching effectiveness. Follman (1992) observes “that no other individual or group has [the] breadth, depth, or length of experience with the teacher. . . . Teachers look to their students rather than to outside sources for indications of their performance” (p. 169).

Mertler (1999) conducted a study in which he examined teachers' perceptions of students as participants in teacher evaluation. Participants for his study were 14 teachers and almost 600 students. The results of his study showed that teacher participants valued
having the opportunity to collect student feedback on their teaching. Moreover, the findings indicated that most of the teachers experienced a variety of benefits resulting from the evaluation process and many expressed a wish to continue receiving evaluations of their teaching from their students.

Advocates of evaluating teachers by using student reports argue that a very good source of information about teacher quality is that group of people with whom teachers work most directly and spend the most time. Student reports are systematic collections of information about pupil perspectives on teachers and their accomplishment of important educational goals such as development of motivation in the classroom, opportunity for learning, degree of rapport and communication development between teacher and student, existence of problems between teacher and student, and classroom equity (Aleamoni, 1981; Peterson, 2000; Scriven, 1994).

Although teacher evaluations by students are common at the college level, they are rarely used for teachers at the elementary and secondary levels. Follman (1992) found more agreement among the ratings of four groups of high school students than among three groups of principals regarding teacher performance. He reviewed more than 20 studies, spanning 70 years, and concluded, “that secondary students have and can rate teachers reliably” (p. 171).

Haak, Kleiber, and Pack (1972) suggest that only students in Grades 4 and above should be involved in the evaluation process; however, students as young as kindergarten age have demonstrated adequate reliability for inclusion in the process (Driscoll, Peterson, Browning, & Stevens, 1990). Follman (1992) contends that the issue should ultimately be whether students have the experience, knowledge, wisdom, judgment, and
poise to discriminate and/or evaluate anybody on anything, let alone a professional person such as a teacher, on their performance (p. 175).

Peterson (2000) indicated advantages and disadvantages of student evaluations.

Advantages of student evaluations include:

1. Students are in daily contact with a number of teachers: and, therefore, have the best basis upon which to make comparative judgments of teacher production.
2. The availability of a large number of students for judges of teacher quality provides high reliability for many kinds of teacher performances.
3. Student report data are often obtained through questionnaires and are relatively inexpensive in terms of time and personnel. In other words, it is an inexpensive method of teacher appraisals.
4. Students' reports can be justified since they are the consumers and stakeholders of quality teaching. (p. 103)

Disadvantages of students' evaluations are:

1. Students are too immature to evaluate teaching performance.
2. Student surveys may encourage teachers to pander to students to get high ratings.
3. Students may tend to give low evaluations for a stricter teacher, the teacher who gives a great deal of work, the teacher who has high expectations, or the teacher of a subject that is mandatory and considered boring by the majority of students.
4. As with any reporters of human behavior, students may be dishonest for trivial or self-interest reasons. (p. 104)

As a whole, student evaluations of teachers can provide useful data. The data can be compared with other sources of evaluation to ensure that information obtained is valid for making decisions about the teacher's behavior in the classroom.

Evaluation of Teachers by Peers

Evaluation of teachers by their peers is a process in which teachers use their own knowledge and experience to examine and judge the merit and value of another teacher. French-Lazovik (1981) found that teacher peer evaluation brings the expertise and experience of the profession into evaluation, as does no other assessment technique. The
author further notes that in the school districts surveyed, whenever a teacher selects peer review as an option during the period of a required supervisory evaluation, the results became a part of the formal teachers' evaluation process. Peterson (2000) stated:

> Teacher colleagues are familiar with school goals, priorities, values, and problems. They know subject matter, curriculum, instruction, and materials. At the same time, they are aware of the actual demands, limitations, and opportunities that classroom teachers face. They are in a position to address both the quality of teaching and the real limitations of actual teaching situations. (p. 121)

Evidently, evaluation by one's peers seems to be a logical way of achieving appropriate information for teacher evaluation purposes. However, there are some pros and cons about the peer evaluation methods. Peterson (2000) indicated that the advantages of peer evaluation are:

1. A fellow worker assigned the same task possesses more in-depth knowledge of the requirements of a specific assignment than any other individual.
2. A peer evaluation process produces better morale throughout the entire employee group because peers are placed in a helpful relationship.
3. Peer evaluation encourages camaraderie between co-workers and helps to lessen teacher isolation, and it makes exemplary practice available for other teachers to follow. (p. 122)

He further stated that the disadvantages of peer evaluation are:

1. The peer evaluator will not be objective in his evaluation since he is a member of the same employee group. The tendency to whitewash all employees may be increased with the presence of unions and collective bargaining.
2. The peer evaluator is placed in the unfair position of an evaluator when he has no authority or responsibility to make judgments about the quantity and quality of a fellow worker production level. This responsibility is an administrator's responsibility and the administrator should shoulder this load completely.
3. The peer evaluation may conflict with that of the immediate administrative supervisor who has to make recommendations as to hiring, firing, and protection. Peer positive evaluations may undergird his case and hinder the administrator's decision.
4. Peer evaluation may upset the delicate balance of cooperation needed in a school for day-to-day functioning if the evaluation is not favorable. This, in turn, could lead to inter-group conflict, which could be detrimental to the total school district's operation. (p. 123)
Student Achievement Tests

The use of student achievement, how much and what students learn, is the single most important concern about educational programs. To many, it is the most compelling evidence about teacher quality (Peterson, 2000). Soar, Medley, and Coker (1983) also support the importance of the use of student achievement when they say, "Student achievement tests are an important criterion for assessing teaching effectiveness, and it would be a mistake to ignore it completely" (p. 243). Herman (1973) gave this view:

Teacher evaluation by use of student scores on standardized achievement tests is one method that should probably be incorporated as a portion of the total evaluation scheme. The evaluator, however, must be cognizant of the fact that standardized tests normally measure only the areas of information retained; they do not deal with attitudes, values, appreciations and other important outgrowths of information. Over-reliance on standardized test scores may also cause the teacher to teach to the test. Finally, pupil achievement is due to many factors including the instructional environment provided by teachers who had the students in prior years. (p. 48)

Advocates of evaluating teachers by student achievement tests argue that students are the consumers of education. Therefore, their gains should be one of the ways to determine teacher effectiveness (Aleamoni, 1981; Peterson, 2000).

As desirable as student achievements are for teacher evaluation, Stake (1973) found that good pupil gain is difficult to get for many teachers, and it is difficult to isolate and document teacher effects on pupil learning. In deciding to use student gains to evaluate teachers, Peterson (2000) suggested that evaluators remember the following about achievement tests:

1. They are limited to the small segments of the educational program, which can be adequately measured and so are never a comprehensive measure of the teacher.
2. Their use is largely restricted to research since to use pupil gain in school systems would tend to place undue emphasis on the measured areas of the program.
3. The imperfections in tests used make it difficult for some pupils and classes to demonstrate satisfactory gain no matter how effective the teacher.

4. Pupil gain measures tend to have low reliability and doubtful validity.

5. Teacher quality and effort are not always directly tied to student learning. For example, lack of student effort can thwart the effects of the most brilliant teachers. In addition, research shows that such factors as parental expectations, prior achievement, socioeconomic status, and the general educational quality of the home add up to a greater influence on pupil learning than does the teacher. (pp. 136-139)

Teachers, like other professionals, do not have to be able to guarantee outcomes; rather they must defend what they are doing in a professional sense (House, 1973, p. 76). They may be answerable to such things as their competence on the subject matter and their ability to communicate with students.

The argument against using student achievement to assess teachers may be given by outlining what teachers are expected to do as professionals. Peterson and Walberg (1979) expressed:

Teachers are not hired to cram information into students' heads to be retained just long enough to enable them to pass objective tests. Teachers are hired to educate children, to produce important, lasting changes in their behavior, not short-term changes in tests. Teachers are supposed to teach children to read, to communicate, to reason, to become happy, productive, responsible members of this democracy. (p. 17)

It can be seen that teaching is a complex task, which embraces broad and lasting aspects of students' learning. Thus, it becomes difficult to measure a teacher's competence by students' gains. While it is true "that a teacher may increase the achievement levels of most on his or her students, he or she may be unable to reach some students whose home backgrounds are so chaotic as to cripple their ability to concentrate on academic tasks" (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1983, p. 278).
Parent Reports

Parents and guardians play an important role in student learning, and they are a significant audience for teacher performance (Epstein, 1985; Peterson, 1984). Peterson (1995) describes “parent reports of teachers as systematic collections of information about parent or guardian perspectives on teacher quality” (p. 169).

Advocates of evaluating teachers by parent reports argue that parents are clients, and taxpayers and the rights of consumers have been established in evaluation practice (Epstein, 1985; Peterson, 2000; Mark & Shotland, 1985). As desirable as parent reports are for teacher evaluation, there are substantial arguments against using them. Lortie (1975) found that parent input in teacher evaluation in most school districts consists of haphazard, hearsay, unreliable single-case involvement that may complicate the evaluation process. In deciding to use parent reports to evaluate teachers, Mark and Shotland (1985) find that although parent reports give an indirect view of the classroom, they provide a direct view of the set of teacher duties dealing with parents and of student reactions to the teacher expressed outside of the classroom. To this, Scriven (1988) states, “that valid and reliable inclusion of parental views in teacher evaluation recognizes the partnership of parents in education” (video recording).

In conclusion, Bunde (1997) asked whether parents should evaluate teachers’ professional skills. In his article, he contends that parents evaluating teachers is a vital part of the evaluation process. Parents have the largest stake in their children’s lives, know their children better than any teacher ever could, and get daily feedback on whether their children are applying school lessons in their daily lives.
Administrative Ratings

In the literature, the principal is identified as the primary teachers' evaluator in elementary and secondary schools (Hauge, 1981; Kowalski, 1978; McKenzie, 1979; Peterson, 2000; Redfern, 1963). It is also stated in the literature that other administrators like the vice-principal, supervisors, and master teachers may be involved in teacher evaluation.

Administrators can use various techniques available for collecting data on teacher/student classroom interactions. These techniques include systematic observation procedures, rating scales, and checklists.

Systematic Rating Procedures

The main purpose for these procedures is to study interactions between teacher and student by keeping a running record of selected behavioral events that occur within the classroom (Peterson, 2000).

The most commonly used systematic observation procedures as listed by Kowalski (1978) are:

1. Flanders Interactional Analysis, which analyzes verbal interaction between teachers and students (Flanders, 1970)

2. Galloway's Non-Verbal Communication, which analyzes the types of nonverbal behaviors teachers use with students by means of video tape-recording (Galloway, 1973)

3. Parsons' Types of Question Analysis, which analyzes the types of questions teachers use with students (Evaluation Handbook, 1975)

5. The Verbal Interaction Category System, an adoption of the Flanders system, including measurement of the nonverbal behavior of the teacher and student (Griffin, 1983)

6. The Classroom Observational Method, which analyzes cognitive levels on which classroom verbal interaction takes place (Griffin, 1983)

7. Observation Guides, which are comprehensive itemizations of specific and observational aspects of teaching and learning which helps a supervisor to monitor certain phases of instruction (Griffin, 1983)

8. The Briggs Observational Guide, a collection of questions which serves as a guide to help supervisors arrive at judgments regarding the purpose of a lesson, classroom climate, organization, and development of lessons, among others (Griffin, 1983)

9. Videotape analysis, which allows teacher and supervisor to review a lesson and reach consensus on constructive alternatives for teaching improvement (Griffin, 1983)

10. Observation Schedule and Record (OScAR), which is a verbal category system that yields frequent counts of the occurrence of different verbal behaviors (Medley, 1973)

11. Instruments for the Observation of Teaching Activities (IOTA), which is a written description of classroom behavior by a team of at least three observers.

One of the shortcomings of systematic procedures is that local administrators using them need intensive training, and such systems may not provide a justifiable return
for the expenses incurred (Bolton, 1973). The practitioners have also faced the problem of adopting systematic observation procedures to their particular needs. Despite the shortcomings of systematic procedures, educators still find them useful because they provide a common language for analyzing the teaching-learning process.

Rating scales

There are many different types of rating scales. Remmers (1963, pp. 329-343) detailed groups of rating scales as follows:

1. **Numerical Rating Scales**: Numbers are assigned to categories, usually on an a-priori basis. The observer assumes that the intervals of this kind of scale represent equal psychological intervals between adjacent numbers.

2. **Graphic Rating Scales**: The graphic rating scale provides a continuous straight line with cues or categories along the line to guide the rater. It appears in many varieties, for it is possible to present the straight line in many ways, with or without descriptive categories and with or without numbers for the scale units.

3. **Cumulated-Points Rating Scales**: The cumulated-points method of scoring is common to several rating scale types. By this method, scales are scored in the same way as psychological tests, usually 1 or 0 per item.

4. **Multiple-choice Rating Forms**: The alternative for each item may be arranged in multiple-choice form and the choices weighted a priori according to their desirability of degree of representation of a specified dimension of teaching.

5. **Forced-choice Rating Scale**: The forced-choice rating scale is not an a-priori kind of scale but a psychologically scaled instrument requiring considerable experimental work for its construction.
Kowalski (1978) in describing rating scales said:

In general rating scales contain a listing of descriptions regarding certain teacher classroom behaviors. When using such a scale, the rater judges the extent to which a teacher manifests the quality described by putting a check on a number scale or on a comment (such as good, improving, conditional, or unacceptable). (p. 5)

The rating scales, like any other instruments for measuring teacher behaviors, have their strengths and weaknesses. As for strength, the rating scales “allow the observers to consider clues from a variety of sources before making a judgment” (Mohan & Hull, 1975, p. 266). The problem with rating scales is that they tend to enhance the subjective biases when they cover a considerable period of time and a wide variety of conditions and teacher behaviors (Brandt, 1973). Other problems are pointed out by Bolton (1973):

1. When too many ratings are clustered at a particular point, the evaluator may infer that raters are too lenient, too harsh, or unwilling to be decisive and objective.
2. It is easier to identify the very poor and the very good than to differentiate in the middle range of a rating scale. Therefore, middle-range ratings are more difficult to justify. (p. 36)

Although rating scales have these shortcomings, Peterson (1995) observed “that if an evaluator has no practical alternative to rating scales then rating scales are probably better than nothing, especially if they are used only to isolate the extremely weak and extremely strong teachers” (p. 143).

Checklists

Checklists are similar to rating scales in certain ways. They are composed of items relevant to the teaching-learning process. As in rating scales, the evaluator usually checks appropriate items or writes a brief comment next to it to indicate the specific type
of behavior manifested by the teacher” (Kowalski, 1978, p. 5). There are certain advantages for using checklists in evaluating teachers. One of the advantages “is that it is possible to construct checklists locally to meet particular needs, once their potential utility is recognized and the general procedures for their development understood” (Brandt, 1973, p. 29). Other advantages are given by Griffin (1983):

1. It directs attention to aspects of a lesson, which the observer might otherwise miss.
2. It gives a degree of objectivity to an evaluator’s observations.
3. It provides a permanent record, which is quick and easy to make.
4. It helps a teacher to analyze his or her own lesson and to determine what a supervisor considers important. (p. 54)

The author also gives the disadvantages of using checklists as follows:

1. A checklist influences an evaluator to analyze teacher performance during a lesson according to a common pattern even though lessons may vary widely in form and purpose, thus making classroom observations a mechanical, routine procedure.
2. Items on a checklist often are numerous and vary in significance and there is rarely any attempt to weigh their relative importance.
3. Checklists usually deal with details, which are often superficial.
4. When the use of checklists becomes routine, supervisors are apt to make judgments without patient reflection and careful analysis. (p. 54)

The school administrators and the teachers should make the decision regarding the kind of teacher-evaluation instruments suitable for local use. When rating scales or checklists are chosen, Bolton (1973) argues “that their accuracy may be improved by clearly defining the focus of the evaluation; developing specific, low-inference items; using common record forms; and providing adequate training for observers” (p. 36).

Teacher Self-Evaluation

Self-evaluation of teachers should be an integral part of a school’s evaluation program. On this, Peterson (2000) stated that “self-evaluation should and must play an
important role in the evaluative process” (p. 88) of teachers in the school system.

Researchers in teacher education often find “that self-evaluation can form the basis for the rational change and can help the instructor to systematically allocate a reasonable amount of time and effort for self-improvement in the areas where he believes changes are likely to be most profitable” (Simpson. 1966. p. 1). Also. Bolton (1973) indicated:

The teacher’s analysis helps to reduce the natural conflict that is often encountered when an outsider makes judgments about teacher behavior. Since the supervisor is placed in the role of a resource person, assisting to develop the teachers coding and analysis skills, he is no longer perceived as a threat to the teacher. The common goal of the supervisor or principal and the teacher in self-evaluation is to provide a teacher the opportunity to improve his teaching skills by observing his own behavior in a threat-free atmosphere. (pp. 140-141)

In the evaluation of teachers, the principal plays the role of a counselor and works together with the teacher throughout the evaluation process. Teacher self-evaluation suggestions are offered by Olds (1973):

1. Select the proposed job targets for the evaluation period based upon review of previous evaluations and/or self-appraisal.
2. Present proposed targets to evaluator and reach mutual agreement on plans at target-setting conferences.
3. Monitor and help gather performance data.
4. Hold periodic conferences with the evaluator to discuss progress made toward targets and to review data flow.
5. Review performance data from all sources, make analysis, and prepare a self-evaluation report on progress made toward selected targets.
6. At a final progress conference, review self-evaluation with the evaluator and discuss evaluation reports made by the evaluator.
7. Propose follow-up activities and discuss evaluators’ proposals based upon analysis of the evaluator’s preliminary discussion of target ideas for next cycles.
8. Offer suggestions for improvement of a performance evaluation program under procedure established for the evaluation system. (p. 36)

As can be seen, the final progress conference provides the time to review what has taken place in a teacher’s self-evaluation and to propose what needs to be done in the
next cycle. Peterson (2000) states "that self-evaluation, properly used, is a guide for planning further self-improvement" (p. 43).

School administrators need to understand that teachers, as professionals, want to be autonomous in seeking their own improvement. Directly or indirectly, "teachers have expressed a desire to be the determiner of whether process goals were met and of the appropriate action to take" (Bolton, 1973, p. 141). When a school system encourages self-evaluation, "it recognizes teachers to be students of teaching, systematically assessing and revising their own behavior" (McNeil & Popham, 1973, p. 134).

The teacher has the responsibility of making self-evaluation a success while working with the evaluator who acts as a counselor. The teacher should view self-evaluation as a way of continually diagnosing his/her work in terms of what is being done, and how it is progressing. To the evaluators and teachers, Redfern (1963) suggested:

Self-appraisal should be accomplished within the framework of judging performance in terms of the appraisee's own concept of satisfactory service. In other words, each appraisee has in his own mind a picture of what he considers to be acceptable or satisfactory standard of achievement. Self-appraisal merely means measuring accomplishment in terms of the individual and personal standards of satisfactory service. It does not mean trying to compare oneself with the teacher across the hall. Thoughtful self-appraisal is a process of reporting as honestly and as accurately as possible how well the appraisee feels he has done in each of the areas of performance. (pp. 37-38)

Self-evaluation can take different forms. An audio or video tape-recording of teaching behavior can be used. The teacher then analyzes the recorded behavior for the purpose of judging whether the behavior is useful to teaching. Although the use of audio-visual is becoming a common practice in teacher evaluation programs, teachers should remember that the student body is an asset to a self-evaluation process. Peterson (2000)
said, "that teachers should be encouraged to acquire feedback from students as a regular part of self-evaluation procedures" (p. 141).

In any teacher evaluation program, self-evaluation has been found to play a significant role (Olds, 1973; Peterson, 2000; Redfem, 1980). The authors seem to agree that self-improvement based on self-evaluation is both desirable and crucial to an evaluation program. Olds (1973) indicated: "One of the great advantages of self-evaluation efforts, when made a part of a school system's performance evaluation plan, is that the evaluation is a mutual venture. The evaluatee has definitive rights as well as responsibilities" (p. 43).

On the other hand, self-evaluation has its shortcomings. Redfem (1980) states, "that the primary disadvantage is that the standards used for evaluation may not relate readily to outside criteria or needs of the school district" (p. 38). Redfem (1980) recommends that before implementing a teacher self-evaluation program, a school district should provide teachers with (1) training to help them specify their own goals in measurement terms, (2) a framework (e.g., an observational system) for analyzing and interpreting their own behavior, and (3) the technical competence needed for operating various new media for recording their own behavior.

Critical Reflection Approach

The idea of using reflection as a part of the evaluation process is not new in the educational enterprise. Dewey, as far back as 1930, referred to reflection as an activity involving the perceptions of relationships and connections between parts of an experience (Boyd, Keogh & Walker, 1985).
Reflection can mean different things to each of us. In a physical sense the notion of mirrors and reflected images will often come to mind. From the individual view we may imagine silent, introspective reviewing of experiences that we have had or we might see groups of people carrying out post-mortems on issues or events they have shared. Many educators and writers have written on the concept of reflection. According to Boyd, et al. (1985); Fusco and Fountain (1992); and Wilson and Wing Jan (1993) reflection is:

1. An important human activity in which people recapture experience, think about it, mull over and evaluate it
2. A process that is integral to every aspect of learning – reflection precedes learning, it is part of learning, and occurs after learning
3. A process that implies revision, or recrafting, of learning experiences or a series of learning experiences
4. Involves the interaction of feelings, thoughts, and actions
5. Involves a process of looking inward at thoughts and thought processes and outwardly at experience and situations
6. Allows a person to see himself or herself as an actor with choices
7. Works as a catalyst for further thought and action.

The common thread found in the definitions is that reflection involves action and that the interaction of thoughts, feelings, and actions is paramount. It is only when we stop to think (reflect) that a reflective response becomes conscious. According to Boyd, et al. (1985), conscious reflection is necessary for evaluation of experience and to allow choices to be made about the action taken.
Reflection is action oriented. The nature of reflection means that the learner (anybody engaged in the reflective process) is continually involved in exploring events and experiences. Fusco and Fountain (1992) summarized the reflective process by pointing out that reflective response occurs as the learner constructs, reviews, and links experiences to prior, present, or proposed learning experiences. In order to accomplish adequate reflection learners need to be able to question, self-question, assess, evaluate, find alternatives, and express their feelings. This reflective process should be used in the evaluation of teaching performance (pp. 51-58).

Performance Objective Approach

The Performance Objective Approach (Redfern 1980) to teacher evaluation provides an opportunity for teachers and evaluators to work together. Since this method of evaluation is based upon analysis or measurement of the progress made on predetermined objectives, the evaluator and evaluatee must together agree and establish the objectives. To do this, there must be mutual understanding between the teacher and the evaluator. Objectives provide the basis of action for the teacher during classroom instruction. The Performance-Objectives Approach places responsibility for the evaluation process on both the teacher and evaluator. On this, Redfern (1980) said:

There is no doubt that evaluation by objectives puts new demands upon leadership talents of school administrators who are involved in the process. They are obliged to know more about evaluation as a process. They have to improve their skills in helping teachers set appropriate performance objectives. They are obliged to devise better monitoring and information-gathering techniques. And inescapably, they have to perfect counseling and conference competencies. (p. 8)

At the time when the evaluatee and evaluator jointly establish work objectives, they should also agree upon well-established action plans, and how to measure
accomplishments in terms of results obtained. In order to implement the objectives set in classroom instruction, they must be communicable and measurable. Hence, the objectives should be stated in behavioral terms. Since the objectives constitute a performance commitment on the part of a teacher, they should be clearly stated so that it can be determined when they have been reached. Bell (1974) suggests, “that the objective should be written using quantitative language and the anticipated results should be stated in numbers, percentages, ratios, or some other definite measurable terms” (p. 63).

Redfern (1980) identified six basic components of the Performance-Objective Approach aimed at improving an individual teacher’s performance:

1. Set responsibility criteria: Duties and responsibilities in the performance of an assignment must be indicated.
2. Identify needs: Using responsibility criteria, the evaluatee and the evaluator cooperatively identify the status of the performer’s current performance.
3. Set objectives and action plans: Objectives and action plans are the means to achieve desired outcomes determined by the evaluation process.
4. Carry out action plans: The evaluator should monitor the evaluatee’s performance to collect data and information that relate to the objectives being pursued. Monitoring is concerned with performance outputs; it is the evidence-gathering part of the total evaluation plan.
5. Assess results: Interpreting the meaning and significance of monitored data is a very important part of the total process of evaluation. This represents the culmination of all that has gone before.
6. Discuss results: The evaluation conference is exceedingly important. It is the occasion for the persons most intimately involved in the process to discuss the outcome of their efforts to achieve the objectives. A very important responsibility is placed upon the evaluator to help the evaluatee view evaluation as a constructive rather than a negative process. (p. 88)

During the discussion stage, the current objectives are reconsidered, and those that are no longer necessary are eliminated. Depending on an individual teacher’s ability and need, new objectives may be added to the previous ones, which have not been met. In other words, performance-objectives evaluation is cyclical.
The evaluator and evaluatee need to know that the performance objective's evaluation is not problem-free. The weakness of the method lies in the teachers' inability to identify and set realistic job targets. It is found that teachers set either too ambitious objectives that may require much of their time or invalid ones in which the pupils already possess the competence and do not need more work in that area (McNeil, 1967).

Frequently heard criticism of goal-based evaluation is that focusing attention on the results of performance only in terms of its intended objectives narrows the evaluation, so that the different procedures used to achieve results and their relationship to performance outcomes are ignored.

On the other hand, performance-objectives evaluation has its strengths. Redfern (1980) listed the following strengths:

1. Establishment of clearer perceptions of performance expectations: The process definitely clarifies the scope of an individual's duties and responsibilities. This emerges during the needs assessment process, which is conducted before specific performance objectives are determined.

2. Use of feedback to refine performance strategies and procedures: Evaluatees profit most when information regarding their performance is communicated to them in a timely manner. Feedback needs to be used as it becomes available. Periodic progress evaluations, throughout the year, should be used to modify performance procedures, to alter objectives, to discard some, and to replace those discarded with more relevant ones.

3. Reinforced practitioner-supervisor relationships: The performance objectives approach to evaluation changes the nature of the working relations between the practitioner and supervisor as the emphasis is upon partnership.
4. Greater sensitivity to needs and concerns of clients: It is repeatedly emphasized that in evaluation by objectives a major consideration is the learning achievement of students. The welfare of the student/client is paramount. Performance objectives stress what happens to students under the instruction and guidance of the teacher. While objectives may be fixed in other areas, the learner's needs and concerns come first.

The objectives-based evaluation, as can be seen, is a learner-oriented process. The evaluatee and evaluator are able to work together throughout the process in order to accomplish the objectives. The teacher carries out plans in the classroom, and the evaluator assists by monitoring the teacher's performance.

Clinical Supervision

Clinical supervision is defined as supervision focused upon the improvement of instruction by means of systematic cycles of planning, observation, and intensive intellectual analysis of actual teaching performance in the interest of rational modification (Weller, 1971). It "refers to face-to-face contact with teachers with the intent of improving instruction and increasing professional growth" (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1983, p. 292). Specifically, the word "clinical" is "meant to suggest face-to-face relationship between teacher and supervisor and a focus on the teacher's actual behavior in the classroom" (Acheson & Gall, 1980, p. 8).

Clinical supervision acknowledges the need for teacher evaluation, under the condition that the teacher participates with the supervisor in the entire process.

Expanding on this concept, Sergiovanni and Starratt (1983) stated:

In practice, clinical supervision requires a more intense relationship between supervisor and teacher than that found in traditional evaluation, first in the establishment of colleagueship through the cycle of supervision. The heart of
clinical supervision is an intense, continuous, mature relationship between supervisor and teacher with the intent being the improvement of professional practice. (p. 299)

According to Acheson and Gall (1980) the primary goal of clinical supervision "is the professional development of teachers, with an emphasis on improving a teacher's classroom performance" (p. 11). The authors further indicate the aims of clinical supervision to be the following:

1. To provide teachers with objective feedback on the current state of their instruction
2. To diagnose and solve instructional problems
3. To help teachers develop skill in using instructional strategies
4. To evaluate teachers for promotion, tenure, or other decisions
5. To help teachers develop a positive attitude about continuous professional development. (p. 11)

In order to achieve these aims, Sergiovanni and Starratt (1983) suggested:

The focus of clinical supervision should be on formative evaluation. The supervisor is first and foremost interested in improving instruction and increasing the teacher's personal development. A formative evaluation emphasis is entirely consistent with holding teachers accountable, but in a professional, not occupational sense. Professional accountability is growth-oriented and implies commitment to consistent improvement. (p. 58)

The authors also mention that "clinical supervision can and should take many forms, and that more experimentation with different forms is needed" (p. 59). Although the phase/stages of clinical supervision have been identified with various labels attached to the components involved, the content is similar with general emphasis placed on planning, observation, and evaluation (Peterson, 2000). Acheson and Gall (1980) view clinical supervision as "a model of supervision that contains three phases: planning conference, classroom observation, and feedback conference" (p. 11). The authors also suggest that planning and feedback conferences be used to identify and share evaluative
criteria. And, classroom observation data be used as a feedback to the teacher but also as the basis for objective evaluation of the teacher's performance.

Cogan (1973) identified eight phases to the cycle of clinical supervision. Phase 1 requires establishing the teacher-supervisor relationship. Phase 2 requires intensive planning of lessons and units with the teacher. Phase 3 requires planning of the classroom observation strategy by the teacher and supervisor. Phase 4 requires the supervisor to observe in-class instruction. Phase 5 requires careful analysis of the teaching-learning process. Phase 6 requires planning the conference strategy. Phase 7 is the conference and Phase 8 requires the resumption of planning.

Another model is that of Goldhammer (1963) which consists only of five stages: (a) pre-observation conference, (b) observation, (c) analysis and strategy, (d) supervision conference, and (e) post-conference analysis.

From the above clinical models, it can be seen that “the supervisor works at two levels with teachers during the cycle: helping them to understand and improve their professional practice and helping them to learn more about the skills of classroom analysis needed in supervision” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1983, p. 302).

In general, it has been found that the clinical supervision process often ends up producing a “professionally responsible teacher who is analytical of his or her own performance, open to help from others, and self-directing” (Cogan, 1973, p. 12). The reasons for such professional growth are that both the teacher and the supervisor participate actively in conferencing, data gathering and analyzing information gathered; they both work on the level of decision makers; they work as individuals and may agree
to disagree with the shared understanding about the final decisions and their implementation.

**Professional Goals**

In order for teacher evaluation to succeed, setting professional objectives for the process is a major element. Both the supervisor and the teacher should be involved in setting specific performance objectives, which will form a useful basis for the collection of data needed. Redfern (1980) has this to say about the importance of setting objectives:

> Objectives and action plans are the means to achieve desired outcomes determined by the evaluation process. At the time performance objectives are agreed upon, it is important to discuss the actions and efforts that will be expended to obtain the objectives. (p. 15)

It is a consensus in the literature that setting performance objectives is a major step in the teacher evaluation process and that it should be done jointly by the teacher and the supervisor (Beecher, 1979; Danielson, 2001; Hawley, 1976; Peterson, 1995). The objective should be stated in behavioral terms that can be measured for evaluation purposes. As the teacher and the supervisor work together in setting objectives, the needs of the teacher should be defined by her or him and then be incorporated. The teacher may also suggest ways to secure the data that will determine whether the objectives have been achieved. It is the responsibility of the supervisor to assist the teacher to see how the suggestions given can be best fitted into evaluation procedure. Both the teacher and the evaluator should agree on how progress on the objectives will be recognized and recorded. They should also agree on how any help, technical or personal, will be obtained or obtainable. The joint effort of the teacher and the supervisor places responsibility on both for the success or failure of the evaluation process. It also allows the recognition of a
teacher as a participating professional in design, implementation, and results of the
process. This kind of partnership, Noonan (1981) observed, can make the process of
teacher evaluation effective and successful. The author also observed:

The job satisfaction of teachers would increase both by recognition as a
professional whose input is critical and by participation in the process. Personal
development so crucial to teachers would have direction and the backing of the
administrator for the need would be clear and methods for correction available.
(p. 9)

As can be seen, the teacher involvement at any stage of the evaluation process is
not just a formality but it is a necessity. In summarizing the role of the evaluator and
evaluatee in setting objectives and the importance of objectives to teacher evaluation,
Redfem (1980) stated:

The nature of the performance targets is influenced by strategies that are devised
to attain them. The plan of action is composed in those activities that the
evaluatee and the evaluator have decided are the most promising for achieving
objectives. The evaluatee and the evaluator have mutual interest in the successful
achievement of the targets. The former has a direct and personal interest and the
latter has an interest that stems from management and supervisory
responsibilities. When proper planning has taken place, it will be possible for the
evaluatee to know precisely how to proceed in independent action during the year.
(p. 29)

Synthesis of the Research on Teacher Evaluation

In the literature three kinds of research on teacher evaluation were identified.
First, empirical studies present actual observed results with well-described procedures.
Second, survey studies report opinions, views, and attitudes of various participants
through questionnaires and interviews. Third, conceptual studies analyze the logic, intent
and consequences of practice.

An empirical study conducted by Medley and Coker (1987) depicted principals as
inaccurate raters both of individual teacher behavior and overall teacher merit. Medley
and Coker (1987) obtained ratings of 46 principals on 322 teachers in three roles: (a) facilitating pupil learning of fundamental knowledge; (b) fostering pupil development of citizenship, personal satisfaction, and self-understanding; and (c) being a professional colleague of other educators. The researchers correlated the principal ratings with empirical evidence of teacher performance using achievement tests and colleague reports. The authors reported low statistical correlation between administrative ratings and teacher roles: 0.20 with Knowledge growth in pupils, 0.19 with Affective growth in pupils, and 0.13 with Professionalism. Medley and Coker (1987) concluded that, "the most important finding of their study is the low accuracy of the average principal’s judgments of the performance of the teachers he or she supervises" (p. 245).

Kauchak et al. (1985) conducted a survey study of Utah and Florida teachers. They found evaluations based on principal visits to be "perfunctory with little or no effect on actual teaching practice" (p. 33). The first problem identified by the teachers was that evaluation visits were too brief and non-rigorous in their content. Second, teachers complained that the principal had not taught at their level (elementary) or in their subject area (secondary). Overall, the researchers found that teachers did not see evaluation as instrumental in improving their teaching.

Ongwela (1986) reported a survey study with 55 elementary principals in the Michigan Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. In general, she found that "teacher evaluation in the Michigan Conference was perfunctory, and in most cases the formal classroom observations were unannounced and the purpose of the visit was not made known to the teacher" (p. 170).
Johnson (1990) interviewed 115 teachers from the perspective of better understanding of their workplace. Overall, the teachers in Johnson's (1990) study were quite critical of current evaluation procedures:

For... good teachers, schools offered no systematic way to productively review and improve their practice. The process of... evaluation, supposedly meant for all teachers, actually addressed the problems of only the weakest. Evaluators were seldom sufficiently skilled or experienced to offer constructive criticism in subject areas and frequently limited themselves to giving categorical praise. They concentrated on the procedural demands of the process that were subject to legal review in any dismissal case. (p. 274)

Other survey studies found responses corroborating those given above. Trask (1964) found that even elementary school principals were faulted by teachers if they had not taught at the grade level at which they judged teacher performance. Osmond (1978) reported that more than half of his respondents said that not enough time was devoted to evaluation. Rothberg and Buchanan (1981) found that stress was the most negative part of current practice in teacher evaluation. Brevity and infrequency were the second most mentioned part of evaluation visits.

In their conceptual analysis study, Peterson and Chenoweth (1992) criticized current evaluation practices because teachers have little control and involvement in their own evaluation. They describe three ways to increase teacher participation:

First, recent technical developments... such as peer review... have not been widely adopted. Teachers and administrators alike lack technical expertise or awareness of... evaluation options. Second, means to develop teachers to change from passive recipients of evaluation into active participants have not been carefully thought out. Finally, educators who design teacher evaluation systems continue to place teachers into receiver roles, rather than to tap the more powerful functioning of professional evaluation. Researchers and policy makers lack a vision of teacher participation. (p. 177)
Linking Teacher Evaluation and Professional Growth

The need for, and implementation of, professional development has been well documented. Research conducted in 58 schools in Newfoundland, with 1,059 teachers in all districts, revealed that promotion of professional growth was the most significant single leadership activity that was related to increased levels of teacher commitment (the degree to which teachers are supportive of and committed to the school and their colleagues); professional involvement (the degree to which teachers are concerned about their work, are keen to learn from one another, and committed to professional development); and innovativeness (the degree to which variety, change, and new approaches are emphasized in the school) (Sheppard, 1996).

These findings were confirmed in another Newfoundland study of school improvement in which data were gathered from 19 districts, 155 principals, 279 teachers, 223 parents, and 69 students. Responding to a mail-out survey, principals and teachers were consistent in their perception of the most important activities which motivated school improvement in their schools, indicating that the most influential were professional development activities sponsored by the district (Brown, Button, Noseworthy-Button, & Sheppard, 1997).

This is consistent with the recognition of the need for staff development across North America. Guskey (1994) stated:

Never before in the history of education has there been a greater recognition of the importance of professional development. Every proposal to reform, restructure, or transform schools emphasizes professional development as the primary vehicle in efforts to bring needed change. (p. 42)
A number of theorists, notably Fullan (1993) and Guskey (1994, 1995), link teacher development with improvements in student learning. Guskey (1995) states, "If we are going to have improvement in student learning then staff development is an essential prerequisite" (p. 35). Similarly, Fullan (1993) concluded, "To restructure is not to reculture, and changing formal structures is not the same as changing norms, habits skills and beliefs" (p. 49). In other words, if teachers are to change teaching practice, or if the culture is to become a better one in the sense of improving student learning, teachers and administrators must be provided opportunities to learn. Fullan (1993), reviewing the evidence on site-based management, concluded, "Restructuring reforms that devolved decision making to schools may have altered governance procedures but did not affect the teaching-learning core of schools" (p. 230). He also cited Sarason who made the point even more forcefully, "Yes, we expect the teachers to give all to the growth and the development of students. But a teacher cannot sustain such giving unless the conditions exist for the continued growth and development of the teacher" [italics in the original] (Sarason, as cited in Fullan, 1993, p. 234).

It is because of the existence of the evidence and claims listed above that Brandt (1994) issued the challenge to North American educators: "They should make continuous learning an integral part of every educator's professional life" (p. 2). Also, this appeal is recognized in the mission statement of the National Staff Development Council (NSDC) in the United States which broadens the role of professional development in respect to continuous learning as it is not only directed at professionals, but also students and the school. It emphasizes (1) ensuring success for all students, (2) improving schools, and (3) advancing individual and organizational development (Sullivan, 1997).
Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (1995) identify a variety of formats for staff development, which have emerged over the last several years. Some examples follow:

*Mentoring programs:* An experienced teacher is assigned to a novice for the purpose of providing individualized, ongoing, professional support.

*Skill-development programs:* This consists of several workshops over a period of months, and classroom coaching between workshops to assist teachers to transfer new skills to their daily teaching.

*Teacher centers:* Teachers can meet at a central location to engage in professional dialogue, develop skills, plan innovations, and gather or create instructional materials.

*Teacher institutes:* Teachers participate in intensive learning experiences on single, complex topics over a period of consecutive days or weeks.

*Collegial support groups:* Teachers within the same school engage in a group inquiry and address common problems, jointly implement instructional innovations, and provide mutual support.

*Networks:* Teachers from different schools share information, concerns, and accomplishments and engage in common learning through computer links, newsletters, fax machines, and occasional seminars and conferences.

*Teacher leadership:* Teachers participate in leadership preparation programs and assist other teachers by assuming one or more leadership roles (workshop presenter, cooperating teacher, mentor, expert coach, instructional team leader, curriculum developer). The teacher-leader not only assists other teachers but also experiences professional growth as a result of being involved in leadership activities.
Teacher as writer: This increasingly popular format has teachers reflect on and write about their students, teaching, and professional growth. Such writing can be in the form of private journals, essays, or reaction papers to share with colleagues, or formal articles for publication in educational journals.

Individually planned staff development: Teachers set individual goals and objectives, plan and carry out activities, and assess results.

Partnerships: Partnerships between schools and universities or businesses, in which both partners are considered equal, have mutual rights and responsibilities, ample contributions and receive benefits. Such partnerships could involve one or more of the previously described formats (Glickman et al., 1995, p. 340).

In conclusion, as documented by research, the best strategy for improving teaching and learning is building the capacity of the school to function as a learning community in which professional development is job embedded. Furthermore, if educators are to accept the lessons related to professional development highlighted herein, they must be committed to both individual and organizational learning. While it is clear that individuals can learn without any contribution from the organization, it is also apparent that learning can be helped or hindered by the organization. Also, because schools are human endeavors, it makes intuitive sense that organizational learning will not occur unless individuals are learning. According to Griffin (1997), “The current mental images of professional development must be challenged, and new images must be constructed in order for our schools to become centers of continuous learning that will serve our students in the new millennium” (p. 166).
Summary

This chapter dealt with the various aspects of teacher evaluation. It included the following: (1) the purpose of teacher evaluation; (2) teacher evaluation procedures which took into account things such as scheduling, observation, and conferences; (3) the role of the administrator in teacher evaluation; (4) climate and relationship which looked into areas like setting climate for teacher-principal relationships, the principal as a personnel manager, the principal as a communicator, and human relationships as an asset to the principal in teacher evaluation; (5) current evaluation processes which involve the following methods and techniques: administrative ratings, teacher self-evaluation, student evaluation of teachers, evaluation of teachers by peers, student achievement tests and clinical supervision and (6) professional development of teachers.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This chapter presents the research design and methodology used in this study. The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions held toward teacher evaluation practices and policies by teachers and their supervisors in Adventist schools in Canada. Discussion in this chapter includes the research design, research population and sample, instrumentation, collection of data, research questions and related null hypotheses, statistical methodology, and a chapter summary.

Research Design

This research study was descriptive and explorative in nature. It utilized a five-paged, quantitative survey instrument to measure the perceptions held toward teacher evaluation practices and policies by teachers and their supervisors in Adventist schools in Canada.

The purpose of a descriptive research is to "describe systematically the facts and characteristics of a given population or area of interest" (Isaac & Michael, 1979, p. 18) and such research entails a database.

The survey method was utilized to allow the researcher access to many more subjects than is possible when interviewing alone. It was also relatively less expensive.
than interviewing subjects all over Canada. A five-part questionnaire was simultaneously mailed to 225 teachers and 48 supervisors.

A disadvantage of this method was that the response rate was lower than with the interview technique. Also, questions on the quantitative survey are frequently closed-ended which discourage respondents from clarifying their answers.

The Population and Sample

The target population in this study consisted of all elementary and secondary teachers, current and recently retired supervisors within the Adventist schools in Canada. A list containing the elementary and secondary teachers as well as the current supervisors was obtained from the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Canada Office of Education. Form the list of 275 teachers only those teachers who had taught for at least 1 year in Adventist schools in Canada were selected. As a result, 225 teachers and 48 supervisors were identified for the study.

The study involved the total population of teachers (225) who had taught at least one year or more without any sampling. Sampling was not done because the population of teachers and supervisors in the Adventist schools in Canada was relatively small and the numbers were manageable. The supervisors who participated in this study were principals and superintendents of education serving in their positions or recently retired.

There were various elements of perception addressed in this study: teaching ability, evaluation time, evaluation hindrance, evaluation frequency, degree of evaluation satisfaction, frequency of usage of standardized form, type of form used, incidence of non-standardized methods, importance of formal observation, frequency of individual conference, time spent observing teaching performance, influential source of information
about teaching performance, degree of usefulness of evaluation, frequency of debriefing after evaluation, how soon post-observation take place, post-evaluation action, supervisors level of competence and their level of easiness in certain administrative roles.

Two additional measures on pre- and post-evaluation training were added to ascertain the level of competence of the supervisors in their role as evaluators of teachers. To further explain the differences between the two groups, comments resulting from the open-ended question on the questionnaire were analyzed into three categories: purpose of evaluation, training for supervisors, and evaluation policies and practices, from which frequency tabulation was performed to determine relative areas of concern.

**Instrumentation**

The survey questionnaires used in the study was adapted from the one used by Hauge (1981). Hauge had revised the instrument used by Kowalski (1978) and McKenzie (1979). In order to address the Adventist school in Canada teachers and supervisors situation, slight modifications were made to the questions. Some of the questions were reworded, deleted or substituted. To verify the validity of the instrument, it was reviewed by two professors in the Educational Administration and Leadership Department at Andrews University, two teachers (one secondary and one elementary), two principals (one elementary and one secondary) and one superintendent of education. Their suggestions were incorporated into the final version of the survey questionnaires.

The first research question required the two groups of respondents (supervisors and teachers) to indicate how well supervisors thought they knew their teachers’ teaching capabilities, and how well teachers knew their own teaching abilities. Also, supervisors and teachers investigated the sources that gave the most influential information about the
quality of teachers' teaching performance. Items 1 and 12 on the survey questionnaire, which correspond to null hypotheses 1-6 addressed the first research question.

To answer the second research question, the respondents were asked their opinion of the usefulness of their evaluation process as presently conducted and question 13 on the survey questionnaire, which corresponds to null hypothesis 7, was used to answer that research question.

In the third research question, the two groups of respondents were asked what is the main purpose of evaluation, and null hypotheses 8-11, which correspond to item 9 on the survey questionnaire, were used to address that question.

To answer the fourth research question, the supervisors and teachers were asked to indicate their perceptions on four of the basic components of the evaluation process (i.e., classroom observation, instruments used for evaluation, criteria and follow-up procedures). A total of 12 items on the survey questionnaire and the corresponding 20 null hypotheses addressed this question. A breakdown of the four areas listed above, and the items on the survey questionnaire, as well as the corresponding hypotheses that address each area are as follows: (1) Null hypotheses 12-18, which correspond to items 2-5 and 11 on the survey questionnaire addressed classroom observation; (2) Null hypotheses 19 and 20, which correspond to items 6 and 7 on the survey questionnaire dealt with the kind of instruments used for teacher evaluation; (3) Item 8 on the survey questionnaire, which corresponds to null hypotheses 21-27, addressed the criteria used; and (4) null hypotheses 28-31, which correspond to items 10 and 14-16 on the survey questionnaire, addressed follow-up procedures.
To answer the fifth research question, both groups were asked how they view the supervisors' level of competence and how at ease they feel in some of their administrative roles. Items 17 and 18 on the survey questionnaire, which correspond to null hypotheses 32-47, were used to answer that question.

To answer the sixth research question, the respondents were asked what steps they would recommend in order to improve the evaluation process. Item 19 on the survey questionnaire addressed that question. Two additional questions, which constitute research questions seven and eight respectively were included on the supervisors' survey questionnaire.

To answer the seventh research question, the supervisors were asked what formal training in evaluation of teaching performance did they acquire before becoming evaluators of teachers' teaching performance. Item 20 on the supervisors' survey questionnaire addressed that question.

To answer the eighth research question, the supervisors were asked what formal training in evaluation of teaching performance did they acquire after becoming evaluators of teachers' teaching performance. Item 21 on the supervisors' survey questionnaire addressed that question.

Collection of Data

The names and addresses of all teachers (225) and all supervisors (48) were collected from the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Canada Office of Education directory. A survey packet containing a cover letter (Appendix A), the survey instruments (Appendix B), and a self-addressed return envelope, were sent by first class mail from the researcher to all potential subjects at the same time. The cover letter included the purpose
of the study, a statement assuring confidentiality and a telephone number for use in the event of questions or problems. A follow-up letter (Appendix A) was sent approximately 3 weeks after the survey instrument to all recipients of the original mailing. This letter reminded recipients to complete and return the survey instrument if they had not already done so. A few duplicate survey instrument packets were mailed to recipients as a result of this letter.

From the original 225 surveys sent to the teachers and 48 sent to the supervisors, none were returned as undeliverable. Data collection efforts yielded a 43.6 percent return from teachers (98 of 225) and a 52.0 percent from supervisors (25 of 48).

Research Questions and Related Null Hypotheses

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions held toward teacher evaluation policies and practices by teachers and their supervisors in Adventist Schools in Canada. This study addressed the following questions and corresponding null hypotheses:

Research Question 1: To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the supervisors' knowledge of their teachers' teaching capabilities and the sources that gave the most influential information about the quality of teachers' teaching performance?

Hypothesis 1. There is no significant difference (or discrepancy) between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the extent to which supervisors know their teachers' teaching capabilities.

Item 1 on the survey questionnaire, which corresponds to null hypothesis 1, was analyzed by using chi-square.
Hypothesis 2. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of using the students' performance on standardized tests as a source of information about the quality of teachers' teaching performance.

Item 12 on the survey questionnaire, which corresponds to hypotheses 2-6, were analyzed by t-test.

Hypothesis 3. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of the supervisors using their intuition as a source of information about the quality of teachers' teaching performance.

Hypothesis 4. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of the supervisors using their subjective observation and evaluation as a source of information about the quality of teachers' teaching performance.

Hypothesis 5. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of supervisors using input from parents as a source of information about the quality of teachers' teaching performance.

Hypothesis 6. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of supervisors using input from students as a source of information about the quality of teachers' teaching performance.

Research Question 2: To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the usefulness of the evaluation process?
To answer this question, item 13 on the survey questionnaire, which corresponds to null hypothesis 7, was analyzed by using chi-square.

**Hypothesis 7.** There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the real issues involved in the formal observation of teachers' teaching performance as it is presently conducted.

**Research Question 3:** To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the main purpose of evaluation of teaching performance?

In an attempt to answer this question, the response to item 9 on the survey questionnaire, which corresponds to null hypotheses 8-11 were analyzed by using t-test.

**Hypothesis 8.** There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions that one of the main purposes of evaluation is to ensure the integration of faith and learning.

**Hypothesis 9.** There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions that one of the main purposes of evaluation is to distinguish between effective and ineffective teachers.

**Hypothesis 10.** There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions that one of the main purposes of evaluation is to improve the quality of the teachers' teaching performance.

**Hypothesis 11.** There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions that one of the main purposes of evaluation is to maximize the learning opportunities for students.
Research Question 4: To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning knowledge of current teacher evaluation processes (i.e., classroom observation, instruments used, criteria used, and follow-up procedures)?

There were a total of 12 items on the survey questionnaire that addressed the four areas listed above. Items 2, 3, 4, 5, and 11 which correspond to null hypotheses 12-18, dealt with classroom observation. The method of analysis used for these null hypotheses was chi-square. Items 6 and 7 on the survey questionnaire correspond to null hypotheses 19 and 20 addressed the instruments used, and chi-square was used to analyze the null hypotheses. Item 8 on the survey questionnaire, which corresponds to null hypotheses 21-27 addressed the criteria used, and t-test was used as the method of analysis. Items 10, 14, 15, and 16 on the survey questionnaire, which corresponds to null hypotheses 28-31 focused on follow-up procedures, and chi-square was the method of analysis.

Hypothesis 12. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how much time supervisors have to evaluate the teaching performance of their staff.

Hypothesis 13. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the main reasons for not observing and evaluating teachers as supervisors would like.

Hypothesis 14. There is no significant difference between probationary teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the frequency with which teachers are evaluated.
Hypothesis 15. There is no significant difference between regular teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the frequency with which teachers are evaluated.

Hypothesis 16. There is no significant difference between professional teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the frequency with which teachers are evaluated.

Hypothesis 17. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of their satisfaction with the frequency with which supervisors observed their teachers' teaching performance.

Hypothesis 18. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the length of time supervisors spend in observing teachers' teaching performance.

Hypothesis 19. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how frequently a standardized form is used by their supervisors to evaluate teachers' teaching performance.

Hypothesis 20. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the kind of standard form supervisors use to evaluate their teaching performance.

Hypothesis 21. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of teachers' general appearance and bearing as it relates to their teachers' teaching performance.

Hypothesis 22. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of the quality of teachers' interaction with students as it relates to their teachers' teaching performance.
Hypothesis 23. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of teachers’ use of behavioral objectives as it relates to their teachers’ teaching performance.

Hypothesis 24. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of teachers’ ability to control the class as it relates to their teachers’ teaching performance.

Hypothesis 25. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of teachers’ use of a variety of teaching materials as it relates to their teachers’ teaching performance.

Hypothesis 26. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of teachers’ verbal and writing skills as it relates to their teachers’ teaching performance.

Hypothesis 27. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of teachers’ ability to meet diverse needs of students as it relates to their teachers’ teaching performance.

Hypothesis 28. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the frequency of conducting a pre-observation conference during the formal observation of teaching performance.

Hypothesis 29. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the frequency post-observation evaluation conferences are conducted.
Hypothesis 30. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the time supervisors conduct post-observation evaluation conferences.

Hypothesis 31. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the action that most often follow the supervisor's formal observation of teachers' teaching performance.

Research Question 5: To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the supervisors' level of competence and how at ease they feel in some of their administrative roles?

Items 17 and 18. on the survey questionnaire, which correspond to null hypotheses 32-47 addressed the competency of the supervisors in some of their administrative roles. and t-test was used to analyze each null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 32. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as disciplinarian - guiding the students through the difficulties of growth and demonstrating their sincere love and concern for their students' well-being.

Hypothesis 33. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as evaluator of teachers' teaching performance.

Hypothesis 34. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as manager of the school budget.
Hypothesis 35. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as spiritual leader of the school.

Hypothesis 36. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as director of school public relations.

Hypothesis 37. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as counselor of students.

Hypothesis 38. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as secretary of the school board.

Hypothesis 39. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as counselor of faculty and staff.

Hypothesis 40. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as director of school public relations.

Hypothesis 41. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as counselor of students.

Hypothesis 42. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as
disciplinarian - guiding the students through the difficulties of growth and demonstrating their sincere love and concern for their students' well-being.

Hypothesis 43. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as evaluator of teachers' teaching performance.

Hypothesis 44. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as spiritual leader of the school.

Hypothesis 45. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as manager of the school budget.

Hypothesis 46. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as secretary of the school board.

Hypothesis 47. There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as counselor to faculty and staff.

Research Question 6: What steps do teachers and supervisors recommend for improving the evaluation of teachers' teaching performance in Adventist schools in Canada?

Item 19 on the survey questionnaire asked the respondents to list as many suggestions as they could regarding how the present practice of evaluating teaching performance could be improved in Adventist schools in Canada.
Of the suggestions made by the respondents, three recurring themes emerged. The themes were (1) purposes of evaluation, (2) training for evaluators, and (3) teacher evaluation practices and procedures. The themes were analyzed by using frequency and percent.

**Research Question 7:** What formal training in evaluation of teaching performance did supervisors acquire before becoming evaluators of teachers’ teaching performance?

Item 20 on the supervisors survey questionnaire was analyzed by using frequency and percent.

**Research Question 8:** What formal training in evaluation of teaching performance did supervisors acquire since becoming evaluators of teachers’ teaching performance?

Item 21 on the supervisors survey questionnaire was also analyzed by using frequency and percent.

**Statistical Methodology**

The researcher scored the returned responses. The survey instrument was designed with forced-choice items to facilitate the assignment of codes to responses. Open-ended items were categorized according to content before codes were assigned. Statistical analyses were performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The 47 null hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance using the following statistical procedures:
1. *t*-tests were implemented to determine whether a significant difference existed between variables for hypotheses 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, and 47.

2. Chi-square tests were used to determine whether or not an association existed between variables by calculating discrepancies between observed and expected cell frequencies for hypotheses 1, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 28, 29, 30, and 31.

**Summary**

The methodology employed in this research study was descriptive and explorative in nature. The researcher used a quantitative survey instrument that was simultaneously mailed to all 225 teachers and 48 superintendents in Adventist schools in Canada. A total response time of approximately 8 weeks was necessary to collect the survey instruments. Of the 225 teachers surveyed, 98 (or 43.6%) of the surveys were completed and returned. Of the 48 supervisors surveyed, 25 (or 52.0%) of the surveys were completed and returned. Statistical analysis was performed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences utilizing *t*-tests where appropriate and chi-square.

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions held toward teacher evaluation policies and practices by teachers and their supervisors in Adventist schools in Canada. The target population in this study consisted of all elementary and secondary teachers, current supervisors, and those recently retired. Chapter 4 presents the results of the data analysis.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions held toward teacher evaluation practices and policies by teachers and their supervisors in Adventist Schools in Canada.

Chapter 1 established the need for the study and delineated the problem, the research questions raised and hypotheses to be tested. Chapter 2 presented a review of the related literature and in chapter 3 the study population and sample was described, the variables were defined and the survey instrument discussed. This chapter reports the findings from the survey and a detailed analysis of the data.

The results of the study findings are grouped and presented in the following five sections: (1) study population and sample, (2) demographic data and profile of respondents, (3) testing of hypotheses and related findings, (4) additional questions and related findings and (5) summary of data analysis.

Study Population and Sample

The intended participants in this study were all elementary and secondary teachers and supervisors (the principal or superintendent who completes formal evaluations of teachers) in the Adventist schools in Canada. Of the 225 teachers surveyed, 98 (43.6%)
returned questionnaires, and of the 48 supervisors surveyed, 25 (52.0%) returned questionnaires.

Demographic Data and Profile of the Respondents

The survey questionnaire developed for this study contained a section in which respondents indicated personal information. The teachers were asked to respond to questions concerning the following demographic data: sex, age, number of years served in Adventist education, employment status, number of years in present position, and highest degree earned.

Frequency distributions representing responses to personal data for the teachers are represented in Table 1. Of the 98 respondents, 61 (or 62.2%) were females and 37 (or 37.8%) were males. Of the 98 respondents, 38 (or 38.8%) indicated their age as more than 50.

In regard to years served in Adventist education, 18 (or 18.6%) served between 2-5 years, 25 (or 25.8%) served 11-15 years and 23 (or 23.7%) indicated that they have served more than 20 years in Adventist education.

According to responses regarding the highest degree earned, 1 (or 1.0%) has less than a bachelor degree, 64 (or 63.0%) has earned bachelor’s degrees, 31 (or 31.6%) have earned master’s degrees, and 1 (or 1.0%) has a doctorate degree.

For the total number of years served in their present position, 41 (or 42.7%) indicated that they have served between 0.5 to 3.5 years, 29 (or 30.2%) indicated that they have served between 4.0 to 10.0 years and 26 (or 27.1%) indicated that they have served more than 11 years in their present positions.
Table 1

*Teachers' Biographical Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Experience in Adventist Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationary/ Provisional</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Years in Present Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 to 3.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 to 10.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than bachelor's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The supervisors were asked to respond to questions concerning the following demographic data: sex, age, number of years served in Adventist education, employment status, number of years in present position, and highest degree earned.

Frequency distributions representing responses to personal data for the supervisors are given in Table 2. Of the 25 respondents, 8 (or 32.0%) were females and 17 (or 68.0%) were males. The distribution of the respondents by age was 1 (or 4.0%) between 21-30 years of age, 3 (or 12.0%) between 31-40 years of age, 7 (or 28.0%) between 41-50 years of age, and 14 (or 56.0%) indicated their age was more than 50.

In regard to years served in Adventist education, the distribution of the responses was as follows: 9 (or 37.5%) served between 2-5 years, 3 (or 12.5%) served between 6-10 years, 7 (or 29.2%) served between 11-15 years, 3 (or 12.5%) served between 16-20 years and 2 (or 8.3%) served for more than 20 years.

The amount of years the supervisors served in their present positions were classified into three groups namely beginner, intermediate, and senior. The responses obtained indicated that 10 (or 45.5%) were beginners serving between 0.5-3.5 years in their present position, 8 (or 36.4%) were intermediates serving between 4-10 years in their present position, and 4 (or 18.2%) were seniors serving for more than 11 years in their present position.

According to responses regarding the highest degree earned, none had less than a bachelor degree, 6 (or 24.0%) had a bachelor degree, 13 (or 52.0%) had earned master's degree, 1 (or 4.0%) had a specialist degree, and 5 (or 20.0%) had a doctorate degree.
Table 2

*Supervisors' Biographical Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Experience in Adventist Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Years in Present Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5-3.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0-10.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>90.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Testing of Hypotheses and Related Findings

There were 47 hypotheses that were statistically analyzed by using the chi-square ($\chi^2$) and $t$-test procedures. Hypotheses 1, 7, 12-20, 28-31 were analyzed with chi-square, and hypotheses 2-6, 8-11, 21-27, 32-47 were analyzed with $t$-test.

Chi-square ($\chi^2$) procedure is used as an inferential statistic with nominal data such as frequency counts, and ordinal data, such as percentages. In other words, chi-square procedure treats the categorical data and the total frequency in each category (observed frequencies), which are then compared to the expected frequency. Second, the $t$-test procedure was used to indicate the probability that the means of the two groups (teachers and supervisors) were different. Overall, the greater the mean the weaker was the perception on a particular issue.

Null Hypotheses Related to Question 1

Question 1. To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the supervisors' knowledge of their teachers' teaching capabilities and the sources that gave the most influential information about the quality of teachers' teaching performance?

Null hypothesis 1

Null hypothesis 1 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the extent to which supervisors know their teachers' teaching abilities. Item 1 on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.
The null hypothesis was rejected ($\chi^2 = 9.554, p = .008$). As shown in Table 3, while a significantly higher proportion of the teachers, 22 (or 22.4%), compared to a significantly smaller proportion, 1 (or 4.0%), of the supervisors indicated that they have only a little idea of their teachers' teaching abilities, a significantly higher proportion of the supervisors, 13 (or 52.0%), compared to a smaller proportion of the teachers, 23 (or 23.5%), indicated that they have a very clear idea of the teaching capabilities of the teachers. A significantly higher proportion of the teachers, 53 (or 54.1%), compared to 11 (or 44.0%), of the supervisors indicated that they have a fairly clear idea of the teaching capabilities of the teachers. There seems to be discrepant views on this issue.

Table 3

*Perceptions of Teachers and Supervisors on Teaching Capabilities of Teachers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Little Idea</th>
<th>Fairly Clear Idea</th>
<th>Very Clear Idea</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypotheses 2-6 use $t$-tests. A scale of 1-6 where 1 represents the most influential and 6 the least influential was used to compare the strength of the means. The following scale was used to compare the two groups: 1-2 = high importance, 3-4 = moderate importance, 5-6 = low importance.
Null hypothesis 2

Null hypothesis 2 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of using students’ performance on standardized tests as a source of information about the quality of teachers’ teaching performance. Item 12 (a) on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was retained ($t_{113} = .49, p = .628$). Although there was no significant difference between teachers ($M = 3.50$) and their supervisors ($M = 3.35$) on their perception of the importance of supervisors’ making use of students’ performance on standardized tests as a source of information about the quality of their teachers’ teaching performance. a comparison of the means indicated that both groups placed moderate importance on using students’ standardized test scores as a source of information about the quality of teachers’ teaching performance.

Null hypothesis 3

Null hypothesis 3 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of supervisors using their intuition as a source of information about the quality of teachers’ teaching performance. This hypothesis was addressed by using item 12 (b) on the survey instrument.

The null hypothesis was retained ($t_{112} = -1.18, p = .240$). Although there was no significant difference between teachers ($M = 3.52$) and supervisors ($M = 3.95$) on their perception of the importance of a supervisor using his or her intuition as a source of information about the quality of teachers’ teaching performance, a comparison of the means indicated that both groups placed moderate importance on supervisors using their intuition as a source of information about the quality of teachers’ teaching performance.
Null hypothesis 4

Null hypothesis 4 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of supervisors using their subjective observation and evaluation as a source of information about the quality of teachers' teaching performance. Item 12 (c) on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was retained ($t_{116} = 1.55, p = .125$). There was no significant difference between teachers ($M = 1.63$) and their supervisors ($M = 1.25$) on their perception of the importance of supervisors' use of personal observation and evaluation as a source of information about the quality of teachers' teaching performance. A comparison of the means indicated that the teachers as well as the supervisors placed high importance on the personal observation and evaluation by the supervisor as a source of information about teachers' teaching performance.

Null hypothesis 5

Null hypothesis 5 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of supervisors using input from parents as a source of information about the quality of teachers' teaching performance. This hypothesis was addressed by using item 12 (d) on the survey questionnaire.

The null hypothesis was retained ($t_{115} = -.80, p = .425$). There was no significant difference between teachers ($M = 3.72$) and their supervisors ($M = 3.91$) on their perception of the importance of supervisors' use of input from parents as a source of information about the quality of the teachers' teaching performance. However, a comparison of the means indicated that the both groups rated with moderate importance.
on using input from parents as a source of information about the quality of teachers' teaching performance.

Null hypothesis 6

Null hypothesis 6 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of supervisors using input from students as a source of information about the quality of teachers' teaching performance. Item 12 (e) on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was rejected ($t_{116} = 2.21, p = .029$). There was a statistically significant difference between teachers ($M = 3.18$) and their supervisors ($M = 2.58$) on their perception of the importance of supervisors using the input from students as a source of information about the quality of teachers' teaching performance. Although both groups tended to place moderate importance on using input from students as a source of information about the quality of teachers' teaching performance, supervisors placed significantly higher importance than the teachers.

Null Hypothesis Related to Question 2

Question 2: To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the usefulness of the evaluation process?

Null hypothesis 7

Null hypothesis 7 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the usefulness of the observation of teaching
performance as it is presently conducted. Item 13 on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was retained ($\chi^2 = 7.258, p = .300$). The analysis of the data in Table 4 shows that 48 (or 49.0%) of the teachers compared to a similar proportion, 12 (or 50.0%), of the supervisors indicated that evaluation is somewhat helpful. Also, while 8 (or 8.2%) of the teachers compared to a similar proportion, 1 (or 4.2%), of the supervisors indicated that evaluation lacks clarity, only 1 (or 1.0%) of the teachers compared to a similar proportion, 1 (or 4.2%), of the supervisors indicated that evaluation as presently conducted is threatening. Twenty-five (or 5.5%) of the teachers compared to a dissimilar proportion, 10 (or 41.7%), of the supervisors indicated that evaluation as presently conducted is helpful. In spite of that, the overall perception of the teachers and the supervisors regarding the usefulness of teacher evaluation in the Adventist schools in Canada was congruent.

Table 4

*Perceptions of Teachers and Supervisors on Usefulness of Teaching Performance as Presently Conducted*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>Somewhat Helpful</th>
<th>It's an Imposition</th>
<th>Lacks Clarity</th>
<th>Threatening</th>
<th>Judgmental</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>25 5.5</td>
<td>48 49.0</td>
<td>2 2.0</td>
<td>8 8.2</td>
<td>1 1.0</td>
<td>3 3.1</td>
<td>11 11.2</td>
<td>98 80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>10 41.7</td>
<td>12 50.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>1 4.2</td>
<td>1 4.2</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>24 19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35 28.7</td>
<td>60 49.2</td>
<td>2 1.6</td>
<td>9 7.4</td>
<td>2 1.6</td>
<td>3 2.5</td>
<td>11 9.0</td>
<td>122 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Null Hypotheses Related to Question 3

Question 3: To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the main purpose of evaluation of teaching performance?

Null hypotheses 8-11 use t-tests. In order to test the strength of the means, a scale of 1 to 4 was used. One represents most important and 4 least important. The following scale was used to compare the two groups: 1 = high importance, 2 = moderately high importance, 3 = low importance and 4 = least importance.

Null hypothesis 8

Null hypothesis 8 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions that the main purpose of evaluation is to ensure the integration of faith and learning. This hypothesis was addressed by using item 9 (a) on the survey questionnaire.

The null hypothesis was retained ($t_{118} = .23, p = .822$). Analysis of the data shows that there was no significant difference between teachers ($M = 3.13$) and their supervisors ($M = 3.08$) on their perception that the main purpose of evaluation is to ensure the integration of faith and learning. Both groups indicated low importance.

Null hypothesis 9

Null hypothesis 9 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions that the main purpose of evaluation is to distinguish between effective and ineffective teachers. Item 9 (b) on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.
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The null hypothesis was rejected ($t_{119} = -2.33, p = .021$). Analysis of the data shows that there was a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of the teachers ($M = 3.01$) and their supervisors ($M = 3.56$). A comparison of the means indicated that while both groups tended to place low importance on the perception that the main purpose of evaluation is to distinguish between effective and ineffective teachers, teachers placed significantly higher importance than the supervisors.

Null hypothesis 10

Null hypothesis 10 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions that the main purpose of evaluation is to improve the quality of teachers' performance. This hypothesis was addressed by using item 9 (c) on the survey questionnaire.

The null hypothesis was retained ($t_{118} = 1.08, p = .283$). Analysis of the data shows that there was no significant difference between the perceptions of the teachers ($M = 1.66$) and their supervisors ($M = 1.48$). A comparison of the means indicated that both groups tended to place high importance on the perception that the main purpose of evaluation is to improve the quality of teachers' performance.

Null hypothesis 11

Null hypothesis 11 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions that the main purpose of evaluation is to maximize the learning opportunities for students. Item 9 (d) on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.
The null hypothesis was retained \( t_{118} = 1.23, p = .220 \). Although there was no significant difference between teachers \( (M = 2.13) \) and their supervisors \( (M = 1.88) \) on their perception that the main purpose of evaluation is to maximize the learning opportunities for students, a comparison of the means indicated that both groups tended to place high importance on the perception that to maximize the learning opportunities for students is the main purpose of evaluation.

Null Hypotheses Related to Question 4

Question 4: To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors' and those of their teachers concerning knowledge of some of the basic components of the evaluation processes (i.e., classroom observation, instrument used, criteria used and follow-up procedures)?

Null hypothesis 12

Null hypothesis 12 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how much time supervisors devote to evaluating the teaching performance of their staff. Item 2 on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was retained \( \chi^2 = 2.156, p = .340 \). Table 5 shows that 33 (or 37.5%) of the teachers compared to a similar proportion, 7 (or 28.0%), of the supervisors indicated that they rarely have enough time to evaluate their teachers' teaching performance. Also, while 53 (or 54.1%) of the teachers compared to a similar proportion, 17 (or 68.0%), of the supervisors indicated that supervisors usually have enough time to evaluate teachers' teaching performance, only 12 (or 12.2%) of the teachers compared to
a similar proportion, 1 (or 4.0%), of the supervisors indicated that supervisors always
have enough time to evaluate teachers' teaching performance. Therefore, it appears that
there is congruency between the perception of the teachers and the supervisors regarding
the amount of time supervisors in the Adventist schools in Canada devote to the
evaluation of their teachers.

Table 5

Perceptions of Teachers and Supervisors on Enough Time to Evaluate Teaching
Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypothesis 13

Null hypothesis 13 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and
their supervisors in their perceptions of the main hindrance supervisors give for not
observing and evaluating teachers as often as they would like. Item 3 on the survey
questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was retained ($\chi^2 = 8.578, p = .073$). Analysis of the data in
Table 6 shows that 3 (or 4.4%) of the teachers compared to a similar proportion, 1 (or
4.2%) of the supervisors indicated that budgetary matters are the main hindrance
supervisors give for not observing and evaluating teachers as often as they would like.
Also, 6 (or 8.8%) of the teachers compared to a similar proportion, 7 (or 29.2%), of
supervisors indicated that part-time teaching was the main hindrance. While 5 (or 7.4%) of the teachers compared to a similar proportion, 3 (or 12.5%). of the supervisors indicated that disciplinary problems was the main hindrance supervisors give for not evaluating teachers, only 48 (or 70.6%), of the teachers compared to a similar proportion, 13 (or 54.2). of the supervisors say other responsibilities were the main hindrance. It would appear that the perceptions of the teachers, and the supervisors are similar regarding the main hindrance supervisors give for not evaluating teachers.

Table 6

Perceptions of Teachers and Supervisors on Main Hindrance to Evaluating Teaching Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budgetary Matters</th>
<th>Part-time Teaching</th>
<th>Disciplinary Problems</th>
<th>Off-Campus Meetings</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypothesis 14

Null hypothesis 14 states: There is no significant difference between probationary/provisional teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the frequency with which supervisors evaluated their teaching performance, during the 1999-2000 school year. Item 4 on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was rejected ($\chi^2 = 12.034, p = .002$). Table 7 shows that a significantly higher proportion, 7 (or 70%), of the probationary/provisional teachers
compared to a significantly smaller proportion, 2 (or 12.5%), of the supervisors indicated that the evaluation of the teaching performance of probationary/provisional teachers occurred only once during the 1999-2000 school year. Also, a significantly higher proportion of the supervisors, 14 (or 87.5%), compared to a significantly smaller proportion, 2 (or 20%), of probationary/provisional teachers indicated that they were evaluated by their supervisors two or more times during that same time period. There seems to be a wide discrepancy on this issue.

Table 7

Perceptions of Teachers and Supervisors on Frequency of Evaluation of Probationary/Provisional Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>One Time</th>
<th>2 or More Times</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypothesis 15

Null hypothesis 15 states: There is no significant difference between regular teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the frequency with which supervisors evaluated their teaching performance during the 1999-2000 school year. Item 4 on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was rejected ($\chi^2 = 6.956, p = .031$). Analysis of the data in Table 8 shows that a significantly higher proportion, 16 (or 36.4%), of the teachers on regular employment status compared to a significantly lower proportion, 1 (or 5%), of the
supervisors indicated that no evaluation of their teaching performance occurred during the 1999-2000 school year. On the other hand, a significantly higher proportion, 16 (or 80.0%), of the supervisors compared to a significantly lower proportion, 24 (or 54.5%), of the teachers on regular employment status indicated that supervisors evaluated their teaching performance only once during the same period. Also, it was found that a significantly higher proportion of the supervisors, 3 (or 15.0%), compared to 4 (or 9.1%) of the teachers indicated that their teaching was evaluated two or more times during the 1999-2000 school year. There seems to be a wide discrepancy between the two groups regarding the frequency of the evaluation of regularly employed teachers.

Table 8

*Perception of Teachers and Supervisors on Frequency of Evaluation of Regularly Employed Teachers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>One Time</th>
<th>2 or More Times</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypothesis 16

Null hypothesis 16 states: There is no significant difference between professional teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the frequency supervisors evaluated their teaching performance during the 1999-2000 school year. Item 4 on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.
The null hypothesis was retained ($\chi^2 = 2.043, p = .360$). Table 9 shows that 22 (or 55.0%) of the professional teachers compared to a similar proportion, 7 (or 36.8%) of the supervisors indicated that no evaluation of professional teachers was done during the 1999-2000 school year. Also, 15 (or 37.5%), of the professional teachers compared to a similar proportion, 9 (or 47.4%), of the supervisors indicated that evaluation of the professional teachers occurred only once during that same time period. Also, 3 (or 7.5%) of the professional teachers compared to a similar proportion, 3 (or 15.8%), of the supervisors indicated that evaluation of professional teachers occurred two or more times during the 1999-2000 school year. The perception of the professionally employed teachers and the supervisors was similar regarding how frequently supervisors evaluated them during the 1999-2000 school year.

Table 9

*Perceptions of Teachers and Supervisors on Frequency of Evaluation of Professionally Employed Teachers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>One Time</th>
<th>2 or More Times</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypothesis 17

Null hypothesis 17 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of their satisfaction with the frequency with which
supervisors observed their teachers’ teaching performance. Item 5 on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was rejected ($\chi^2 = 10.688$, $p = .014$). Analysis of the data in Table 10 shows that a significantly smaller proportion, 21 (or 21.9%), of the teachers compared to a significantly greater proportion, 13 (or 54.2%), of the supervisors indicated dissatisfaction with the frequency supervisors observe their teaching performance. Also, it was found that a significantly higher proportion of teachers, 50 (or 52.1%), compared to a smaller proportion, 9 (or 37.5%), of the supervisors indicated that they were satisfied with the frequency with which they observed teachers’ teaching performance. Furthermore, a significantly greater proportion, 22 (or 22.9%), of the teachers compared to a significantly smaller proportion, 2 (or 8.3%), of the supervisors indicated that they were very satisfied with the frequency with which they observed the teaching performance of their teachers. There seems to be a wide discrepancy of their views on this issue.

Table 10

*Perceptions of Teachers and Supervisors on Frequency of Observation of Teaching Performance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$f$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Null hypothesis 18

Null hypothesis 18 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the length of time supervisors spent in observing teachers' teaching performance. Item 11 on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was retained ($\chi^2 = 8.465, p = .076$). Analysis of the data in Table 11 shows that 14 (or 14.9%) of the teachers compared to a similar proportion, 4 (or 16.2%), of the supervisors indicated that supervisors spent half of the class period when they observe teaching performance. Also, 50 (or 43.2%) of the teachers compared to a similar proportion, 17 (68.0%), of the supervisors indicated that supervisors spend the entire class period when they evaluate teaching performance. Also, 7 (or 7.4%) of the teachers compared to a similar proportion, 4 (or 16.0%), of the supervisors indicated that the length of time supervisors spend observing teaching performance varies. It would appear that there is congruency between the perceptions of the teachers and supervisors regarding the length of time supervisors' spend observing teachers' teaching performance.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions of Teachers and Supervisors on Length of Time Spent Observing Teaching Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Null hypothesis 19

Null hypothesis 19 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how frequently a standardized form is used by their supervisors to evaluate teachers' teaching performance. Item 6 on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was retained ($\chi^2 = .379, p = .944$). Table 12 shows that, 16 (or 17.4%) of the teachers compared to a similar proportion, 4 (or 16.7%), of the supervisors indicated that a standard form is never used in the evaluation of teaching performance. Also, it was found that 11 (or 12.0%) of the teachers compared to a similar proportion, 4 (or 16.7%), of the supervisors indicated that a standard form is rarely used. While 36 (or 39.1%), of the teachers compared to a similar proportion, 9 (or 37.5%), of the supervisors indicated that a standard form is usually used to evaluate teaching performance, only 29 (or 31.5%) of the teachers compared to a similar proportion, 7 (or 29.2%), of the supervisors indicated that a standard form is always used to evaluate teachers' teaching performance. It would appear that there is congruency between the perception of the teachers and the supervisors regarding the issue.

Table 12

<p>| Perceptions of Teacher and Supervisors on Standard Form Used to Evaluate Teachers |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$f$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Null hypothesis 20

Null hypothesis 20 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the kind of standard form supervisor's use to evaluate teachers' teaching performance. Item 7 on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was rejected ($\chi^2 = 19.961, p = .001$). Analysis of the data in Table 13 shows that a significantly smaller proportion, 1 (or 1.4%), of teachers compared to a significantly greater proportion, 5 (or 23.8%), of supervisors indicated that supervisors use a form of their own construction, to evaluate teachers' teaching performance. It was also found that a significantly lower proportion, 21 (or 28.8%), of the teachers compared to a significantly higher proportion, 7 (or 33.3%), of the supervisors indicated that a local conference form approved by the Board of Education is used to evaluate teachers' teaching performance. Also, a significantly lower proportion, 10 (or 13.7%), of the teachers compared to a significantly higher proportion, 4 (or 19.0%), of the supervisors indicated that a form from the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Canada is used to evaluate the teaching performance of their teachers. There seems to be discrepant views on this issue.

Table 13

Perceptions of Teachers and Supervisors on Type of Form Used to Evaluate Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Church in Canada</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Local School</th>
<th>Curriculum Committee</th>
<th>Own Construction</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$f$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Null hypotheses 21-27 use t-tests. A scale of 1 to 8 where 1 represents most important and 8 the least important was used to test the strength of the means. The following scale was used to compare the two groups: 1-2 = high, 3-4 = moderately high, 5-6 = moderately low and 7-8 = low.

Null hypothesis 21

Null hypothesis 19 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of the teachers’ general appearance and bearing as it relates to the evaluation of their teachers’ teaching performance. Item 8 (a) on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was retained ($t_{81} = .63, p = .529$). Analysis of the data shows that while there was no significant difference between teachers ($M = 6.06$) and their supervisors ($M = 5.79$). Both groups indicated moderately low importance on the teachers’ general appearance and bearing as it applies to evaluation of teaching performance.

Null hypothesis 22

Null hypothesis 22 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of the quality of teachers’ interaction with students as it relates to their teachers’ teaching performance. This hypothesis was addressed by using item 8 (b) on the survey questionnaire.

The null hypothesis was retained ($t_{82} = .74, p = .464$). There was no significant difference between teachers ($M = 2.26$) and their supervisors ($M = 2.00$) on their perception of the importance of the quality of teachers’ interaction with students as it
relates to their teachers’ teaching performance. Both groups indicated high importance to
the quality of the teacher’s interaction with students as it relates to their teaching
performance.

Null hypothesis 23

Null hypothesis 23 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and
their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of teachers’ use of behavioral
objectives as it relates to their teachers’ teaching performance. Item 8 (c) on the survey
questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was retained ($t_{81} = -1.65, p = .102$). There was no significant
difference between the perception of the teachers ($M = 3.61$) and their supervisors ($M =
4.47$). Examination of the means indicated that the teachers and the supervisors placed
moderately high importance on the teachers’ use of behavioral objectives as it relates to
their teaching performance.

Null hypothesis 24

Null hypothesis 24 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and
their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of teachers’ ability to control the
class as it relates to their teachers’ teaching performance. This hypothesis was addressed
by using item 8 (d) on the survey questionnaire.

The null hypothesis was retained ($t_{81} = .51, p = .615$). Analysis of the data shows
that although there was no significant difference between teachers ($M = 3.59$) and their
supervisors ($M = 3.37$) on their perception of the importance of teachers’ ability to
control the class as it relates to their teachers’ teaching performance. Both groups
indicated moderately high importance on the teachers’ ability to control the class as it relates to their teaching performance.

Null hypothesis 25

Null hypothesis 25 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of teachers’ use of a variety of teaching materials as it relates to their teachers’ teaching performance. Item 8 (e) on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was retained ($t_{81} = -0.03, p = .974$). Whereas, there was no significant difference between the perception of the teachers ($M = 3.43$) and their supervisors ($M = 3.44$), by comparing the means it was found that both groups tended to place moderately high importance on the teachers’ use of a variety of teaching materials as it relates to their teaching performance.

Null hypothesis 26

Null hypothesis 26 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of teachers’ verbal and writing skills as it relates to their teachers’ teaching performance. This hypothesis was addressed by using item 8 (f) on the survey questionnaire.

The null hypothesis was rejected ($t_{81} = 2.13, p = .036$). Analysis of the data shows that there was a statistically significant difference between teachers ($M = 5.719$) and their supervisors ($M = 5.00$) on their perception of the importance of teachers’ verbal and writing skills as it relates to their teachers’ teaching performance. Although both groups tended to place moderately low importance on verbal and writing skills as it relates to
teachers' teaching performance, supervisors indicated significantly higher importance than teachers.

Null hypothesis 27

Null hypothesis 27 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and supervisors in their perceptions of the importance of teachers ability to meet diverse needs of students as it relates to their teachers' teaching performance. Item 8 (g) on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was retained (t_{81} = -.82, p = .416). Although there was no significant difference between the perception of the teachers (M = 3.91) and their supervisors (M = 4.32), both groups placed moderate importance on the teachers' ability to meet the diverse needs of students as it relates to their teaching performance.

Null hypothesis 28

Null hypothesis 28 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the frequency of conducting a pre-observation conference during formal observation of teaching performance. This hypothesis was addressed by using item 10 on the survey questionnaire.

The null hypothesis was rejected (\chi^2 = 7.864, p = .049). Table 14 shows that a significantly higher proportion, 36 (or 38.3%), of the teachers compared to a significantly lower proportion, 3 (or 12.0%), of the supervisors indicated that supervisors never hold individual pre-observation evaluation conference with their teachers. It was also found that a significantly lower proportion, 14 (or 14.9%), of the teachers compared to a significantly higher proportion, 7 (or 28.0%), of the supervisors indicated that supervisors
always conduct individual pre-observation evaluation conference with their teachers. A significantly lower proportion, 20 (or 21.3%), of the teachers compared to a significantly higher proportion, 9 (or 36.0%), of the supervisors indicated that pre-observation evaluation conference with their teachers was rarely conducted in the Adventist schools in Canada. There seems to be discrepant views on this issue.

Table 14

Perceptions of Teachers and Supervisors on Individual Pre-observation Conferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( f )</td>
<td>( % )</td>
<td>( f )</td>
<td>( % )</td>
<td>( f )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypothesis 29

Null hypothesis 29 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the frequency of conducting a post-observation conference when observing teachers' teaching performance. Item 14 on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was retained \((\chi^2 = 3.55, p = .314)\). Table 15 shows that, 58 (or 60.4%) of the teachers compared to a similar proportion, 18 (or 72.0%), of the supervisors indicated that supervisors always conduct post-observation evaluation conference. Also, 26 (or 27.1%) of the teachers compared to a similar proportion, 7 (or 28.0%), of the supervisors indicated that supervisors usually conduct post-observation evaluation conference. The perception of the teachers and the supervisors appear to be
congruent regarding the frequency with which supervisors in the Adventist schools in Canada conduct post-observation evaluation conferences.

Table 15

*Perceptions of Teachers and Supervisors on Frequency of Post-observation Conference*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Only if Serious Problems Were Observed</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypothesis 30

Null hypothesis 30 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of when supervisors conduct a post-observation conference of teachers' teaching performance. This hypothesis was addressed by using item 15 on the survey questionnaire.

The null hypothesis was retained ($\chi^2 = 6.091, p = .192$). Analysis of the data in Table 16 shows that 69 (or 72.6%) of the teachers compared to a similar proportion, 17 (or 68.0%), of the supervisors indicated that the post-observation evaluation conference occurs on the same day of the observation of the teachers' teaching performance. It was also found that 4 (or 4.2%) of the teachers compared to a similar proportion, 3 (or 12.0%), of the supervisors indicated that the post-observation evaluation conference occurs the day after the observation. Furthermore, 11 (or 11.6%) of the teachers compared to a similar proportion, 4 (or 16.0%), of the supervisors indicated that the post
observation evaluation conference occurs within a week after the observation of the teachers' teaching performance, and 1. (or 1.1%), of the teachers compared to a similar proportion, 1 (or 4.0%) of the supervisors indicated that the post-observation evaluation conference occurs more than a week after the observation of teaching performance. There seems to be congruency between the perception of the teachers and the supervisors regarding the time post-observation evaluation conferences are held in Adventist schools in Canada.

Table 16

*Perceptions of Teachers and Supervisors on When Post-observation Conference Is Held*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Do Not Hold a Conference</th>
<th>More Than a Week After Observation</th>
<th>Within a Week After Observation</th>
<th>The Day of Observation</th>
<th>The Day After Observation</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypothesis 31

Null hypothesis 31 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the action that most often follows the supervisor's formal observation of teachers' teaching performance. Item 16 on the survey questionnaire was used to answer this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was rejected ($\chi^2 = 12.821, p = .012$). Table 17 shows that a significantly higher proportion, 13 (or 13.5%), of the teachers compared to a significantly lower proportion, 1 (or 4.2%), of the supervisors indicated that a report to the
superintendent is the action that most often follows observation of teaching. Also, a
significantly smaller proportion, 3 (or 3.1%), of the teachers compared to a significantly
higher proportion, 4 (or 16.7%), of the supervisors indicated that plans made by the
supervisor to help the teacher is the action that often follows the observation of teaching
performance. A significantly lower proportion, 38 (or 39.6%) of the teachers compared to
a significantly higher proportion, 14 (or 58.3%) of the supervisors indicated that the
action that often follows teacher evaluation is that the supervisor and teacher meet and
plan together. It was also found that a significantly higher proportion, 30 (or 31.3%), of
the teachers compared to a significantly lower proportion, 2 (or 8.3%), of the supervisors
indicated that no formal action is taken following the observation of teachers' teaching
performance. There seem to be clearly differing views on this matter.

Table 17

Perceptions of Teachers and Supervisors on Action Taken Following Observation of
Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Report To Superintendent</th>
<th>Supervisor Plans to Help Teacher</th>
<th>Supervisor and Teacher Plan Together</th>
<th>No Formal Action Taken</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypotheses 32-47 use t-tests. A scale of 1 to 8 where 1 represents the most
competent and 8 the least competent was used to compare the strength of the means. To
compare the two groups the following scale was used: 1-2 = high, 3-4 = moderately high,
5-6 = moderately low, 7-8 = low.
Null Hypotheses Related to Question 5

Question 5: To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the supervisors' level of competence and how at ease they feel in some of their administrative roles?

Null hypothesis 32

Null hypothesis 32 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as disciplinarian. This hypothesis was addressed by using item 17 (a) on the survey questionnaire.

The null hypothesis was retained ($t_{91} = -1.52, p = .132$). Although there was no significant difference between teachers ($M = 4.42$) and their supervisors ($M = 5.20$) on their perception of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as disciplinarian, a comparison of the means indicated that both groups indicated a moderate level of competence for supervisors in their role as disciplinarian.

Null hypothesis 33

Null hypothesis 33 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as evaluator of teachers' teaching performance. Item 17 (b) on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was retained ($t_{99} = .52, p = .606$). Analysis of the data shows that although there was no significant difference between teachers ($M = 4.10$) and their supervisors ($M = 3.80$) on their perception of the level of competence demonstrated by
supervisors in their role as evaluator of teachers' teaching performance. A comparison of the means indicated that both groups rated supervisors as demonstrating a moderate level of competence in their role as evaluator of teachers' teaching performance.

Null hypothesis 34

Null hypothesis 34 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as manager of the school budget. This hypothesis was addressed by using item 17 (c) on the survey questionnaire.

The null hypothesis was rejected ($t_{33} = -2.15, p = .035$). There was a statistically significant difference between teachers ($M = 4.53$) and their supervisors ($M = 5.75$) on their perception of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as manager of the school budget. A comparison of the means indicated that, although both groups tended to place moderately low level of competence on supervisors in their role as manager of the school budget, teachers indicated significantly higher level of competence than the supervisors.

Null hypothesis 35

Null hypothesis 35 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as spiritual leader of the school. Item 17 (d) on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was retained ($t_{91} = 1.86, p = .066$). Although there was no significant difference between teachers ($M = 3.68$) and their supervisors ($M = 2.75$) on
their perception of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as spiritual leader of the school, a comparison of the means indicated that both groups rated supervisors as moderately competent in their role as spiritual leader of the school.

Null hypothesis 36

Null hypothesis 36 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as director of school public relations. This hypothesis was addressed by using item 17 (e) on the survey questionnaire.

The null hypothesis was rejected ($t_{91} = -2.85, p = .005$). There was a statistically significant difference between teachers ($M = 4.00$) and their supervisors ($M = 5.50$) on their perception of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as director of school public relations. However, a comparison of the means indicated that although both groups rated the competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as director of the school public relations, as moderately low, the teachers indicated a significantly higher level of competence than the supervisors.

Null hypothesis 37

Null hypothesis 37 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as counselor of students. Item 17 (f) on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was rejected ($t_{90} = 2.06, p = .043$). Analysis of the data shows that there was a statistically significant difference between teachers ($M = 4.93$) and their
supervisors \((M = 3.80)\) on their perception of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as counselor of students. Examination of the means indicated that both groups placed moderately high level of competence demonstrated by the supervisors in their role as counselor of students. However, supervisors indicated significantly higher level of competence than the teachers.

Null hypothesis 38

Null hypothesis 38 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as secretary of the school board. Item 17 (g) on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was retained \((t_{87} = -1.37, p = .174)\). The data shows that there is no significant difference between teachers \((M = 5.46)\) and their supervisors \((M = 6.30)\) on their perception of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as secretary of the school board. A comparison of the means indicated that both groups rated supervisors as moderately low in their level of competence as secretary of the school board.

Null hypothesis 39

Null hypothesis 39 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as counselor of faculty and staff. This hypothesis was addressed by using item 17 (h) on the survey questionnaire.
The null hypothesis was rejected ($t_{64} = 2.18, p = .032$). Analysis of the data shows that there was a statistically significant difference between teachers ($M = 3.88$) and their supervisors ($M = 2.63$) on their perception of the level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as counselor of faculty and staff. Although both groups placed moderately high level of competence demonstrated by supervisors in their role as counselor of faculty and staff, teachers rated them as being significantly less competent than the supervisors.

Null hypothesis 40

Null hypothesis 40 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as director of school public relations. Item 18 (a) on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was rejected ($t_{90} = -3.69, p = .000$). Analysis of the data shows that there is a statistically significant difference between teachers ($M = 3.87$) and their supervisors ($M = 5.68$) on their perception of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as director of school public relations. While, a comparison of the means indicated that both groups placed moderately low level of importance of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as director of the school public relations, the teachers indicated significantly higher level of importance than the supervisors.

Null hypothesis 41

Null hypothesis 41 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as
counselor of students. This hypothesis was addressed by using item 18 (b) on the survey questionnaire.

The null hypothesis was retained ($t_{92} = 1.25, p = .215$). There was no significant difference between teachers ($M = 4.14$) and their supervisors ($M = 3.50$) on their perception of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as counselor of students. Examination of the means shows that both groups placed moderately high importance of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as counselor of students.

Null hypothesis 42

Null hypothesis 42 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as a disciplinarian. Item 18 (c) on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was rejected ($t_{91} = -2.66, p = .009$). Analysis of the data shows that there is a statistically significant difference between teachers ($M = 4.70$) and their supervisors ($M = 6.00$) on their perception of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as disciplinarian. A comparison of the means indicated that although both groups indicated moderately low importance on how at ease supervisors feel in their role as disciplinarian, the teachers indicated significantly higher importance than the supervisors.

Null hypothesis 43

Null hypothesis 43 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as
evaluator of teachers' teaching performance. This hypothesis was addressed by using item 18 (d) on the survey questionnaire.

The null hypothesis was retained ($t_{98} = -0.03, p = .980$). There was no significant difference between teachers ($M = 4.08$) and their supervisors ($M = 4.09$) on their perception of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as evaluator of teachers' teaching performance. A comparison of the means indicated that both groups placed moderately high importance of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as evaluator of teachers' teaching performance.

Null hypothesis 44

Null hypothesis 44 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as spiritual leader of the school. Item 18 (e) on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was rejected ($t_{93} = 2.11, p = .038$). Analysis of the data shows that there is a statistically significant difference between teachers ($M = 3.66$) and their supervisors ($M = 2.59$) on their perception of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as spiritual leader of the school. A comparison of the means indicated that although both groups placed moderately high importance of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as spiritual leader of the school, the supervisors placed significantly higher importance than the teachers.
Null hypothesis 45

Null hypothesis 45 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as manager of the school budget. This hypothesis was addressed by using item 18 (f) on the survey questionnaire.

The null hypothesis was retained ($t_{89} = -1.28, p = .204$). There was no significant difference between teachers ($M = 4.86$) and their supervisors ($M = 5.59$) on their perception of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as manager of the school budget. A comparison of the means indicated that both groups placed moderately high importance on how at ease supervisors feel in their role as manager of the school budget.

Null hypothesis 46

Null hypothesis 46 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as secretary of the school board. Item 18 (g) on the survey questionnaire was used to address this hypothesis.

The null hypothesis was retained ($t_{87} = -0.45, p = .654$). Analysis of the data shows that there is no significant difference between teachers ($M = 5.66$) and their supervisors ($M = 5.91$) on their perception of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as secretary of the school board. A comparison of the means indicated that both groups placed moderately low importance of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as secretary of the board.
Null hypothesis 47

Null hypothesis 47 states: There is no significant difference between teachers and their supervisors in their perceptions of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as counselor to faculty and staff. This hypothesis was addressed by using item 18 (h) on the survey questionnaire.

The null hypothesis was rejected, \( t_{97} = 2.38, p = .019 \). There is a statistically significant difference between teachers \( (M = 3.88) \) and their supervisors \( (M = 2.63) \) on their perception of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as counselor to faculty and staff. Although both groups indicated moderately high importance of how at ease supervisors feel in their role as counselor of faculty and staff, supervisors placed significantly higher importance on this issue than teachers.

Additional Questions and Related Findings

Research Question 6: What steps do teachers and supervisors recommend for improving the evaluation of teachers' teaching performance in Adventist schools in Canada? Item 19 on the survey questionnaire was used to answer this question.

There were a total of 217 suggestions given by the respondents. In order to analyze the suggestions they were organized into three categories. The categories were: (a) purpose of evaluation, (b) training for supervisors, and (c) evaluation policies and practices.

Table 18 shows that 33 or (15.9\%) of the suggestions made by the respondents addressed the purpose of evaluation while 22 or (10.6\%) addressed training for supervisors. A majority of the suggestions 162 or (73.1\%) addressed the area of policies and procedures.
Table 18

*Categories of Comments Concerning the Improvement of Teacher Evaluation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of Evaluation</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for Supervisors</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Policies and Practices</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>217</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following list below is only a sampling of the respondents' suggestions regarding the improvement of teacher evaluation in Adventist schools in Canada. The comments relate to the purpose of evaluation, training for supervisors and evaluation policies and practices.

1. "Make evaluation a growth experience."
2. "Evaluation is to help teachers and not to 'control' or 'keep teachers in line' as some principals do."
3. "Teachers are professionals and evaluation should help them develop professionally."
4. "Evaluation should be designed to encourage improvement in both teacher and the school."
5. "Hold teachers accountable but do it kindly."
6. "Use the evaluation to maximize the teachers strengths."
7. "Classroom observations should be used to improve the quality of teaching not to find fault."
8. "Provide more training for supervisors."

9. "Provide continued opportunities for workshops and seminars to enhance the evaluation skills of the principals and superintendents."

10. "Train principals and superintendents to evaluate teachers professionally. Some are woefully lacking in interpersonal skills."

11. "Provide formal training for principals."

12. "Do not allow unqualified persons to assume supervisory roles in the conference."

13. "Standardize the approach to evaluation across the Canadian Union."

14. "Allow individual teachers especially those who are on professional employment status to take on more responsibility for their own evaluation and professional growth. Treat them as professionals."

15. "Have good/valid reasons to evaluate and not on 'hearsay' from parents or board members."

16. "More time is needed to do meaningful evaluation."

17. "Principal needs to take more active role in evaluation."

18. "Always have a pre-evaluation conference."

**Research Question 7:** What formal training in evaluation of teaching performance did supervisors acquire before becoming evaluators of teachers’ teaching performance? Item 20 on the supervisors’ questionnaire was used to address this question.

Table 19 shows that the highest proportion of the supervisors, 9 (or 36.0%), indicated that they received pre-training in the evaluation of teachers’ teaching
performance through graduate courses. Also, 8 (or 32.0%), reported that they received
pre-training in evaluation of teachers teaching performance through graduate courses,
seminars sponsored by their local conferences and the Seventh-day Adventist Church in
Canada Department of Education.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisors’ Pre-training in Evaluation of Teaching Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars by Union Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars by others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No pre-training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 8: What formal training in evaluation of teaching
performance did supervisors acquire since becoming evaluators of teachers’ teaching
performance? This question was addressed by using item 21 on the supervisors’ survey
questionnaire.

Table 20 shows that the highest proportion of the supervisors 8 (or 34.8%) indicated that they received training in the evaluation of teachers’ teaching performance
through seminars sponsored by the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Canada Department
of Education after they had become supervisors. A much lower proportion, 3 (or 13.0%),
of the supervisors indicated that they received no post-training in the evaluation of
teachers teaching performance.
Table 20
Supervisors’ Post Training in Evaluation of Teaching Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate courses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars by Union Office</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars by others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No post-training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Data Analysis

The following tables provide a summary of the data analysis.

Table 21 summarizes the statistical tests that were used to test each null hypothesis. The table also shows the number that corresponds to each hypothesis that was retained or rejected.

Table 22 lists each research question and the items on the survey questionnaire that corresponds to each research question.

Table 23 lists the items on the survey instrument and the corresponding hypotheses that dealt with each item on the survey.

Table 24 presents a summary of the hypotheses testing.
Table 21

*Summary of Statistical Tests and Null Hypotheses Retained and Rejected*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Test</th>
<th>Hypotheses Retained</th>
<th>Hypotheses Rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>7, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 29, 30</td>
<td>1, 14, 15, 17, 20, 28, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (chi-square)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 21, 22, 23, 24</td>
<td>6, 9, 26, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25, 27, 32, 33, 35, 38, 41, 43, 45, 46</td>
<td>44, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (t-test)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22

*Summary of Research Questions and Corresponding Survey Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Survey Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17, 18,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>19, 20, 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 23

**Summary of the Survey Items and the Corresponding Hypotheses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>Corresponding Hypotheses Retained</th>
<th>Corresponding Hypotheses Rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8, 10, 11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>32, 33, 35, 38,</td>
<td>34, 36, 37, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>41, 43, 45, 46,</td>
<td>40, 42, 44, 47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total = 18  Grand Total = 29  Grand Total = 18
Table 24

**Summary of Hypotheses Testing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Extent to which supervisors know teachers' capabilities</td>
<td>.008**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Source of teacher quality - students' performance on standardized test</td>
<td>.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Source of teacher quality - supervisor intuition</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Source of teacher quality - supervisor personal observation</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Source of teacher quality - input from parents</td>
<td>.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Source of teacher quality - input from students</td>
<td>.029*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Usefulness of teaching performance as presently conducted</td>
<td>.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Purpose of evaluation integration of faith and learning</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Purpose— distinguish between effective &amp; ineffective teachers</td>
<td>.021*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Purpose— improve teaching performance</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Purpose— maximize students' learning opportunities</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Time supervisors devote to evaluation</td>
<td>.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Hindrance for not evaluating teachers</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Frequency supervisor evaluated probationary teachers</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Frequency supervisor evaluated regular teachers</td>
<td>.031*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Frequency supervisor evaluated professional teachers</td>
<td>.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Supervisors' satisfaction with frequency of teaching performance</td>
<td>.014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Length of time in observing teaching performance</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Frequency standardized form used in teaching performance</td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Form supervisor use to evaluate teaching performance.</td>
<td>.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Importance of teacher's appearance and bearing</td>
<td>.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Importance of teacher's interaction with students</td>
<td>.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Importance of teacher's use of behavioral objectives</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Importance of teacher's ability to control class</td>
<td>.615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Importance of teacher's use of variety of teaching materials</td>
<td>.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Importance of teacher's verbal and writing skills</td>
<td>.036*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Importance of teacher's ability to meet diverse needs of students</td>
<td>.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Frequency of pre-observation evaluation conference</td>
<td>.049*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Frequency of post-observation conference</td>
<td>.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>When supervisors conduct post-observation conference</td>
<td>.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Action that most often follows observation of teaching performance</td>
<td>.012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Supervisor's level of competence as disciplinarian</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Supervisor's level of competence as evaluator</td>
<td>.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Supervisor's level of competence as manager of school budget</td>
<td>.035*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Supervisor's level of competence as spiritual leader of the school</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Supervisor's level of competence as director of Public Relations</td>
<td>.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Supervisor's level of competence as counselor of students</td>
<td>.043*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Supervisor's level of competence as secretary of school board</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Supervisor's level of competence as counselor of faculty and staff</td>
<td>.032*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>How at ease supervisors feel as director of Public Relations</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>How at ease supervisors feel as counselor of students</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>How at ease supervisors feel as disciplinarian</td>
<td>.009**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>How at ease supervisors feel as evaluator</td>
<td>.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>How at ease supervisors feel as spiritual leader of the school</td>
<td>.038*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>How at ease supervisors feel as manager of the school budget</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>How at ease supervisors feel as secretary of the school board</td>
<td>.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>How at ease supervisors feel as counselor of faculty and staff</td>
<td>.019*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05. **p ≤ .01. *** p ≤ .001.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter of the research, the problem and the purpose of the study are restated, and a brief summary of evaluation practices found in the literature is given. Also, the summary and conclusions derived from analysis of the data, as well as recommendations for further study are outlined. Applications of the findings to the Adventist schools in Canada are also presented.

Restatement of the Problem

The Seventh-day Adventist Church operates one of the largest, worldwide protestant Christian education systems ranging from preschool through university level. According to Seventh-day Adventist Education - World Statistics (2000, p. 15) there are a total of 1,065,092 students preschool through university enrolled in 6,064 schools. Of that total, 732,698 are elementary students and 257,937 are secondary students enrolled in 5,935 schools. Of these schools, sixty-seven are located in Canada.

The Seventh-day Adventist Church recognizes that quality education is important if its youth are to receive training that makes them effective workers in both the church and public sectors.

It is also recognized that education is a complex task in which the teacher plays a significant role. The Adventists' view of the teacher as the key person in the education of
children is supported by White (1943) in the statement that "to the teacher is committed a most important work... work upon which he should never enter without careful and thorough preparation. He should feel the sacredness of his calling, and give himself to it with zeal and devotion" (p. 229). Therefore, each teacher in the Adventist church school system is considered to be an educational resource person who should provide the best possible education for each student. To facilitate this, an effective program of supervision of instruction is important.

The General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists Manual For Supervision in Seventh-day Adventist Schools (1985) defines supervision as "an on-going, participating, diagnostic and cooperative process or transaction between the supervisor and the teacher. It provides new insights and practices which are aimed at improving instruction that ultimately have an effect on the learning of students" (p. 7).

Evaluation of teachers is a growing concern in education. Both the public and parochial school systems are pressured from all sides to evaluate teachers. Hence, the need for evaluation of teachers is not limited to Adventist schools only. Janet Ecker, Ontario Education Minister observes that an excellent teacher can make a difference to a child's education. She also indicated that one of her goals is to ensure that every teacher standing in front of a classroom in Ontario is as good as he or she can be (Ray, 2000).

According to Alberta Learning (2001) the approach to teacher development and supervision recently mandated in Alberta aims to ensure that each teacher's actions, judgments, and decisions are in the best educational interests of students and support optimum learning. The article stated that the evaluation system should give teachers useful feedback on classroom needs, the opportunity for teachers to learn new teaching...
techniques, and obtain counsel from principals and other teachers on how to make changes in their classrooms.

With this view of the teacher's role in the educational process of children, the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Canada, Office of Education charges each educational administrator, the principal and superintendents to provide leadership that will enable each teacher to grow professionally so as to improve instruction in the classroom. One of the ways by which the principal and/or superintendent can help a teacher improve instruction is to observe him or her in the classroom and then provide constructive feedback. On this point, Hauge (1981) stated:

The observation of the classroom instruction is a component of the process to instructional improvement. The evaluation of teaching requires certain skills, knowledge and abilities on the part of the administrator. (p. 30)

The research on teacher evaluation however, shows that there are problems with current direction and practice. According to Peterson (2000) teachers mistrust evaluation and they feel that current evaluation procedures fall short of collecting information that accurately characterizes their performance. Furthermore, they perceive that the ratings they receive are based more on the idiosyncrasies of the evaluator than on their own behavior in the classroom.

To assist evaluators in the task of evaluating teachers, an inquiry into how they perceive current direction and practice can serve as a means of feedback on their performance. Such an inquiry, according to the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Canada, Office of Education, has not been done on its teachers and administrators. This researcher, therefore, has undertaken the task of making such an inquiry.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the current practices of teacher evaluation and the perceptions held toward those practices by teachers and their supervisors (the person, principal, or superintendent who completes formal evaluation of teachers) in the Adventist elementary and secondary schools in Canada.

Summary of Teacher Evaluation Practices and Procedures

The evaluation of teachers is an administrative process for assessing the performance of teachers for the purposes of helping teachers to grow professionally. This is accomplished through formal and informal observation, analysis of the teachers’ instructional strengths and weaknesses, and providing effective feedback to the teachers.

Before a school or school system can effectively evaluate teachers, it must officially define its expectations in terms of teacher performance. Once these standards are developed, they must be effectively communicated to, and be clearly understood by the teachers and administrators. In other words, informing the teacher of his or her job expectations is absolutely essential to a successful teacher evaluation process.

The process of evaluation is ongoing consisting of a number of events and activities. There should be a planning phase, which involves the teachers as a whole as well as the individual teachers to be evaluated. The teachers as a whole should know what is involved in evaluation such as the purposes of evaluation, the basis for evaluation, the performance standards, which teachers are to be evaluated and the evaluation events. This information should be given to the teachers before the school begins or early in the school year to involve the teachers in the critique of the evaluation policies and practices.
The data-gathering phase is the heart of the evaluation process. This phase is ongoing, and provides the basis for making the final evaluation report. The supervisor should rely on a broad spectrum of sources of data for evaluating teacher performance. According to Stronge (1997), the most important source of data is the instructional observation because these observations focus on the instructional process, which is the primary task of the teachers. Peterson (2000) indicated that valid evaluations should be based on a broad variety of information sources such as student reports, parent reports, student achievement data, and documentation of teachers' professional activities.

Supervisors should provide useful and meaningful feedback to the teacher following an observation of classroom teaching, remembering that the purpose of instructional supervision is to help teachers develop their potential. Unless effective feedback is received promptly, the teacher is unlikely to benefit from the supervision. Therefore, when a formal classroom observation is conducted, a formal post-observation conference should be conducted promptly. Supervisors need to remember that a conference with a teacher is almost certain to evoke feelings of concern or anxiety from the teacher. No matter how "collegial" a supervisor may perceive him or herself to be, it is a mistake to assume that the teacher shares those relaxed or open feelings of collegiality. Therefore, the supervisor needs to be sensitive to those feelings of anxiety and conduct a post-observation conference that is conducive to developing attitudes of self-confidence and motivation for growth. In conducting the conference, the first step the supervisor should take it to set the proper feeling tone. To set a positive feeling tone for the conference, the supervisor should begin the conversation with relaxed and positive
comments. The location for the conference should be one which is most likely to reduce the teacher's anxieties.

In order to improve the likelihood that teacher growth will occur as a result of the observation and the conference, follow-up procedures need to be established. It is essential that when a supervisor is asking a teacher for improvement the resources, necessary for empowering the teacher to implement the recommendations or suggestions should be made available to the teacher. Before closing the post-observation conference, the supervisor should be sure that no misunderstandings are present in terms of future expectations relative to the conference and follow-up activities.

Methodology

The purpose of this descriptive study was to investigate the current policies and practices of teacher evaluation through analysis of the perceptions held toward those policies and practices by teachers and their supervisors (the person, principal, or superintendent who completes formal evaluation of teachers) in the Adventist elementary and secondary schools in Canada.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the supervisor’s knowledge of their teachers’ teaching capabilities and the sources that gave the most influential information about the quality of teachers’ teaching performance?

2. To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the usefulness of the evaluation process?
3. To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the main purpose of evaluation of teaching performance?

4. To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning knowledge of current teacher evaluation processes (i.e., classroom observation, instruments used, criteria used, and follow-up procedures)?

5. To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the supervisors’ level of competence and how at ease they feel in some of their administrative roles?

6. What steps do teachers and supervisors recommend for improving the evaluation of teachers’ teaching performance in Adventist schools in Canada?

7. What formal training in evaluation of teaching performance did supervisors acquire before becoming evaluators of teachers’ teaching performance?

8. What formal training in evaluation of teaching performance did supervisors acquire since becoming evaluators of teachers’ teaching performance?

The study was quantitative using a survey instrument. A questionnaire for supervisors and one for teachers was developed with both fixed and open-ended questions. Although most of the questions on both forms were similar, an exact parallel construction of items was not employed, so that some of the pertinent perceptions of supervisors and teachers could be sought in more unobtrusive ways.

A packet containing a questionnaire, a cover letter, and a self-addressed envelope were sent to the target population consisting of all elementary and secondary teachers and supervisors in the Adventist schools in Canada. A population of 225 teachers and 48
supervisors were surveyed. Data collection efforts yielded a 43.6 percent return from the teachers and a 52.0 percent from the supervisors.

To measure congruency between the groups, chi-square was used to determine whether or not an association existed between variables by calculating discrepancies between observed and expected cell frequencies. The data was processed by the use of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Of the 47 hypotheses, 15 were tested by application of the chi-square tests, and the remainder by t-tests. The findings from the survey were tabulated on each null hypothesis analyzed for each variable. A .05 level of significance was selected as a criterion for rejecting the hypotheses. From the study there was sufficient evidence to reject 18 hypotheses because of significant differences and 29 hypotheses were retained due to no significant differences.

Findings

A summary of the findings on the research questions and conclusions from this study are as follows:

Research Question 1

To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the supervisor’s knowledge of their teachers’ teaching capabilities and the sources that gave the most influential information about the quality of teachers’ teaching performance?

Both supervisors and teachers agreed that the following sources that gave the most influential information about the quality of teachers’ teaching performance were: students’ performance on standardized tests, the supervisors’ intuition, the supervisors’
personal observation and evaluation of teachers’ teaching performance, and input from the parents.

The two groups differed in their perceptions of how good an idea the supervisors have of teachers’ teaching capabilities. The two groups also differed in their perceptions of the use of student input as a source that gave the most influential information about the quality of teachers’ teaching performance.

The findings show that the teachers and the supervisors in the Adventist schools in Canada are in agreement that the use of multiple data sources in teacher evaluation gives more credible information about the quality of the teachers’ teaching performance than reliance on just one source of information such as an administrators report, which is the current practice in many school districts. Good teaching is complex and needs to be documented and recognized in a number of ways. Therefore, the use of a variety of data sources is important because no one source tells all about what a teacher does. In other words there is no single person, checklist, test, or set of characteristics that, by itself, defines or indicates good teaching.

Research Question 2

To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the usefulness of the evaluation process?

Supervisors and teachers in the Adventist schools in Canada reported congruency between their perceptions regarding the usefulness of the evaluation process, which 28.7% describe to be “helpful,” and 49.2% describe as “somewhat helpful.” This is indeed an important finding, because it differs from Frase and Streshley (1994) finding which stated that, “teacher evaluation has been of little value” (p. 48).
These findings suggest that the supervisory practices in Adventist schools in Canada are effective in helping teachers improve their teaching performance and that supervisors offer their teachers useful advise. Also, the findings mean that Adventist teachers and supervisors in Canada have created and maintained a relationship of mutual commitment and trust in an evaluation system that develops professional competency in the teachers.

Research Question 3

To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the main purpose of evaluation of teaching performance?

Most teachers and supervisors in the Adventist schools in Canada stated that the primary purpose of evaluation is a helping one—to improve instruction and hence learning. They however, indicated a difference in their perceptions that the main purpose of evaluation is to distinguish between effective and ineffective teachers.

The findings clearly suggest that, although the literature shows that evaluation of teachers is demeaning, arbitrary, perfunctory and superficial, the teachers and the supervisors in Adventist schools in Canada perceive that the main purpose of evaluation is to make a determination about teacher effectiveness. In other words, evaluation is not something the supervisors do to, or even for, their teachers. It is, rather, a goal-setting process in which the supervisors participate with their teachers.

The findings also indicate that teachers in Adventist schools in Canada want to know the level of their performance in teaching whether or not their students are learning.
Therefore, teachers in the Adventist schools in Canada welcome the efforts that are made to strengthen their professional repertoire and thus enhance student learning.

**Research Question 4**

To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning knowledge of current teacher evaluation processes (i.e., classroom observation, instruments used, criteria used, and follow-up procedures)?

*Classroom Observation:* There was congruency between the perceptions of the supervisors and the teachers regarding the amount of time supervisors in Adventist schools in Canada devote to evaluating their teachers’ teaching performance. There was also congruency between the perceptions of the teachers and the supervisors regarding the main hindrances such as: budgetary matters, part-time teaching, and disciplinary problems that supervisors give for not observing and evaluating teachers as often as they would like. Also, both the supervisors and the professionally employed teachers' perceptions were similar regarding how frequently the supervisors evaluated their teaching performance during the 1999-2000 school year. There was also congruency between the perceptions of the teachers and the supervisors regarding the length of time supervisors spend observing teachers teaching performance.

There were discrepant views between teachers on probationary/provisional employment status and teachers on regular employment status and the supervisors regarding how frequently the supervisors evaluated their teaching performance during the 1999-2000 school year.

The findings clearly suggest that although teachers and supervisors in Adventist schools in Canada view classroom observation as an important part of the teacher
evaluation process, the groups indicated discrepant views regarding their overall satisfaction with the classroom observation of teachers' teaching performance and the frequency with which regular teachers and probationary teachers were observed by their supervisors during the 1999-2000 school year.

Because most of the supervisors in the Adventist schools in Canada carry heavy administrative and/or teaching responsibilities that require a large percentage of their time, classroom observations are sometimes neglected. Therefore, supervisors appear to be frustrated because they do not have time to do what they ought to be doing.

_**Instruments Used:**_ Both supervisors and teachers agreed that a standardized form is usually used by their supervisor to evaluate teachers' teaching performance. They differed in their perception of the kind of standard form supervisors' use to evaluate teachers' teaching performance.

Although respondents reported that a standardized evaluation form is usually used by the supervisors in Adventist schools in Canada when they conduct formal classroom observation of their teachers' teaching performance, the findings also suggest that there are discrepant views regarding the type of form that is used. This means that the teachers in the Adventist schools in Canada are not involved as they should be in the development of the types of evaluation forms supervisors use to evaluate their teaching performance. Therefore, greater involvement of the instructional staff in the development of the evaluation instruments used for assessing teachers teaching performance would alleviate the discrepant views, and make the supervisors and teachers partners in the evaluation process.
Criteria Used for Evaluation: The supervisors and the teachers in the Adventist schools in Canada agreed in their perceptions that, the most important criteria supervisors look for when observing teaching performance are the quality of the teachers' interaction with students, the teachers' ability to control the class, the teachers' use of a variety of teaching materials, the teachers' use of behavioral objectives, the teachers ability to meet the diverse needs of students and the teachers general appearance and bearing. They differed in their perception that the teachers' verbal and writing skills are the most important criteria supervisors look for when observing teaching performance, if a standard form is not used.

The findings mean that when supervisory visits are conducted in the Adventist schools in Canada, the supervisors tended to concentrate more on the students and their responses and for trends in instruction. Therefore, because the supervisors know what to look for and the teachers know those areas, or criteria, by which they will be evaluated supervision of instruction in Adventist schools in Canada is a meaningful process.

Follow-up Procedures: Supervisors and teachers agreed in their perception on the frequency, with which supervisors conduct post-observation evaluation conferences and when it is conducted. They differed in their perception on the frequency with which supervisors conduct pre-observation evaluation conferences and the action that most often followed the supervisors' evaluation of a teachers' teaching performance.

The findings clearly indicate that the follow-up procedures to the supervision of instruction in Adventist schools in Canada pose some unique problems. For example, conferences cover extensive geographic areas that make adequate follow-up visits difficult. Therefore, to alleviate the problem when geographical or scheduling limits
Research Question 5

To what degree is there congruence between the perceptions of supervisors and those of their teachers concerning the supervisors’ level of competence and how at ease they feel in some of their administrative roles?

The supervisors and teachers agreed in their perceptions that supervisors were most competent in their role as spiritual leader, evaluator, disciplinarian and secretary of the board. They differed in their perception that supervisors were “most competent” in their role as manager of the school budget, director of public relations, counselor of students and counselor of faculty and staff.

Teachers and supervisors also agreed in their perceptions that supervisors were “most at ease” in their role as counselor of students, evaluator, manager of the school budget, and secretary of the school board. They differed in their perception that supervisors were “most at ease” in their role as director of public relations, disciplinarian, spiritual leader of the school, and counselor of faculty and staff.

The findings indicate that the teachers and the supervisors in the Adventist schools in Canada perceive the supervisors as being both competent and at ease in some of their administrative roles which include evaluator of teachers’ teaching performance.

Research Question 6

What steps do teachers and supervisors recommend for improving the evaluation of teachers’ teaching performance in Adventist schools in Canada?
Item 19 on the survey questionnaire asked the respondents to list as many suggestions as they could regarding how the present practice of evaluating teaching performance could be improved in the Adventist schools in Canada.

Of the 208 suggestions made by the respondents, three recurring themes emerged. The themes were (1) purposes of evaluation, (2) training for evaluators, and (3) teacher evaluation practices and procedures. Most of the suggestions centered on teacher evaluation practices and procedures, and the highest priority was given by supervisors and teachers to efforts to free supervisors from some of their administrative and teaching responsibilities so that they might dedicate more time to their evaluative function.

Research Question 7

What formal training in evaluation of teaching performance did supervisors acquire before becoming evaluators of teachers’ teaching performance?

The findings indicate that all of the supervisors in the Adventist schools in Canada have had pre-training in evaluation of teachers’ teaching performance through graduate courses and seminars.

Research Question 8

What formal training in evaluation of teaching performance did supervisors acquire since becoming evaluators of teachers’ teaching performance?

The findings indicate that a majority of the supervisors in the Adventist schools in Canada have acquired training in teacher evaluation since becoming supervisors by taking graduate courses and attending seminars sponsored by the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Canada and other organizations.
Conclusions

Based on the findings from this research as supported by collected data, several conclusions can be made.

1. Supervisors think they have a better knowledge of their teachers' teaching capabilities than their teachers think they have.

2. Supervisors and teachers perceive the evaluation process to be a useful one.

3. Most of supervisors reported having had formal training in performance evaluation before and after assuming the supervisory role, they feel competent and at ease in the evaluator's role, and the teachers concur.

4. Teachers and supervisors view the improvement of teaching performance, and to maximize the learning opportunities for students as the main purposes of performance evaluation.

5. The evaluation process as it is presently being implemented in Adventist schools in Canada reflects some similarities with that of its public counterparts as reported in the literature and pertinent research studies.

Recommendations for Practice

The following recommendations are presented for further practice:

1. School administrators in Adventist schools in Canada should give the instructional staff greater involvement in the development of the evaluation instruments used for assessing teaching performance. This may mean, for example, establishing teacher evaluation panels in each local conference. The panels should be made up of a majority of teachers, but should also include administrators. The purpose of the panels...
would be to design teacher evaluation instruments and to ensure the legitimacy and effectiveness of such instruments.

2. Adventist schools in Canada should grant evaluators sufficient time, unburdened by competing administrative demands, for evaluation of their teachers' teaching performance. This may mean, for example, providing substitute teachers on a mandated regular basis.

3. Teacher evaluation in Adventist schools in Canada should be closely aligned with professional development based on the areas identified in this study.

4. Conferences associated with Adventist schools in Canada should allocate personnel resources commensurate with the number of teachers to be evaluated.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

The following recommendations are presented for further research:

1. The duplication of this study in larger Adventist school divisions would offer a broader perspective of congruence regarding the teacher evaluation policies and practices.

2. Studies focusing on the relationship that exists between staff development activities and teacher evaluation results would enhance both practices.

3. Research in the area of teacher evaluation practices and job satisfaction for evaluators and evaluatees might yield useful information about teacher turnover.

4. A study of the relationship between teacher evaluation practices and teacher accountability may shed light on teacher accountability.

5. A study to investigate reasons for congruence in evaluation practices among teachers and administrators could result in reinforcing certain practices.
6. A study to investigate reasons for the discrepancies in evaluation practices among teachers and administrators could result in serious staff development sessions.
APPENDIX A

LETTERS OF AUTHORIZATION
January 10, 2001

Dear Colleague:

In the current environment of increased accountability and professionalism for teachers, issues related to the goals and methods of teacher assessment have gained the attention of educational policy makers in Canada. As part of a doctoral dissertation study, in Educational Administration and Leadership at Andrews University, Dr. Jeffery and Dr. Bernard and I are conducting a research project in all Seventh-day Adventist Schools in Canada. The study’s purpose is to compare the perceptions of and attitudes toward current teacher evaluation policies and practices held by supervisors (the person-principal or superintendent who completes teachers formal evaluations) with those of teachers in the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Canada K-12 school system. The Seventh-day Adventist Church in Canada, Office of Education has approved this project.

We are mailing this survey to you in the winter with the hope that your schedule will permit the 30 minutes it will take to complete the questions. Your assistance is vital to the success of this study and would be greatly appreciated.

All the teachers and administrators in the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Canada K-12 School System are being asked to participate in the study. Please be assured that your participation is voluntary and will remain completely confidential. Also, even if you give consent, you may withdraw for participating in the study at any time, without prejudice. Neither you nor the teachers in your school will be identified in the report of our findings. We are providing you with a business reply postage paid envelope, which you can use to return the survey. The code number on the return envelope is for tabulation purposes only.

Questions concerning your rights as a subject in this study may be directed to Andrews University’s Human Subjects Review Board at (616) 471-6088. In addition, if you have any questions or if we can be of assistance, please feel free to contact Dr. Jeffery at (616) 471-3577, Dr. Bernard at (616) 471-6702 and Dave Higgins anytime at (905) 571-1022 Ext. 210.

Please return the completed survey in the enclosed envelope within seven (7) calendar days after receiving it. Your return of the survey will indicate your consent to participate. A summary of the findings will be made available to you upon request.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

Jim Jeffery, Ph.D.
Dissertation Committee Chair
Associate Professor
Educational Administration and Leadership
(616) 471-3577

Hindsdale Bernard, Ph.D.
Statistician
Associate Professor
Educational Administration and Leadership
(616) 471-6702

Dave Higgins
Doctoral Candidate
Ontario Conference
(905) 571-1022
January 10, 2001

Dear Colleagues:

I am writing on behalf of Mr. Dave Higgins, Superintendent of Education for Ontario Conference. I have had the pleasure of working with Mr. Higgins when I served as superintendent in Ontario.

As part of doctoral dissertation study in Educational Administration and Leadership at Andrews University, Mr. Higgins is doing a research study, the purpose of which is to compare the perception of and attitudes toward current teacher evaluation policies and practices held by supervisors (i.e. those persons – principals or superintendents who completes teachers formal evaluations) with those of teachers in the SDA Church in Canada K-12 school system. This study could be very significant for teachers as well as administrators in our union and the Office of Education has approved and is supportive of the study.

The courtesies that you will extend to Mr. Higgins to facilitate the study will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Mike M. Lekic
Education Director
February 7, 2001

Dear Fellow Educators:

Greetings to you and your family and to your co-teachers.

This letter is to let you know that I am still waiting for the questionnaire I sent to you January 10. Due to the fact that only a limited number of teachers are included in this study, it is extremely important that your input be included in this survey. Your participation in this study will provide an accurate representation of the views of the teachers in the SDA Church in Canada school system.

In case you have misplaced the questionnaire, please use the enclosed postage paid post card to request another copy. Upon receipt of your request, I will promptly send you another copy by first class mail.

If you have already completed and mailed back the questionnaire to me, please accept my sincere thanks.

Again, thank you very much for your participation in this study.

May the Lord continue to bless your efforts in guiding, educating, and preparing your students for His kingdom, which we hope will be soon.

Sincerely yours,

Dave D. Higgins
Doctoral Student
Andrews University
Berrien Springs
Michigan
QUESTIONNAIRE (Form A)

For Use by the Teacher

Instruction. Please circle the letter in front of the option (response), which best represents your accurate recollection, opinion, or judgment.

1. How good an idea do you think your supervisor (the person—principal or superintendent who completes your formal evaluation) has of your teaching abilities?
   a. Very clear idea
   b. Fairly clear idea
   c. Little idea
   d. I don’t know

2. Do you think that your supervisor has enough time to evaluate your teaching performance?
   a. Always
   b. Usually
   c. Rarely

3. If you have not been observed and evaluated as often as you wish, what is the main hindrance? (Circle only one)
   a. Supervisor dealing with budgetary matters
   b. Supervisor involved in part-time and/or substitute teaching
   c. Supervisor dealing with discipline problems
   d. Supervisor attending off-campus committee meetings
   e. Other

4. Thinking back on the 1999-2000 school year, about how many times did your supervisor formally evaluate your teaching performance?
   a. 2 or more times
   b. 1 time
   c. No times

5. Are you satisfied with the frequency with which your supervisor formally observes your teaching performance?
   a. Very satisfied
   b. Satisfied
   c. Dissatisfied
   d. Very Dissatisfied
6. Does your supervisor use a standard form to formally observe your teaching performance?
   a. Always
   b. Usually
   c. Rarely
   d. Never

7. If a standard evaluation form is used, which of the following is it?
   a. Seventh-day Adventist Church in Canada form
   b. Local conference form approved by the Board of Education
   c. A form constructed by your supervisor
   d. A form constructed by a faculty curriculum committee
   e. A form of your own construction
   f. Other ___________________________
      (Please specify)

8. If the principal does not use a form what does he or she looks for when formally observing your teaching performance? (Please arrange the following points in the order of importance which you perceive the principal places by placing numbers 1-8, 1 being MOST important, on the appropriate lines).
   a. ____ Your general appearance and bearing
   b. ____ The quality of your interaction with the students
   c. ____ Your use of behavioral objectives with appropriate practice
   d. ____ Your ability to control the class
   e. ____ Your use of a variety of teaching materials
   f. ____ Your verbal and writing skills
   g. ____ Your ability to meet diverse needs of students
   h. ____ Others ___________________________
      (Please specify)

9. What in your opinion are the main purposes of formal observation of teaching? (Please arrange the following options in the order of importance to you by placing numbers 1-4 on the appropriate lines, 1 being the MOST important).
   a. ____ To determine if the teacher is integrating faith and learning
   b. ____ To distinguish between effective and ineffective teachers
   c. ____ To improve the quality of the teacher’s teaching performance
   d. ____ To maximize the learning opportunities for students

10. Does the supervisor hold an individual conference with you before coming to formally observe your teaching performance?
    a. Always
    b. Usually
    c. Rarely
    d. Never
11. When formally observing your teaching performance how long does your supervisor normally spend?
   a. The entire class period
   b. At least half of the class period
   c. Less than half of the class period
   d. No set amount of time
   e. It varies

12. Please arrange the following sources in terms of their importance in informing your supervisor about the quality of your teaching performance. (Place numbers 1-6, 1 being the MOST influential, on the appropriate lines).
   a. _____ Your students' performance on standardized tests
   b. _____ The supervisor's intuition
   c. _____ The supervisor's personal observation and evaluation of your teaching
   d. _____ Input from parents
   e. _____ Input from students
   f. _____ Other ________________________________
      (Please specify)

13. Which of the following statements best express your feelings regarding the formal observation of your teaching performance as it is presently being conducted?
   a. It is a very helpful process
   b. It is a somewhat helpful process
   c. It is an imposition
   d. It lacks clarity and purpose
   e. It is threatening
   f. It is too judgmental
   g. Other ________________________________
      (Please specify)

14. Does your supervisor hold a conference with you after each formal observation of your teaching performance?
   a. Always
   b. Usually
   c. Rarely
   d. Only if serious problems were observed

15. If your supervisor holds a post-observation conference with you when does it usually take place?
   a. The day of the observation
   b. The day after the observation
   c. Within a week of the observation
   d. More than a week after the observation
   e. Do not hold a conference
16. What action most often follows your supervisor's formal observation of your teaching performance? (Please circle only one).
   a. A report to the superintendent of schools
   b. Formal plans are made by the supervisor to help you improve your teaching performance
   c. The supervisor meets with you to agree on ways through which you can improve your teaching performance
   d. No formal action is taken to your knowledge
   e. Other ______________________________
      (Please specify)

17. Please indicate your evaluation of your supervisor's competence in the following roles by arranging them in order 1-8, 1 being the MOST competent and placing the numbers on the appropriate lines.
   a. _____ Disciplinarian
   b. _____ Evaluator of teacher's teaching performance
   c. _____ Manager of the school budget
   d. _____ Spiritual leader of the school
   e. _____ Director of school public relations
   f. _____ Counselor to students
   g. _____ Secretary to the school board
   h. _____ Counselor to faculty and staff

18. Please indicate how at ease you think your supervisor feels in the following roles by arranging them in order of most to least ease. Place numbers 1-8, 1 being MOST at ease, on the appropriate lines.
   a. _____ Director of school public relations
   b. _____ Counselor to students
   c. _____ Disciplinarian
   d. _____ Evaluator of teacher's teaching performance
   e. _____ Spiritual leader of the school
   f. _____ Manager of the school budget
   g. _____ Secretary of the school board
   h. _____ Counselor to faculty and staff

19. How could the practice of formal observation of teaching performance in your school be improved? Please list as many suggestions as you can in order of priority (a being the most important).
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 
   d. 
   e. 
   f. 
   g. 
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Biographical Data. Please check only one in each section.

1. ( ) Male ( ) Female

2. Age: ( ) 21-30 ( ) 41-50  
   ( ) 31-40 ( ) More than 50

3. Total teaching years:  
   ( ) 2-5 ( ) 11-15  
   ( ) 6-10 ( ) 16-20  
   ( ) More than 20 years

4. Employment Status:  
   ( ) Regular employment  
   ( ) Provisional employment  
   ( ) Professional employment

5. Number of years at present school____________________  
   (Please place on line)

6. Highest degree:  
   ( ) Less than Bachelor  
   ( ) Bachelor  
   ( ) Master  
   ( ) Educational Specialist (EdS)  
   ( ) Doctorate

7. Would you like a copy of the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of this study be provided to your school? (Check one)  
   ( ) Yes ( ) No

Thank you very much for your kindness in answering these questions. Please place the completed form in the envelope provided, seal it and return it to your principal who will forwarded all sealed envelopes to me.

KINDLY COMPLETE THIS WITHIN SEVEN (7) DAYS AFTER RECEIVING IT.
QUESTIONNAIRE (Form B)
For Use by the Supervisor
(i.e. principal or superintendent)

Instruction. Please circle the letter in front of the option (response), which best represents, your accurate recollection, opinion or judgment.

1. How good an idea do you have of each of your teacher's teaching abilities?
   a. Very clear idea
   b. Fairly clear idea
   c. Little idea
   d. I don't know

2. Do you have enough time to evaluate your teachers' teaching performance?
   a. Always
   b. Usually
   c. Rarely

3. If you do not observe and evaluate as often as you wish, what is the main hindrance?
   (Circle only one)
   a. Dealing with budgetary matters
   b. Regular part-time and/or substitute teaching
   c. Dealing with discipline problems
   d. Attendance at off-campus committee meetings
   e. Other

4. Thinking back on the 1999-2000 school year, about how many times on average during that year did you evaluate the teaching performance of an individual teacher in the following categories? (Please circle the appropriate response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probationary Teacher</th>
<th>Regular Teacher</th>
<th>Professional Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 or more times</td>
<td>2 or more times</td>
<td>2 or more times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>One time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Are you satisfied with the number of visits you make to observe teachers?
   a. Very satisfied
   b. Satisfied
   c. Dissatisfied
   d. Very dissatisfied
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6. Do you use a standard form for the evaluation of teaching performance?
   a. Always
   b. Usually
   c. Rarely
   d. Never

7. If you use a standard form, which of the following instruments do you use?
   a. Seventh-day Adventist Church in Canada form
   b. Local conference form approved by Board of Education
   c. Local school form approved by the board of your school
   d. A form constructed by a faculty curriculum committee
   e. A form of your own construction
   f. Other ______________________________________________ (Please specify)

8. If you do not use a standard form for evaluating teaching performance, what do you look for when observing teaching performance? (Please arrange the following options in order of importance to you by placing number 1-8 on the appropriate lines, 1 being MOST important.)
   a. _____ Teacher’s general appearance and bearing
   b. _____ Quality of student-teacher interaction
   c. _____ Teacher’s use of behavioral objectives with appropriate practice
   d. _____ Teacher’s ability to control the class
   e. _____ Teacher’s use of a variety of teaching materials
   f. _____ Teacher’s verbal and writing skills
   g. _____ Teacher’s ability to meet the diverse needs of students
   h. _____ Others ____________________________________________ (Please specify)

9. What, in your opinion, are the main purposes of evaluation of teaching performance? (Please arrange the following options in the order of importance to you by placing 1-4 on the appropriate lines, 1 being the MOST important).
   a. _____ To determine if the teacher is integrating faith and learning
   b. _____ To distinguish between effective and ineffective teachers
   c. _____ To improve the quality of teacher’s performance
   d. _____ To maximize the learning opportunities for students

10. Do you conduct individual pre-observation conference?
    a. Always
    b. Usually
    c. Rarely
    d. Never
11. When observing a teacher's teaching performance, how long do you normally spend?
   a. The entire class period
   b. At least half the class period
   c. Less than half the class period
   d. No set amount of time
   e. It varies

12. Please arrange the following sources in terms of their importance in informing you about the quality of your teacher's teaching performance. (Place numbers 1-6, 1 being the MOST influential, on the appropriate lines).
   a. _____ Your students' performance on standardized tests
   b. ______ The principal's intuition
   c. ______ The principal's personal observation and evaluation of your teaching
   d. _____ Input from parents
   e. _____ Input from students
   f. _____ Other ________________________________
      (Please specify)

13. Which of the following statements best express your feelings regarding the formal observation of your teacher's teaching performance as it is presently being conducted?
   a. It is a very helpful process
   b. It is a somewhat helpful process
   c. It is an imposition
   d. It lacks clarity and purpose
   e. It is threatening
   f. It is too judgmental
   g. Other ________________________________
      (Please specify)

14. Do you hold a post-observation conference with the teacher?
   a. Always
   b. Usually
   c. Rarely
   d. Only if serious problems were observed

15. If you hold a post-observation conference with the teacher, when does it usually take place?
   a. The day of the observation
   b. The day after the observation
   c. Within a week of the observation
   d. More than a week after the observation
   e. Do not hold a conference
16. What action most often follows your evaluation of a teacher's teaching performance? (Please circle only one).
   a. A report to the superintendent of schools
   b. Formal plans by the principal to help the teacher improve
   c. The principal and the teacher meet to agree on plans for teacher to improve his or her teaching performance
   d. No formal action
   e. Other

(Please specify)

17. Please indicate your self-evaluation of your competence in the following roles by arranging them in order 1-8, 1 being the MOST competent. Place the number on the appropriate lines.
   a. ______ Disciplinarian
   b. ______ Evaluator of teachers' teaching performance
   c. ______ Manager of school budget
   d. ______ Spiritual leader of the school
   e. ______ Director of school public relations
   f. ______ Counselor of students
   g. ______ Secretary to the school board
   h. ______ Counselor of faculty and staff

18. Please indicate how at ease you feel in the following roles by arranging them in order 1-8, 1 being the MOST at ease. Place the numbers on the appropriate lines.
   a. ______ Director of school public relations
   b. ______ Counselor of students
   c. ______ Disciplinarian
   d. ______ Evaluator of teachers' teaching performance
   e. ______ Spiritual leader of the school
   f. ______ Manager of the school budget
   g. ______ Secretary to the school board
   h. ______ Counselor of faculty and staff

19. How could the present practice of evaluating teaching performance be improved? Please list as many suggestions as you can in order of priority, (a being the most important)

   a.
   b.
   c.
   d.
   e.
   f.
   g.
20. Did you have any formal training in evaluation of teaching performance before becoming a supervisor? (Please circle one)
   a. Yes, through graduate courses
   b. Yes, through seminars sponsored by conference and/Seventh-day Adventist Church in Canada, Department of Education
   c. Yes, through seminars sponsored by others
   d. Yes, through all of the above (a, b and c)
   e. No

21. Have you had any formal training in the evaluation of teaching performance since becoming a supervisor? (Please circle only one)
   a. Yes, through graduate courses
   b. Yes, through seminars sponsored by conference and/Seventh-day Adventist Church in Canada
   c. Yes, through seminars sponsored by others
   d. Yes, through all of the above (a, b and c)
   e. No

Biographical Data. Please check only one in each section.

1. ( ) Male ( ) Female

2. Age: ( ) 21-30 ( ) 31-40
   ( ) 41-50 ( ) More than 50

3. Total number of years as supervisor:
   ( ) 2-5 ( ) 11-15
   ( ) 6-10 ( ) 16-20
   ( ) More than 20 years

4. Number of years in present position: ___________________
   (Please write on line)

5. Previous position (before becoming a supervisor)
   ( ) Vice-principal
   ( ) Counselor
   ( ) Superintendent of schools
   ( ) Other _____________________________
   (Please indicate title)

6. Highest degree:
   ( ) Less than Bachelor
   ( ) Bachelor
   ( ) Master
   ( ) Educational Specialist (EdS)
   ( ) Doctorate
7. Would you like a copy of the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of this study be provided to your school?  
   () Yes  () No

Thank you very much for your kindness in answering these questions. Please return your completed form along with those of the teachers in your school who are participating in this study. A stamped, self-addressed envelope has been provided.

KINDLY COMPLETE THIS WITHIN SEVEN (7) DAYS AFTER RECEIVING IT
REFERENCE LIST
REFERENCE LIST


DAVE D. HIGGINS

EDUCATION:

1996 - Present
Ed.D. - Educational Administration and Leadership
Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI
Co-Chair: Hinsdale Bernard, Ph.D.
Co-Chair: James Jeffery, Ph.D.
Comprehensive Examinations: Passed, 8/98

1972 – 1973
MPH - Health Education
Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA

1969 – 1971
B.Sc.- Behavioral Science
Atlantic Union College, South Lancaster, MA

EXPERIENCE:

2001 - Present
Health & Children Ministries Director Ontario Conference of SDA, Oshawa, Ontario, Canada
Providing leadership in health ministries and Children ministries.

1996 – 2001
Superintendent of Education & Health Ministries Director Ontario Conference of SDA, Oshawa, Ontario, Canada
Provided leadership in administering K-12 education in the Ontario Conference. Provided limited leadership in health ministries.

1986 – 1996
Associate Superintendent of Education Ontario Conference of SDA, Oshawa, Ontario, Canada
Responsible for curriculum development and supervision of instruction, School and Teacher evaluations

1979 – 1986
Principal/Teacher Ontario Conference of SDA, Toronto Western SDA School
Principal/teacher of K-8 School, taught Grades 7 & 8, supervised 4 other teachers.

1971 – 1972
Teacher Grades 7 — 10 St. Croix SDA School, Virgin Islands, USA
Taught Biology and Health Science grades 7-10.