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Problem

The purpose of this study was to measure public school teachers’ perception regarding the effectiveness of their evaluation instrument, the Career Path System, in the Bahamas.

Method

The research population consisted of two categories of public school teachers: (a) level of teachers—elementary and secondary teachers, and (b) status of teachers—evaluated and non-evaluated teachers. The data were analyzed utilizing descriptive statistics, means, and ANOVA.
Results

The results of this study indicate that public school teachers, regardless of the categories elementary or secondary, evaluated or non-evaluated, perceived 44 of 46 performance items of the Career Path System (CPS) evaluation instrument as satisfactory. The two performance items that were perceived by teachers as unsatisfactory are related to student creativity, originality, and investigative skills that came under the domain Student Achievement. A hierarchical preference of the five domains selected by teachers from most satisfactory to least satisfactory was: Teacher Planning, Record Keeping, Teacher Observation, Classroom Management, and Student Achievement.

The general evaluation information also did not affect the perceptions of teachers regarding their stance on the effectiveness of the CPS instrument. The results of the survey suggested that evaluated and non-evaluated teachers were unanimous in their conclusion that the CPS was a sound and effective instrument.

Conclusions

Both elementary and high-school teachers and evaluated and non-evaluated teachers shared a great deal of unanimity regarding the perceived soundness of the Career Path Evaluation instrument. However, there were two performance items under the domain Student Achievement that teachers perceived as unsatisfactory: (a) students’ work shows evidence of creativity, originality, and imagination; and (b) students’ work shows evidence of the use of investigative skills. Other general evaluation information supports teachers’ perception of the Career Path Instrument as being a sound assessment document. Suggestions for further research include an expansion on this study to target a
demographic component and a longitudinal study over a period of 3 to 5 years to investigate the changing perceptions of teachers.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Change and restructuring has been one of the dominant features of the 21st century that has affected the perceptions and thinking process of the status quo in education. According to Darling-Hammond and Ball (1998), Ferguson and Ladd (1996), and Wright, Horn, and Sanders (1997), research shows that teacher quality significantly affects student achievement more than any other school-based variable. In addition, the most qualified teachers are the least likely to stay in teaching, and new teachers are more inclined to leave when they are not given an opportunity to advance in their careers, collaborate with colleagues, or expand their influence within schools (Henke, Chen, & Geis, 2000). Hence, in the United States there is a strong incentive for reform in education by President George Bush’s No Child Left Behind Act (Wikipedia, 2001a, January 15) with focus on teacher qualification, teacher evaluation, and student achievement.

While American educators have experienced and are presently experiencing unprecedented reform in education from the No Child Left Behind Act, the Bahamas, an independent nation in the Caribbean, has likewise experienced a major change in its educational system in 1999. This reform focuses on teacher qualification, evaluation, and teacher improvement. It is centered on their evaluation system, the Career Path System (CPS), and has impacted the careers of the Bahamian teachers. The CPS has similarly
engendered perceptions among public school teachers as to its content and purpose.

According to Stronge (1997), the fundamentals of a quality teacher evaluation system are fairness and effectiveness based on performance and are designed to encourage improvement in both the evaluated teacher and the school. The purpose of this study therefore is to explore the perceptions of public school teachers as to their level of satisfaction towards the content of the CPS instrument. This study represents the first available research of its kind on the perceptions of public school teachers in the Bahamas towards the CPS instrument.

Similar research on Career Ladders (which is synonymous with Career Path System) and their perceptions on teacher evaluation has been studied in the United States. This has relevance for this study, and will be an integral part of the literature research.

Clark and Astuto (1994) reported that too often educational reform has generated disappointing results, or as Pogrow (1996) describes it as a complete failure. Fullan (1996) faulted current teacher evaluation system reforms on fragmentation: “When the pressures—and even the opportunities—for reform work at cross purposes or seem disjointed and incoherent” (p. 420).

An illustration of cross purposes, disjointed, and incoherent reform is the following scenario: (a) Electing to change school policy from a regular eight-block to four-block system, (b) providing intermittent staff development on prospective innovation, (c) implementing the innovative system, and (d) persisting in utilizing the existing evaluation instrument and practices.

Stufflebeam (1988) stated that a sound, defensible evaluation system is an essential component of a successful reform. Stronge (1993) affirms this position by the
following statement: “A rational relationship exists between personnel and programs: If program effectiveness is important and if personnel are necessary for effective programming, then a conceptually sound and properly implemented evaluation system for . . . education personnel is essential” (p. 70).

In a healthy school organization a synergistic, dynamic relationship exists between the teacher and the school. This mutuality fosters and enhances the goals of the school. Goldrick (2002) indicated that such an approach “may help revolutionize teaching evaluation” (p. 1).

A teacher evaluation system thus represents the means of transport to facilitate and assess success for both teacher and the school. Therefore, a teacher evaluation system is an essential component of school upgrading and restructuring.

To achieve a premium evaluation system built upon a dynamic balance between teacher and the organization, several key features are recommended by Stronge (1997) and Peterson (2000). Among these vital concepts are establishing validity and reliability, emphasis on systematic communication, climate for evaluation, and the district evaluation system is analyzed using the Personnel Evaluation Standards. These features are briefly examined in the following pages.

Validation of Teacher Evaluation System

Peterson (2000) indicates that validating a teacher evaluating system would involve completing various steps that would eventually develop into a sound case grounded on principles and evidence, and that can function dependently, accurately, and with known limits. Validation entails a public reviewable document that shows that the evaluation instrument addresses what it purports to address in teacher performance, and
assess what it claims to assess. Validity means that the system and its results are believable (Peterson, 2000). It is important to note that no single attribute confers validity; instead, a combination of factors facilitates or increases the degree of validity of an evaluation system. Trochim (2006) lists the following types of validity: face validity, construct validity, predictive validity, concurrent validity, convergent validity, and discriminant validity.

**Face Validity**

In face validity, the evaluation documents what it appears to document. Peterson (2000) amplifies the above statement by stating that “validity is the degree to which a procedure is absolutely correct in measuring what it purports to measure” (p. 360).

**Construct Validity**

Construct validity represents how accurately the evaluation instrument reflects its purpose (Trochim, 2006). Questions such as: Are there good reasons behind this evaluation instrument? or How does this evaluation fit into the larger scheme of education? would be appropriate in this context.

**Predictive Validity**

Predictive validity involves other things that are important in education, or that other valuable outcomes will occur as a result of the evaluation instrument (Peterson, 2000). Some of these predictive values could include—teacher responsibilities; increased knowledge, skills, and effectiveness; a culture of career opportunities; and increased productivity and fulfillment.
Concurrent Validity

Concurrent validity assesses the evaluation instrument’s ability to distinguish between groups that it is theoretically representing (Trochim, 2006). In this context, this is evaluated and non-evaluated teachers.

Convergent Validity

Convergent validity examines the degree to which the evaluation instrument is similar to other evaluation instruments that it theoretically should be similar to. In this context the CPS should show evidence that the instrument is similar to other career ladder evaluation instruments.

Discriminant Validity

Discriminant validity examines the degree to which the evaluation instrument is not similar to other evaluation instruments that it theoretically should not be similar to. Evidence could be gathered to show that the CPS instrument is not similar to other career ladder evaluation instruments.

This research on the Career Path System instrument for Bahamian public teachers will contribute to one aspect of validity, face validity. Face validity in this study will be accomplished by examining the performance items of the CPS as a valid measure of teacher effectiveness.

Systematic Communication

Systematic communication is divided into two aspects: public and private. The public nature of systematic communication in evaluation is that of public disclosure of the rudiments that involve teachers, administrators, and the general public, which has the
right to be informed. According to Stronge (1997) essential elements of public disclosure in teacher evaluation include the following:

1. Establishment of institutional goals
2. Determination of evaluation purposes in relation to those goals
3. Identification of acceptable standards of performance
4. Delineation of procedural guidelines and safeguards embedded in the evaluation system (p. 7).

The general public’s right to know about the school evaluation system is codified in law. This aspect is reflected in school board open meetings which make provision for public discussion on pertinent issues relevant to policy practices being debated for the improvement of the school.

The private nature of communication is demonstrated by the administrator/evaluator and teacher/evaluatee. Effective communication between evaluator and evaluatee according to Stronge (1997) is beneficial for the following reasons:

1. It allows for the cooperative development of an evaluation plan.
2. It increases the likelihood that needed changes in performance will take place.
3. It allows identification of ways to reach higher standards and correct significant discrepancies.
4. It establishes a system of checks and balances for the evaluation process.
5. It provides systematic opportunities for individual skill enhancement and improved performance (p. 8).

Cummings and Schwab (1973) summarize that this two-way communication
between evaluator and evaluatee minimizes unintended consequences while simultaneously maximizing organizational goals of improvement and performance. Consequently, this study will facilitate that openness in communication, encourage dialogue, and help to maximize the goals of the CPS program.

**Evaluation Climate**

According to Redfern (1980), in an evaluation process the concerns of the evaluator and the teacher are satisfied in a cooperative atmosphere. Unfortunately teacher evaluation systems are frequently fraught with mistrust, conflict, and suspicion (Stronge & Helm, 1991). However the greatest benefit to both parties is when an evaluation system exists in an atmosphere of mutual expectations.

The concepts of cooperative atmosphere, climate, and satisfaction are closely intertwined (Owens, 1987), and are an integral part of a successful, productive, sound evaluation system. In fact, Stronge and Tucker (2000) emphasized that a critical variable in the climate of satisfaction in the workplace is consideration, or fair and humane treatment among employees and between employer and employee. It is from this perspective that this study on the degree of satisfaction of teachers towards their evaluation instrument, the Career Path Study, proposes to make a significant contribution.

**Personnel Evaluation Standards**

The Personnel Evaluation Standards were developed by a 16-member Joint Committee (1988) from various educational organizations such as: (a) American Association of School Board, (b) American Educational Research Association, (c) American Federation of Teachers, (d) American Psychological Association, (e) American Psychological Association.
National Education Association, and (f) National School Boards Association.

The above representatives along with seven other organizations came up with a list of 21 standards that “present criteria for judging evaluation plans, procedures, and reports” (p. 9). Evaluation systems that incorporate these guidelines substantially increase their opportunity for achievement of desirable outcomes as described in the guiding assumptions of the Personnel Evaluation Standards (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1988) which includes the following:

1. To provide effective service to students and society.
2. To establish personnel evaluation practices that are constructive and free of unnecessary threatening or demoralizing characteristics.
3. To facilitate planning for sound professional development experiences.

The Personnel Evaluation Standards has significance to this study as it can provide quality control to stakeholders—teachers, policy makers, administrators, government, parents, students, and others; and can support improvement in the overall evaluation process (Stufflebeam & Brethower, 1987; Stufflebeam & Sanders, 1990). The general principles of the Personnel Evaluation Standards are elaborated on later in this chapter.

**Historical Development of Career Ladders**

Career ladders became one of the terminologies to emerge from teacher evaluation and became prominent in the 1980s during the Reagan administration. A review of the literature reveals various hybrid terms in use for career ladders in different states and countries such as: Career in Teaching Program—Boston, Massachusetts; Professional Opportunities Program—Miami, Florida; Minneapolis Public Schools
Superintendent Aaron Shelley (1867) of Adams County, Pennsylvania, alluded to career ladders over 100 years ago in his annual report:

I cannot but condemn the practice, prevailing to some extent, of paying all teachers the same wages; the merest tyro in the art as much as the well qualified, experienced teacher. It seems to me that by these course directors, actually offer a premium to mediocrity, if not to positive ignorance and incompetency. Inducements should always be held out to teachers who duly qualify themselves for their work; and it seems to me that this can best be done by means of salaries increasing progressively in proportion to the amount and value of the services performed. This would excite the emulation of teachers, and thus could be established a system of promotion advantageous to the schools. (Wickersham, 1868, pp. 8-9)

Superintendent Shelley was actually espousing the cause of teacher incentives by rewarding quality teaching. A plethora of national reports in the decade of the 80s gave impetus to an identical educational reform. Darling-Hammond (1986) indicated that over 1,000 pieces of legislation affecting teachers, including salary, were passed. The major areas of reform were increased accountability of teachers, improvement in academic standards for students, and greater recognition of teachers. These reforms notably impacted teacher evaluation.

A significant national report in 1983, *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), made a specific recommendation for improving teachers’ salaries and teachers’ performance. This report, along with several others, were instrumental in the establishment of the current career ladders. By 1984, the U.S. Department of Education identified 24 states interested in career ladder and 6 states that had instituted pilot programs. Eventually by 1987, career ladders, according to Southern Regional Education Board’s Career Ladder Clearing House, and other incentive pay
programs became the largest educational experiment in the United States (Cornett & Gaines, 1994).

A career ladder, according to the Office of Affirmative Action at the University of Rhode Island (2007), is a hierarchy of jobs consisting of a series of more complex duties and responsibilities within a general occupational area. Therefore, a career ladder system offers teachers the opportunity to enhance their abilities, skills, knowledge, and the privilege to develop their leadership skills by accepting additional responsibilities. Correspondingly, as teachers are promoted through the various career ladder levels, higher salaries are earned. The fundamental goals for career ladders are to reward excellence, improve teaching skill, and increase student achievement through the process of assessing and evaluating teacher performance.

Statement of the Problem

Before the 1960s, education was considered a moral and social obligation in the Bahamas. This perception emerged from the latter part of the 19th century during the emancipation of slavery; slave-owners were interested in slaves constructively occupying their leisure time. Consequently, education was not seen in terms of an investment until 1968, when a genuine attempt at universal education materialized under the platform of the Progressive Liberal Party (PLP) government.

With the economic boom in tourism and under a majority government rule, the PLP affirmed education as its priority. Qualified Bahamian teachers were in demand, and numerous educational opportunities and scholarships were given to persons to fill this void. Unfortunately, the old evaluation system, the Annual Confidential Report (ACR), which was developed in the early 20th century, remained static and did not
evolve with other aspects of education. Teachers' main complaints about the ACR were lack of constructive feedback, very little direction for staff-development programs, and a single salary schedule characterized by insensitivity to grade, specialization, and performance. Hence, the Bahamas Union of Teachers and the Ministry of Education in 1997 jointly developed the career structure called the Career Path System with reassuring results. In 2003, the average enrollment rate was approximately 94% and in 2005 there were approximately 3,000 teachers, 50,000 students, and 158 schools. As a result, trained teachers were the convention (Sears, 2005).

The Career Path System is synonymous with the term career ladders used in the United States. This evaluation process represents a separate track from the regular annual and continuous assessment of teachers. The purpose is to diversify the incentive system, to promote teachers, and to award increments differentially based on performance. The Career Path System offers a three-tiered teacher ladder that includes: junior rank or certified teacher II, senior teacher, and master teacher. The initial evaluation for the Career Path System is limited to applicants for the ranks of senior and master teacher.

Historically, incentives for Bahamian teachers were restricted to one scale regardless of job demands and performance. Compared to administrators who were awarded for their performance and position, teachers' promotion and financial mobility were limited. Under the system of the ACR, teachers were recognized for their performance largely on the basis of merit pay or incremental award. This practice perpetuated the perception that advancement within the system may be achieved only by leaving the classroom to become an administrator. The majority of teachers do not aspire to be administrators. Therefore, to enhance the quality of education, teachers must be
encouraged to remain in the classroom and be adequately compensated based on merit for their services.

The Career Path System was therefore implemented in September of 1999 to provide teachers with an avenue for promotion and merit pay based upon performance, experience, and qualification. However, from its very inception the CPS generated levels of perceptions among teachers pertaining to its content, assessment method, preferential selection of candidates, and lack of teacher input. Therefore this study plans empirically to explore the following issue as it relates to the perception of teachers towards the contents of the CPS instrument.

The best way to address these concerns is by utilizing a random stratified sample. This would include a representative sample of the two categories of teachers: levels of teachers—secondary and elementary; and teacher evaluated status—non-evaluated and evaluated.

Rationale

The rationale for this study is based on two key features. First, according to Stronge and Helm (1991), a sound, fair evaluation system and instrument for teachers is fundamental for an effective school. Despite the fact that this aspect is vital to a successful school, it is often neglected. Second, evaluation of teachers is of national concern and in particular career ladder structures and their evaluation instruments have additional urgency because they affect the stakeholders’ finances: the taxpaying public, the business community, and the parents (Odden & Kelley, 1997).

Each of the above features requires that the education system produce results—increase student achievement and link pay to performance. The Career Path System
(CPS) instrument in the Bahamas faces parallel challenges in its infant stage. Hence, this study is to measure public school teachers’ perceptions of the effectiveness of the CPS instrument to facilitate it evolving into a technically sound evaluation instrument.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to measure Bahamian public school teachers’ perceptions of the performance items of the Career Path System (CPS) instrument as an indicator of teacher effectiveness. Due to the fact that no study has been done on the CPS instrument, this research could be one of the significant attributes that may enhance the degree of validity and integrity of the CPS instrument.

**Research Questions and Related Hypotheses**

The five domains, 46 performance items, and the six items comprising the general evaluation information section represented the dependent variables for this research; and the level of teachers and evaluation status of teachers represented the independent variables. There were five research questions and 11 hypotheses. Research questions 1, 2, and 3 had no hypotheses. Research question 4 corresponded with five hypotheses selected from the five domains of the CPS instrument; and research question 5 corresponded with six hypotheses extrapolated from the six GEI statements. All 11 hypotheses were tested by two-way ANOVA. The data for the hypotheses were analyzed at the .05 level assigned to the region of rejection.

**Research Questions**

The following five research questions are extrapolated from the CPS instrument and the General Evaluation Information section. Research questions 1, 2, and 3 had no
hypotheses, but were answered by descriptive statistics.

1. How do teachers as a group perceive each item on the CPS as a criterion of teacher effectiveness?

2. How do teachers as a group perceive each domain on the CPS as a criterion of teacher effectiveness?

3. How do teachers as a group perceive the CPS instrument as a whole as a criterion of teacher effectiveness?

4. Is there a significant teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the CPS domains?

5. Is there a significant teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction on the General Evaluation Information (GEI)?

Research Hypotheses

The following represent the related hypotheses for questions 4 and 5:

In addressing question 4, the following research hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 1: There is a significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Teacher Planning domain.

Hypothesis 2: There is a significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Teacher Observation domain.

Hypothesis 3: There is a significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Classroom Management domain.
Hypothesis 4: There is a significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Student Achievement domain.

Hypothesis 5: There is a significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Record-Keeping domain.

In addressing question 5, the following research hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 6: There is a significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction on the CPS motivating teachers to remain in the teaching career.

Hypothesis 7: There is a significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction on the CPS consisting of sound assessment criteria.

Hypothesis 8: There is a significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction on the CPS being given adequate orientation.

Hypothesis 9: There is a significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction on the CPS providing for adequate financial incentives for teachers.

Hypothesis 10: There is a significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction on the CPS motivating other persons to enter the teaching profession.

Hypothesis 11: There is a significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction on the CPS being satisfactorily implemented
Significance of the Study

Many researchers of evaluation processes have issues and doubts about the effectiveness of teacher evaluation. If teachers perceive evaluation as ineffective, there may be few reasons to believe that they can be used effectively to improve the quality of teachers or schools (McGreal, 1983). If reasons can be identified for such perception by teachers, this study may be able to contribute to making the evaluation system meaningful and effective to the participants and other stakeholders. Consequentially, the purpose of evaluations might become relevant for teachers who have doubts about the utility and content of evaluations.

This study has scholarly significance because it will provide insight into career ladders and the process of school organizational change. Change has been a major feature of the 21st century in communication, family structure, entertainment, business, industries, education, and patterns of work. Educational institutions, however, are among those that are most resistant to change. According to Brandt (1990), teacher incentive pay and career ladders represent a major change in school personnel practices. They have the potential for affecting and changing entrenched structural organizational patterns.

For Bahamian teachers this change represents the Career Path System, a new incentive program which may impact the present status quo organization from a horizontal level position to a three-tiered level position. The Ministry of Education in the Bahamas may have greater insight as to how change affects teacher motivation, student achievement, and teacher morale, and thereby facilitate better cooperation and team
Due to the fact that no study has been done on the CPS instrument, this research will be one of the significant attributes to enhance the degree of validity and integrity of the CPS instrument. Validity according to Friend and Guralnik (1960) is constructing a case that is “sound, well grounded on principles or evidence; to withstand criticism or objection, as an argument” (p. 7). One of the highlights of this study is to promote the development of the CPS into a premium evaluation instrument.

This study will also be helpful to evaluators, evaluatees, and other stakeholders in identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the Career Path System to determine whether its goals and objectives are being accomplished. It is hoped that the results of this study will heighten the awareness of the importance of teachers’ views in the evaluation process and thereby engender a more effective and meaningful evaluation system.

**Theoretical Framework**

My study on teacher evaluation instruments revealed that the perceptions are: (a) they typically fail to make the grade (Haefele, 1993; Natriello, Deal, Dornbusch, & Hong, 1977); (b) they are of inferior quality and are ineffectively utilized (Frase & Streshly, 1994; Feild & Holley, 1982); (c) they are ambiguous and lack objectivity (McLaughlin, 1984; Schachter, 1988); (d) they contain unsound and inconsistent practices (Scriven, 1990; Stiggins, 1996; Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, & Bernstein, 1984); and (e) they are of substandard assessment methods (Darling-Hammond, 1986; Peterson & Chenoweth, 1992).

Other researchers in studying the above deficiencies have recommended teachers having a stake in developing an evaluation system that is effective, meaningful, and
substantive. Since teachers are directly impacted by the evaluation process they can be a valuable resource.

The theory of teacher evaluation as presented by Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (1995) also provides the theoretical and supporting framework for this study. These researchers were essentially concerned with the theoretical model of the standards required for an ideal teacher evaluation. According to this model, teacher evaluation has specific standards and expectations to meet. If these standards are not perceived as being met, teachers may perceive the evaluation instrument as being ineffective. This perception may affect the morale of teachers and therefore affect the quality of teaching. Teacher evaluation plays a significant role in the quality of teaching and consequently on the quality of learning. Accordingly, a sound, dependable evaluation system is necessary to yield quality results (Haertel, 1994).

The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1988), in its book *The Personnel Evaluation Standards*, has proposed four basic tenets of a sound evaluation system: propriety, utility, feasibility, and accuracy. Incorporating these four standards into a teacher evaluation instrument will enhance its effectiveness and soundness and additionally minimize teachers' negative perceptions. These standards were researched, developed, and endorsed by the major professional organizations that represent the full range of professional educators in school districts, including the American Evaluation Association, the American Educational Research Association, the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association, the American Association of School Boards Association, the American Association of School Administration, and the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
The essential attributes of the first principle, the propriety standard, for teacher evaluation are ethics and fairness (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 1995). Its purpose is to protect the rights of all stakeholders affected by the evaluation system: students, teachers, administrators, evaluators, and parents. Propriety is one of the principles that is often neglected in teacher evaluation (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1994). To address this violation, teacher evaluation should focus on the fundamental business of education, which is to serve students. This basic tenet will undoubtedly apply to this study and influence the perception of teachers in this study.

The utility standard, the second principle, is intended to make evaluations informative, timely, and influential (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 1995). It specifically addresses the provision of worthwhile information to teachers in regard to improving their performance. The utility standard also requires that evaluation concentrate on predetermined uses, which includes promotion, decisions, timely and relevant feedback from evaluation, and plans for staff development. The purpose of the utility standard is to motivate and encourage teachers toward delivering service of a high caliber. Elements of the utility standard applied to this study are: content of evaluation, and promotion decisions.

The third principle, the feasibility standard, is succinctly described in two words: limited resources. Various forces such as social, political, and government forces affect these resources. Accordingly, the feasibility standards require evaluation systems to be easy to use, not disruptive of the teaching/learning process, adequately funded, and politically viable (Stufflebeam, 1988). These factors played a pertinent role in teachers'
perception in this study.

The fourth and last principle, the accuracy standard, is grounded on dependable information concerning teachers' qualification and/or performance. This standard requires that the obtained information be job related, technically defensible, and appropriately interpreted (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 1995). When aligned against the accuracy standard, the validity of personnel evaluation can be measured. All of the elements in the accuracy standard had an impact on the perceptions of teachers in this study.

Stufflebeam and Shinkfield's (1995) theory provides a relevant framework for this study as they sought to explain the ingredients of propriety, utility, feasibility, and accuracy that make up the basic tenets of a sound, effective evaluation instrument. This study in essence seeks to establish whether there are differences in the degree of satisfaction of teachers based on their status and teaching level on the CPS and the general evaluation information on teacher effectiveness.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms are defined as used in this study:

*Career Ladder/Career Pathway:* Jobs that make up a line of progression from an entry level to a targeted position (Roberts, 1986).

*Domain:* A broad area for which criteria and standards are specified for assessing performances in that domain (Wheeler, Haertel, & Scriven, 1993).

*Teacher Evaluation Status:* Represents the two categories teachers find themselves in—evaluated teachers and non-evaluated teachers.

*Teacher Level:* Represents the two categories teachers find themselves in—
elementary and secondary.

**Delimitations**

The population of interest in this study was public school teachers in the Bahamas. At the time the study was conducted there were 2,300 teachers in the Bahamas. Generalizations to programs other than career ladders/system outside the Bahamas should be made with caution. Three hundred teachers were randomly selected for inclusion in this study. Generalization should be limited to teachers at the elementary and secondary levels with an evaluated and non-evaluated status.

This study focused on the perceptions of teachers concerning their evaluation instrument, the Career Path System. The concerns of this study focused on the differences in the level of satisfaction of teachers based on their evaluation status and teaching level on the CPS on teacher effectiveness and the general evaluation information. This research was limited to the collection of data using a paper-and-pencil survey questionnaire, and was dependent upon participants’ willingness and ability to respond accurately.

**Organization of the Study**

This study is organized into five chapters followed by an appendix and a bibliography.

Chapter 1 includes the following topics: (a) an introduction which looks at the importance and pervasiveness of teacher evaluation in education, (b) validation of teacher evaluation system, (c) systemic communication, (d) evaluation climate, (e) personnel evaluation standards, (f) historical view of the development of career ladders, (g)
statement of the problem, (h) purpose of the study, (i) related questions and related hypotheses, (j) significance of the study, (k) theoretical framework, (l) definition of terms, (m) scope and delimitations of the study, and (n) organization of the study.

Chapter 2 surveys selected literature relevant to this study pertaining to the perception of Bahamian teachers towards their evaluation instrument, the Career Path Instrument. The following topics were focused on: (a) purpose of teacher assessment, (b) career ladder, (c) teacher perceptions toward the evaluation instrument and process, (d) administrators' attitudes towards teacher evaluation, (e) inconsistent agenda, (f) perceptions of teachers' effectiveness, (g) essentials of evaluation instruments, (h) an overview of summative evaluation models, and (h) a summary of the literature.

Chapter 3 discusses the methodology utilized in this study. A description of the research design, population, and sample is presented. In addition, the instrumentation, data collection, research questions, statistical methodology, and summary are discussed.

Chapter 4 of this study contains a presentation and analysis of the data and an interpretation of the results.

Chapter 5 is a discussion of the results and also provides further recommendation for research in this area.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Teacher selection, teacher retention, supervisory activities, tenure considerations, dismissal, and promotion are integrally linked to evaluation. According to the National Education Association (2006), nationally, up to 50% of new teachers leave within the first 5 years, and teaching continues to face the dilemma of how to attract new recruits from competitive colleges. Consequently, Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (1995) suggested that there is strong reason for research to continue in teacher evaluation because it is an emerging area of national interest and need.

The following topics will frame this review of related literature: (a) Purpose of Teacher Assessment, (b) Career Ladders, (c) Teachers’ Perceptions Towards Evaluation Instruments and Processes, (d) Inconsistent Agenda, (e) Perceptions of Teacher Effectiveness, (f) An Overview of Summative Evaluation Models, and (g) The Summary.

Purpose of Teacher Assessment

As stated by Nevo (1994), teacher assessment is part of the life of being a teacher from the moment the teacher enters into the profession. Teachers are assessed as part of their training, their certification, their employment, and their professional development.
According to Campbell (2004) evaluation is like learning, a continuous process which enhances job performance. It ensures that each teacher is aware of the standards and expectations of the educational institution; and it can be utilized to foster the factors which contribute to effective teaching. Consequently, the teacher’s job can become more satisfying and rewarding.

Scriven (1991) classifies the purpose of the assessment into two types: formative and summative. Formative assessment is for the purpose of improving performance and professional growth. Summative assessment is for the purpose of making employment decisions such as hiring or termination.

According to Lunenburg (1995), there are several reasons to evaluate the performance of school employees:

First, the school needs evidence to justify the selection techniques used in hiring personnel. Second, performance appraisal provides input for determining both individual and organizational training and development needs and later gauges whether these have been effective. Third, it serves as the basis for making decisions about salary and merit increases, promotions, transfers, or terminations. Finally it is used as a means of communicating to employees how they are performing and suggesting needed changes in behavior, attitudes, skills, or knowledge. (p. 207)

Dwyer and Stufflebeam (1996) identify four basic roles or purposes for teacher assessment: (a) providing direction for the education of prospective teachers (preparation); (b) providing evidence needed to confer a state licensee or teaching certificate on qualified teachers (certification), (c) providing a basis for selecting, assigning, supervising, or rewarding teachers (practice); and (d) providing feedback to help focus professional growth, development, and advancement (professional development). Iwanicki (1990) cites accountability, professional growth, school improvement, and selection as the fundamental purposes of teacher assessment.
Danielson and McGreal (2000) emphasize that evaluation is not important but a necessity, and that evaluation systems designed to support teacher growth and development through an emphasis on formative evaluation techniques produced higher levels of satisfaction and more thoughtful and reflective practice while simultaneously satisfying the accountability demand. According to Campbell (2004), in context of the Bahamas, evaluations have generally been inefficient and subjective. He suggests that the Bahamian evaluation system needs to be clear, concise, comprehensible, attainable, nationalized, and properly supervised.

**Career Ladder**

Career ladder is one of the multiple approaches to teacher compensation. It created different levels of achievement for teachers. Upward mobility on the career ladder included evaluation of classroom performance, graduate or postgraduate education, taking on additional professional responsibilities, student progress, and peer or administrator evaluations.

According to the National Association of State Boards of Education (2002a), there are three kinds of career ladder programs: performance based, job enlargement, and professional development. Performance-based ladders advance teachers as they exhibit increasing levels of proficiency such as novice teacher, regular teacher, and master teacher. Job-enlargement ladders provide teachers with the opportunity for additional responsibilities apart from the classroom such as supervising or mentoring new teachers. Professional development ladders compensate teachers for advanced degrees, or National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) certification. Career ladders originated for the purpose of addressing the horizontal career structure of teachers and to
create the chance for advancement (National Association of State Boards of Education, 2002a; Odden & Kelley, 2002).

There is some evidence that career ladders have a positive effect on student achievement. The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) in its 20 years of monitoring career ladders statewide has indicated increased student achievement and lower dropout rates, and a renewed sense of shared leadership among lead teachers and school building (National Association of State Boards of Education, 2002b; Odden & Kelley, 2002). In addition, a comparative study between Arizona districts with career ladder programs and districts without career ladder programs revealed similar results as SREB—lower dropout rate, higher graduation rate, and higher scores on state achievement assessment. However, according to the Educators Standards Board and the Ohio Department of Education, due to internal and external variables beyond teachers’ control, student achievement gain cannot be directly link to the career ladder program (The Educator Standards Board & The Ohio Department of Education, 2006).

Career ladders in the 1980s from it inception became a controversial issue. The primary reason was the fairness between evaluation and rewards. The evolution of career ladders crystallized this concept very clearly that evaluations must be fair, must be perceived as fair, and must be understood by teachers and others to be fair (Cornett & Gaines, 2002). The financial constraint of the program also became increasingly restrictive as it progressed into the second and third years. Even though budget issues emerged as a deterrent, the perceived fairness of career ladders based on evaluations was the fundamental reason for many states exploring other alternative incentive programs.

Career ladders have some degree of effectiveness, but its sustainability level is
low. The Southern Regional Education Board reported the beneficial effects to include increased student achievement, lower dropout rates, and increased graduation rates (National Association of State Boards of Education, 2002b). However, many career ladders were short-lived due to changes in or lack of funding, ineffective evaluation systems, lack of support among teachers, disagreement about what objectives should be used, and distrust for the system and evaluators (Clotfelter, 1996; Cornett & Gaines, 1994; Cramer, 1983; Murnane & Cohen, 1986; Odden & Kelley, 1997).

Currently, the following states have career ladder/level systems: Arizona, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Missouri, New York, Ohio, Tennessee, and Utah (Texas Education Agency, 1998). However, the state of Arizona has been recognized for its commitment and longevity to the career ladder program since 1984. The Arizona program has undergone several modifications: making participation voluntary, revising evaluation criteria, and alleviating some of the financial burden on the state by having the school districts share in the funding responsibility (Cornett & Gaines, 1994).

Teacher Perceptions Toward Teacher Evaluation

Research contains voluminous rhetoric concerning teacher attitudes towards the evaluation of their teaching. This attitude has an impact on the capacity of teachers to profit from the evaluation procedure. Kremer-Hayon (1993) put the onus on the teachers for being accountable for their attitude toward evaluation. Kremer-Hayon believed that a positive attitude toward evaluation can result in more benefits than a negative attitude. Taylor and Bogotch (1985) have a contention with this viewpoint, and argue that there is a direct relationship between teachers’ satisfaction with evaluation and evaluators’ level of consideration. According to Campbell (2004), Bahamian teachers view evaluation as a
bureaucratic process, with limited opportunity to contribute to professional advancement, student achievement, and school-wide effectiveness. Hence, teachers seem capable of displaying varying degrees of attitudes toward the evaluation system.

However, there is an array of positive reaction among some researchers towards teacher evaluation. Aderhold (2001) supports the view that an effective evaluation system is based on prompt feedback, utilizing formal and informal observations, inclusion of teachers' input, and relating specific information to teacher performance. Durecki-Elkins (1996) states that teachers are positive when they receive appraiser guidance, and even more so when allowed to participate in goal-setting. McCaffrey (2000) corroborates Durecki-Elkins's position that teachers become more accountable and enthusiastic when permitted to participate. In East Carolina, Colby's in-depth research of approximately 4,000 teachers found that teachers perceive that locally developed evaluation systems had a significant impact on school improvement, professional development, and student performance than districts utilizing a state-mandated system. According to Fred Smith (2001) teachers in general support an evaluation system and understand the importance of accountability in enhancing their profession.

The negative perspective of evaluation, as reported by Gage (1973), states that there are dilemmas in the evaluation system: first, teachers are willing to accept the principle of evaluation while simultaneously rejecting the methods employed by their school system; and second, the perception that the function of evaluation should lead to professional growth while on the other hand it afforded administrators an opportunity to be manipulative. Goldhammer, Anderson, and Krajewski (1980) were more specific in
their analysis of teacher evaluation. They report that teachers in general perceived
evaluation to be objectionable, an inherent part of the administration hierarchy, and a
threat.

In a national study, Bachus (1992) found that the evaluator was usually the
principal, who intermittently evaluated on criteria that were unaligned with teaching
activities and student achievement. Other researchers (Littleton & Littleton, 1988;
Watkins, 1995) found that the evaluation system is ineffective for improving classroom
instruction, and that teachers voiced their concern, frustration, and anxiety about the
evaluation process.

However, Kremer-Hayon’s (1993) belief that a teacher’s attitude can affect their
evaluation experience can be supported by an earlier study published in 1974. Zelanak
and Snider (1974) surveyed teachers in the state of California to examine teachers’
perceptions of the evaluation instrument and the process. A comparative method was
used on two groups of teachers who had different beliefs concerning the intentions of the
appraisal process. The first group of teachers believed that the goal of their appraisal was
for administrative purposes, while the second group believed that the aim of their
appraisal was for improving instruction. The results clearly demonstrated that teachers
who felt that the purpose of their evaluation was for improvement of instruction were in
favor of the procedure. However, a distinct difference in attitude existed with teachers
who felt that evaluation was for instructional purposes such as dismissal, promotion,
tenure, permanent record file, and had a negative attitude towards the evaluation process.
Consequently, teachers’ perceptions are important to the success of the evaluation
procedure.
The outcome of the Zelanak and Snider’s (1974) research is in general consensus with numerous other reports found in the literature documenting the inadequate and ineffective teacher evaluation practices (Darling-Hammond, Wise, & Pease, 1983; Frase & Streshly, 1994; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983; Scriven, 1981). Natriello et al. (1977), in a prominent 10-year literature review research on evaluation, demonstrated that teachers had little faith in the ability or reliability of evaluation instruments. By the early 1990s, there continued to exist strong consensus among researchers including Frase and Streshly (1994), Johnson (1993), and Scriven (1990) that teacher evaluation is inadequate and ineffective.

Administrators’ Attitudes Towards Teacher Evaluation

In many instances the primary evaluator of teachers is the principal. In theory, evaluators and teachers agree that the fundamental purpose for teacher evaluation is to improve instruction. Compared to teachers’ dubious perception of evaluation, principals appear to have a more positive perspective of the evaluation system. This viewpoint is represented by a teacher-oriented perspective aimed at improvement in the areas of teaching, curriculum, and the entire program (Goldhammer et al., 1980). According to Linn, Baker, and Dunbar (1990), North Carolina administrators were in favor of evaluation because it permitted them to differentiate between good and poor teaching practices. Glascock and Taylor (2001) suggest that the principal’s positive perception is linked to his position which enables the principal to have a more expansive view of the evaluation process, criteria, goals, and support systems. Littleton and Littleton (1988), however, found that there was a correlation towards being less positive compared to the growing number of years of experience utilizing the evaluation instrument.
Inconsistent Agenda

Three notable surveys in the 1960s and early 1970s demonstrated the dedication of school districts and teachers towards improvement of teacher quality. This was partly credited to public demand for accountability in education, which also was clearly revisited in the 21st century under the guise of President Bush's No Child Left Behind (Aderhold, 2001). The National Education Association, or NEA, in executing the first national survey in 1964, revealed that formal procedures in evaluation of teachers were followed by more than half of all school systems. This position was subsequently affirmed by Stemnock (1969) who discovered that 90% of schools surveyed nationally had formal appraisal procedures of teachers. In a repeat national survey by the National Education Association (1972), 55% of school systems had rewritten their teacher evaluation within a 3-year span.

The literature of this period clearly supported the stance of teachers as being accountable for their professional conduct. Stemnock's survey of 1969 indicated that 90% of teachers approve evaluation for professional accountability. However, teachers' support of accountability on professional grounds is in contrast with teachers' strong opposition to the method of accountability utilized by numerous school systems.

Since accountability engenders a sense of purpose and responsibility, it follows that the teacher evaluation process must have recognizable purposes. Three researches—Ingils (1970), Stemnock (1969), and National Educational Association (1972)—are in accord concerning the purposes of evaluation.

Ingils (1970) investigated teacher evaluation programs in 70 school districts encompassing 38 states. Three common features have emerged from the outcome of this
study:

1. To improve quality of instruction
2. To assist the teacher in areas that need improvement
3. To protect the competent teacher and eliminate the incompetent.

Stemnack's (1969) analysis of his data revealed that 93% of teachers support evaluation for the purpose of improving competency; 54% of respondents favored the purpose of evaluation for dismissal of incompetent teachers; while only 17% supported the evaluation process to determine advancement on the salary scale. The National Education Association (1972) investigation revealed that 94% of teachers approved that the evaluation should be used for teacher improvement and 82% of respondents thought that the evaluation should be used for the purpose of teacher dismissal.

However, according to Frase and Streshly (1994), ineffective evaluation methods, along with state and local fiat, such as union and administrative requirements, and contract language, often detract evaluators away from the evaluation's central focus—improving instruction. Additionally, the purpose of the evaluation is usually unaligned with the accompanying procedures (McGreal, 1982; Stiggins, 1996).

Consequently, teachers perceive evaluation as a bureaucratic obligation managed in a perfunctory fashion and offering minimal gesture toward improving teacher instruction (Frase & Streshly, 1994; Johnson, 1993; Poston & Manatt, 1992; Root & Overly, 1990). Teacher evaluation outcome is viewed merely for personnel decisions concerning tenure, salary increment, reappointment, or contract termination (Buttram & Wilson, 1987; Stufflebeam, 1988).

This incongruency and inconsistency of purposes and practices of teacher
evaluation have been extensively documented in reports, books, and researches that have made a clarion call for reforms (Andrews, 1985; Blumberg, 1980; Boyer, 1983; Brodinsky, 1984; Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986; Davis & Arnof, 1983; Goodlad, 1983; The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1988; Millman, 1981; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983; Peterson, 1983; Rhine, 1983; Soar, Medley, & Coker, 1983; Wikipedia, 2001b; Wise & Darling-Hamond, 1985). This ineffectiveness of educational institutions of carrying out personnel evaluation responsibilities is also reflected in numerous court cases (Andrews, 1985; Rood, 1977; Strike & Bull, 1981). Testimonies at public hearings are replete with charges and examples of invalid, unfair, superficial, and ineffective evaluation practices (Stufflebeam, 1988). Consequently, teachers and administrators often decry evaluation as being misdirected, subjective, biased, and closed to public scrutiny (Soar et al., 1983).

Campbell (2004) noted that ineffective evaluation systems and practices will eventually minimize dialogue, reinforce institutional hierarchies, and risk lowering morale among school professionals. Danielson and McGreal (2000) summarize this tension of effective teaching to a shift from behaviorist to a constructive view. This includes the cultural expectation that most teachers have of obtaining an outstanding evaluation; limited expertise of the administrator; and low level of trust between teacher and administrators, resulting in a culture of passivity and protection.

**Perceptions of Teachers’ Effectiveness**

The National Education Association (1972) investigation revealed that 94% of researchers have debated the definition of effective teaching for many years. Teacher
effectiveness has been understood as being composed of several different facets by various organizations. However, despite the varying perspectives, historically teacher effectiveness seems to be synonymous with the term teacher quality. Quality in this context connotes possessing sound principles, integrity, and intellectual acuity.

The Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession envisions an effective teacher as one who is a fully skilled professional who demonstrates purposefulness, flexibility, and consistency. These teachers anticipate and monitor situations in their classroom and schools and make appropriate plans and responses. They have an impact on their classroom, school, or district (The Educator Standards Board & The Ohio Department of Education, 2006).

Currently, teacher quality has evolved into a more structured approach specifically by two educational organizations: the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). Both organizations have developed a set of standards for the quality teacher: INTASC for new teachers, and NBPTS for the more experienced teacher. In addition to the above organizations, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) has likewise established its set of criteria for teacher quality to accredit teacher educational programs (National Research Council, 2001).

Despite their differences, the INTASC, NBPTS, and NCATE standards share similar themes. All three agree that teachers should:

1. Understand the process through which children learn and develop, and be committed to furthering students’ education.
2. Have deep knowledge of the subject they teach and be able to convey this knowledge to students in ways that engage student enquiry.
3. Manage and monitor students’ learning and reflect on teaching practices,
making any needed adjustments to keep all students engaged in the learning process.

4. Forge relationships with members of the broader educational community in order to foster students’ learning. (National Research Council, 2001, p. 13)

Goldhaber (2003) contends that most people are likely to agree with the broad teaching standards presented above, but there is considerable controversy about how teachers can achieve and demonstrate mastery of them. Furthermore, he is of the opinion that a teacher who is highly effective in one environment can be ineffective in another. Teachers are like plants in some respect, they thrive best when given the right conditions, sunshine or shade. Some teachers flourish best under a structured setting with definitive guidelines and accountability measurements, while others prosper in a less inflexible environment. Hence, Goldhaber concludes that highly effective teachers may have a range of attributes and skills, some different from one another.

Williams (2005) concurs with Goldhaber that, according to research, effective teaching involves multiple attributes and a combination of factors. He believes that emphasizing one or two characteristics, such as the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) focus on subject matter as the key definition for a highly qualified teacher, is a mistake. Williams’s list of multiple factors includes the following:

1. Know how to instruct and motivate.

2. Be able to manage and assess diverse students.

3. Have strong verbal ability.

4. Have sound subject matter knowledge.

5. Have knowledge of effective teaching methodology.

Williams (2005) believes that these researched attributes demonstrate the greatest promise of a qualified and effective teacher. Consequently, teacher training should
include all of the above factors.

Walberg and Paik (1997) in their research of effective educational practices outline 10 universal attributes utilized in formal schooling by effective teachers. Varied researchers substantiate the 10 universal attributes. Additional information from the CPS instrument shows its alignment with these universal attributes:

1. Parent Involvement: Graue, Weinstein, and Walberg (1983), Iverson and Walberg (1982), and Peng and Wright (1994) concur that the bond between parent and child is equated to the amount of time the parent spends with that child. Research has shown that children up to the age of 18 years have spent 92% of their time under the influence of their parents. Ninety-one percent of the comparisons between parents and teachers favored co-operative effort between these stakeholders as there are strong beneficial effects on learning. This attribute does not correspond with any of the domains within the CPS instrument.

2. Graded Homework: Paschel, Weinstein, and Walberg (1984), Stevenson, Lee, and Stigler (1986), and Walberg and Haertel (1997) support this attribute as one that positively increases academic achievement. Additional benefits are accrued if teachers grade the assignment, make comments for improvement, and discuss the problem and the solution individually with the class. This attribute corresponds with the domain, Record Keeping, within the CPS instrument.

3. Aligned Time on Task: Anderson and Walberg (1994), Walberg and Paik (1997), and Waxman and Walberg (1999) are in consensus that the more time on task, the more students learn. This represents one of the most consistent findings in educational research. The researchers also agree that it is important to know that for this process to be
effective, there should be alignment of learning activities with educational goals. The terms *curricular focus* and *systemic reform* are applicable to this concept, which links the three components of the curriculum: (a) goals, (b) materials and learning activities, and (c) assessment measurements. This attribute corresponds with the domains Teacher Planning, Teacher Observation, Classroom Management, Student Achievement, and Record Keeping within the CPS instrument.

4. Direct Teaching: Brophy and Good (1986), Gage and Needles (1989), Wang, Haertel, and Walberg (1993), and Waxman and Walberg (1999) agree that the key features in direct teaching are: (a) the process and systematic sequencing of lessons, presentation of new content and skills, guided student practice, feedback and independent practice by students; and (b) traits of teachers—clarity, organization, enthusiasm, task oriented, and flexibility. These attributes correspond to the domains: Teacher Planning, Teacher Observation, Classroom Management, Student Achievement, and Record Keeping within the CPS instrument.

5. Advance Organizer: Ausubel (1968), along with Walberg and Haertel (1997), demonstrated that advance organizers enable students to have a ‘mental road map’ of what they have accomplished, where they are presently, and where they are going. This allows for continuity of subject matter and can be a motivating factor to students. This attribute corresponds to the domain Teacher Planning within the CPS instrument.

6. Teaching of Learning Strategies: Haller, Child, and Walberg (1988), as well as Walberg and Haertel (1997), have shown in their studies that students who develop a repertoire of learning strategies can yield positive effects. They suggested that three phases are involved in the teaching of learning strategies: (a) modeling—the teacher
exhibits the desired behavior; (b) the domain Teacher Observation within the CPS instrument.

7. Tutoring: Walberg and Haertel (1997) attest to the beneficial effects of tutoring. They especially noted that peer tutoring may yield in some cases the same results as teacher tutoring. One outstanding benefit of peer tutoring is that it promotes effective learning in both tutors and tutees. This attribute corresponds to the domain Teacher Observation within the CPS instrument.

8. Mastery Learning: Studies by Goldhaber and Anthony (2003) and Waxman and Walberg (1999) show that careful monitoring, sequencing, and control of the learning process increase the learning rate. Teachers must be prepared to implement the following in order for this venture to materialize: identify the components of instruction; develop individualized assessment strategies; and provide reinforcement and feedback. This attribute corresponds to the domains Teacher Planning, Teacher Observation, and Student Achievement within the CPS instrument.

9. Cooperative Learning: Studies by Goldhaber and Anthony (2003), Johnson and Johnson (1989), and Waxman and Walberg (1999) emphasized that learning is more effective when frequent exchanges take place between teachers and students, especially when targeted towards students’ problems and interests. It is recommended that attention be given to the following details in order to produce beneficial results: small groups of two or four be established; group accountability be assigned; a diverse group in strength and needs be utilized; and implement a variety of procedures. Additional benefits of small groups include developing group management skills, learning teamwork, learning the art of negotiation, and learning how to evaluate their individual and collective
activities with others. This attribute corresponds to the domain Teacher Observation within the CPS instrument.

10. Adaptive Education: Studies by Goldhaber and Anthony (2003), Walberg and Haertel (1997), Wang et al. (1993), and Waxman and Walberg (1999) suggest that adaptive education is a comprehensive approach that can be utilized for the entire school day rather than a single method. It includes but is not limited to tutoring, co-operative learning, and other diagnostic-prescriptive process. The achievement effects of the adaptive education program have been extremely beneficial as it focuses on individualized lesson planning and small groups. This attribute corresponds to the domain Teacher Observation of the CPS instrument.

Collectively the 10 attributes demonstrate both effective teaching and positive learning achievement for students under diverse settings. Table 1 shows a condensed version of the domains of the CPS instrument and its alignment with 9 out of 10 universal attributes of teacher effective practices.

**Essentials of Evaluation Instruments**

The Career Path System evaluation instrument represents the Bahamas Ministry of Education's interpretation of teacher effectiveness. These essential elements of the Career Path System evaluation instrument are condensed into five domains: Teacher Planning, Teacher Observation, Classroom Management, Student Achievement, and Record Keeping. The findings in the literature support these criteria.

**Teacher Planning**

Dunkleberger (1982) summarizes that good teaching begins with good planning.
During any class there should be evidence that the lesson has been adequately planned and appropriate methodology employed. The essential elements include a well-designed lesson plan, instructional objectives, content, activities, and assessment.

Table 1

*Comparison of Effective Teaching Practices With the CPS Domains*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Teacher Practices</th>
<th>CPS/Domains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Parent involvement</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Graded home work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Aligned time on task</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Direct teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Advance organizer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher learning strategies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tutoring</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mastery learning</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cooperative learning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Adaptive education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A lesson plan is described as a coherent unit of teaching and learning, generally designed to be completed in one class session, WIT 2003. The essence of lesson planning should be the synthesis of goals that are established as standards by which student learning can be measured (Dunkleberger, 1982). Students’ focal point can therefore be channeled towards the direction of instruction; and teachers can evaluate whether objectives have been met.
Instructional objectives specify the kind of behavior and the content or area in which the behavior operates. Good and Brophy (1987) articulated that teacher improvement is pertinent to instructional objectives being explicitly stated. This perspective enables the teacher to discern precisely what is to be achieved, and how to measure his accomplishments. Consequentially, effective teachers tend to be goal oriented (Stanley, 1991). Their expectations for students are calibrated towards mastery of specific objectives, and they meticulously plan and develop methodologies for students to obtain these goals.

Another dimension of lesson planning is time management and how to maximize the use of classroom time. Effective teachers prioritize their lesson content and spend most of the classroom time on academic activities. Their personalities reflect a "businesslike" approach to teaching.

Bain (2004) indicated in his research of over 60 effective teachers that what they share in common is creating a "natural critical environment." They cultivated an atmosphere where critical thinking about questions student found interesting and provocative were able to flourish. "Critical thinking" involves the following: decisions, defending choices, reasoning from evidence, and making recommendations—all reinforced by continuous feedback from the teacher. This entire strategy takes time, effort, and careful planning. Learning takes time and effort and there is no one teaching strategy that inspires this. The effective teacher must always communicate to the student that mastery and growth will likewise require effort and planning (Hargrove, 2005).

Teacher Observation

Teacher observation involves what a teacher does in the classroom. One of the

The model was created for teacher effectiveness rather than evaluation. Decisions are made concerning growth-evoking feedback, and pinpoints effective decisions, reinforces them, and states the principles undergirding them as well as inappropriate decisions, and offers productive alternatives (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 1995).

According to Hunter (1982) there are five common traits of effective teaching:

1. **Teach to an Objective.** Teaching to an objective links the components of the lesson with each other, eventually connecting to a major objective. A specific objective also encourages time management.

2. **The Objective Is the Correct Level of Difficulty.** Knowing your students is pertinent to adjusting the level of difficulty pertaining to content and language of the lesson. The teacher should be able to discern whether students have grasped the concept, and when to move on to the next objective of the lesson.

3. **Is There Monitoring and Adjustment?** An effective teacher will monitor, adjust, and fine-tune the level of the lesson until the appropriate level of difficulty has been achieved. This aspect of the lesson sometimes requires instant decision-making.

4. **The Teacher Applies the Principles of Learning.** The basic principles of learning are: motivation, rate and degree, retention and transfer. These essentials of
learning should be manifested throughout the lesson.

5. The Teacher Continues Professional Growth. A significant aspect of an effective teacher is adding to his repertoire of strategies, by learning from his mistakes. A professional person will cultivate an interest in improvement and seek constructive criticism.

Bain’s (2004) perspective of an effective teacher is to capture the interest of his students first, before beginning the lesson. This initiating exercise is often referred to as bell work, sponge activity, warm-up exercises, or set induction. Dunkleberger (1982) states that these activities facilitate a readiness or a jump start for the main lesson to follow.

Instructional objectives represent the second most important component of the lesson (Hunter, 1982). Dubelle’s (1986) research has demonstrated that students tend to achieve more in less time if they are aware of the objectives of the lesson. He concludes that instructional activities and classroom directions should include these objectives.

Sanders and Rivers (1998) concur with Hunter and Dubelle’s research. Their study revealed that students who were taught by effective teachers and followed specified instructional objectives over a period of 3 years scored up to 50 percentile points higher. Consequently, effective teachers adapting instructional objectives add value to student learning by helping students to achieve beyond their expectations (Lauer, Dean, Martin-Glen, & Asensio, 2005).

Classroom Management

Good and Brophy (1987) have indicated that classroom management is the most vital aspect of the classroom atmosphere. It is crucial to students’ time on task and
activities that are productive.

Dinsmore's (2003) in-depth study revealed that classroom management permeates and is affected by teacher preparation, presentation method used, and aspects of the classroom environment. The study strongly correlates teacher preparation with off-task behavior such as disruptions and other inappropriate conduct. It was observed that students were more on task when direct instruction began at the onset of the class and within a community setting. Soft lighting and music were the main factors that play a vital role in creating appealing classroom environment.

Good classroom management involves discipline. Dunkleberger (1982) suggests the following in relationship to discipline:

Students should be fully aware of teacher expectations and behavioral boundaries. Inappropriate conduct should be dealt with fairly, firmly, and in a fashion consistent with proper approaches to classroom management. Discipline should be understood to not consist solely of negative reinforcement and punishment. An essential in the promotion of good discipline management is the recognition and positive reinforcement of appropriate behavior. (p. 15)

According to Ellis (1989) effective teaching results in minimal behavioral problems. The American Association of School Administrators (1986) echoes similar sentiments that instruction and classroom management are inextricably linked. The report added that effective classroom managers pre-plan and organize in advance of the school year in order to get the school year off to a good start.

Student Achievement

Student achievement flourishes in an atmosphere of positive, nurturing classroom climate. Dunkleberger (1982) concludes that the overwhelming effect is that achievement gains are maximized. Bain (2004) endorses this concept as where students
encounter safe, yet challenging conditions in which they can try, fail, receive feedback, and try again without facing summative evaluation.

The common traits of student achievement include:

1. Students' responses demonstrate understanding of the concepts.
2. Students successfully complete classroom assignments.
3. Students' assignments are presented in a neat attractive fashion.
4. Students adhere to assignment deadlines.

**Record Keeping**

Effective teachers continuously monitor students' progress in a timely manner and keep accurate record of students' performance (Stanley, 1991). Record keeping has also expanded to student attendance, individualized educational plans, and any other classroom assignment. Dunkleberger (1982) contends that it is crucial that students be given frequent and prompt feedback, and that teachers appraise students of their progress prior to any type of summative evaluation.

According to Kim and Kellough (1995), each teaching unit should have provision made for checking teaching effectiveness and the extent to which students have learned during the course unit. Hunter (1982) recommends that beside extensive formal testing, other alternative strategies are signaled answers, choral or short written response, or samples of students' individual response.

Good and Brophy (1987) also recognized the importance of students evaluating their own work in order for them to become independent learners. Tursman's (1981) expanded view on this concept is that evaluation does not have to be in the form of letter
grades, but it should be fair and consistent and communicated to students what they can do to improve.

An Overview of Summative Evaluation Models

The two functions of evaluation are: (a) formative, in which information and decisions are reported for developmental purposes, and (b) summative, in which a judgment is rendered based on accumulated evidence about the merit or worth of a teacher for promotion, retention, or elimination (Stronge & Tucker, 2000). In this study, summative evaluation models are applicable due to the promotion of teachers. Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (1995) identified three models: the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), William Sanders’s Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System, and William Webster’s Value-Added and Product Measures approach for the Dallas Independent School District. Two common elements are inherent in these models—accountability and judgment.

The NBPTS intention in accountability is to make teachers professionally more responsible by offering nationally recognized qualification for the enhancement of education. William Sanders’s Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System differs somewhat in that the Department of Education is held accountable for teacher improvement, whereas the Dallas model had the District administrators and the District’s schools assume the responsibility for accountability (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 1995).

Judgments in all three methods are based on accumulated evidence about the degree stated needs are met (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 1995). These needs vary: (a) nationwide—as demonstrated by the National Board model, (b) statewide—represented by the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System model, and (c) district-wide—
depicted by the Dallas model.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

NBPTS (1991) is an independent, nonprofit, nonpartisan organization governed by a board of diverse directors. These members include classroom teachers, administrators, school board leaders, governors, state officials, higher education officials, teachers, union leaders, and business and community leaders (NBPTS, 2004).

The NBPTS primary object is to improve the quality of life for U.S. citizens by improving schools and student learning by strengthening teaching. This objective is achieved by “establishing high and rigorous standards for what teachers should know and be able to do, and to certify teachers who meet these standards” (p. iii). Another related goal is advocating educational reforms that improve student learning.

Germane to the success of the NBPTS is the principle that quality teachers are necessary for student learning. Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (1995) insightfully noted, “It has long been recognized, but not acted upon, that excellent teachers too often are unrewarded for the quality of their work” (p. 319). One result is the loss of many illustrious practitioners to the detriment of student learning and ultimately of society itself. In addition, it would seem that the expertise of fine teachers who remain is underutilized.

Other professions have elevated their status through national certification systems where high standards have always been a hallmark. However, such systems for teachers periodically have languished. The 1986 report of the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession in “A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century,” suggested the
formation of a National Board for Professional Standards. Hence in 1987 the NBPTS emerged, and ever since its advent there has been a groundswell of support demonstrated at all levels—local, state, and national—in recognizing the importance and pivotal role NBPTS's work plays in improving education (NBPTS, 2004, p. 2). The summative nature of the National Board is expressed in the previously mentioned primary objective through establishing rigorous standards for skilled teacher certification. The Board endeavors to identify and recognize teachers who enhance student learning while demonstrating high levels of "knowledge, skills, disposition and commitments," (NBPTS, 1989, pp. 13-31) through the following five teacher behaviors:

1. Teachers are committed to students and their learning
2. Teachers know the subjects they teach and know how to teach those subjects to students.
3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.
4. Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience.
5. Teachers are members of learning communities. (p. 13)

Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System

The Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS), created by Dr. William L. Sanders and associates, is a procedure of assessing the impact of the educational system, schools, and teachers on the gains students make over several years on norm-referenced achievement tests. TVAAS employs a mixed-model statistic, which provides unbiased measures of the influence of school systems, students, schools, and teachers on student academic progress. Ultimately, in the Tennessee model, the outcomes are used summatively for accountability purposes. However, Tennessee still uses the career ladder in addition to the Value-Added System, hence broadening the dimensions to teacher evaluation (Sanders & Horn, 1989).
Tennessee, like so many other states in the past decade, recognized the importance of improving educational opportunities for its students. Hence, the first wave of reform resulted in the Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1983 (CERA). A Career Ladder Program emerged as an outcome of CERA.

Simultaneous efforts independent of the Tennessee Department of Education, by two statisticians, Dr. William L. Sanders and Dr. Robert A. McLean, had begun to explore the possibility of using statistical mixed-model methodology to minimize existing impediments in the educational system. These problems included: missing student records, various modes of teaching, teachers changing assignments, transient students, regression to the mean, and the need to upgrade the evaluation system (Sanders & Horn, 1989). Sanders and McLean were eventually recommended by the governing educational bodies to be included in the Education Improvement Act, 1991.

TVAAS philosophical underpinning correlates with Ralph W. Tyler, a notable force involved with the development of modern evaluation. Tyler proposed that evaluation should be a process of comparison between stated objectives and actual outcomes (Sanders & Horn, 1989). In Tennessee, the link between objectives and outcomes is clearly and precisely expressed in The Master Plan for Tennessee Schools (Tennessee State Board of Education, 1992). There are eight objectives set forth in the master plan: early childhood education; primary and middle grades education; high-school education; technology; professional development and teacher education; accountability; school leadership and school-based decision making; and funding. The objective for the accountability component for Tennessee will have "assessment and management information systems that provide information on students, schools, and
school systems to improve learning and assist policy making” (Tennessee State Board of Education, 1992, p. 7).

Tyler's conception of evaluation is readily depicted in the Tennessee master plan. Evaluation is acknowledged as a vehicle for educational improvement, providing information and feedback that can be utilized to determine which practices result in desired outcome. Consequently, concentrating on the outcomes instead of the processes, educators have more autonomy to use additional methods to assist student academic progress. Astin (1982) affirms this position by stating that “the basic argument underlying the value-added approach is that true excellence resides in the ability of the school or college to affect its students favorably, to enhance their intellectual development, and to make a positive difference in their lives” (p. 14).

Dallas Value-Added and Product Measures of Schooling

Webster, Mendro, and Almaguer (1994) note that as pressures increase from many segments of society for better educational accountability, it is often accompanied by societal skepticism of educators and the quality of the job that they are perceived to be doing. Therefore, the Texas Education Agency, in addition to educational agencies in at least 40 other states, has initiated programs to increase their focus on educational outcome and accountability (Duttweiler & Ramos-Cancel, 1986; Southern Regional Education Board, 1990). In Dallas, a Commission for Educational Excellence (1991) was appointed for the comprehensive improvement of Dallas schools. This plan focused on accountability as the nexus for improvement with teacher effectiveness and other staff representing the unit of measurement. Dallas's summative nature is reflected in its
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accountability through criterion-referenced (analysis of outcomes) and norm-referenced (school effectiveness) methods (Webster et al., 1994).

The accountability system of the Dallas Independent School District (DISD) is a three-tier system. The first tier is the school level. Individual schools are held responsible and accountable for many aspects of their own operation. This goal is achieved through school improvement (SIP). The second tier applies to the school district and involves the District Improvement Plan (DIP). DIP constituted the expectancy level on district accountability and defines how Central Office Divisions assist the school. The third tier focuses on school effectiveness indices. These indices involve student background variables, which provide feedback on the effectiveness of schools with their student population (Webster et al., 1994). In summary, both SIP and DIP focus on the end product of the educational process, while the indices support the value-added section of the system.

One of the major concerns by educators related to the accountability systems is soundness and fairness of evaluation. The Dallas Value-Added Product Measures of Schooling incorporate this value as defined by the Standards for Evaluations of Educational Programs, Projects, and Materials. The Standards are focused around four central attributes: utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1981). Also included is the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, National Council on Measurements Used in Education, 1985).
This model represented a three-tier accountability system. School, district, and school effectiveness are operationalized through a specified improvement plan. Accountability is executed in a criterion-referenced manner through an analysis of absolute outcomes.

The advantages of this model are threefold. First, it provides an objective procedure for identifying an effective school. This engenders a sense of teamwork and collegiality among school staff. In this program schools are rewarded rather than individual teachers. Second, the locus of attention is on the outcomes of schooling. This encourages divergent groups to share their views related to the goals and objectives of schooling. Hence, improvement in the curriculum, the instruction, and the instructional delivery process is readily calibrated to impact the defined outcomes (Haertel, 1986). Third, an accountability system such as Dallas’s promotes equality of opportunity to all schools for award achievement. The focus is on student effectiveness. According to Webster, Mendro, and Almaguer (1993), the techniques reward those schools that impact the most students the most positively.

**Summary of Teacher Perceptions Toward Evaluation**

The purpose of teacher evaluation has a two-pronged approach: formative and summative. Formative is utilized for the improvement of performance and developmental purposes, while summative evaluation is designed to present conclusions about the merit or worth of a person’s performance such as employment decisions—hiring, termination, merit pay, or promotion (Scriven, 1991; Stufflebeam, 1988).

There are three summative teacher evaluation models presently recognized in the
United States in response to improving assessing teacher performance: The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), William Sanders's Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS), and William Webster's Value-Added and Product Measures approach for the Dallas Independent School District. Accountability is the common element that links these three models, and the fact that judgments are made on the basis of accumulated evidence about the degree to which stated needs are met (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 1995).

The main intentions of NBPTS are: (a) to establish high and vigorous standards for what teachers should know and be able to do and to certify teachers who meet these standards; (b) to advance other educational reforms for the purpose of improving student learning nationally and to restore public confidence in schools; (c) to recognize and reward the work of accomplished teachers and to increase the status of the teaching profession; and (d) to expand the flow of first-rate people into teaching, and to retain accomplished professionals (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1991).

The proponent of this model is the Board of Directors of NBPTS and their staff of 63 which is composed of educational administrators, teachers, school board leaders, union officials, state legislators, and business and community leaders. The beneficiaries of this model include a wide spectrum of people: teachers, students, schools, districts, and the school community.

An analysis of the NBPTS model evaluated against the Joint Committee's Standards revealed two main weaknesses as it relates to this study. First, the validity of outcomes is highly suspect, due to inefficiency in implementation and executing observation of teachers by credible evaluators; and second, the scope of the NBPTS task
is so vast that assurances that assessments will be executed consistently by persons with
the necessary qualifications and authority could be very difficult (Stufflebeam &
Shinkfield, 1995).

The main intentions of the TVAAS are: (a) to assess impact of educational
systems, schools and teachers on the learning gains students make yearly on norm-
referenced achievement tests; (b) to report individual teacher effects to teacher,
administrators, and school board members for accountability purposes; (c) to base teacher
assessments on 3-5 years of data; and (d) to employ statistical analyses that endeavor to
overcome traditional problems associated with using student achievement data in
educational assessment (Sanders & Horn, 1995).

Analysis of the weaknesses of this model evaluated against the Joint Committee
Standards indicates the following. First, cost effectiveness is workable only for large
districts or state departments; and second, teacher evaluation reports are accessible to
others who do not legitimately have a need to use the report (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield,
1995).

Finally, the Dallas Value-Added and Product Measures of Schooling’s main
intentions are: (a) to use performance outcomes and other variables as a basis for school
and teacher evaluation; (b) to operationalize accountability through criterion-referenced
and norm-referenced methods; and (c) to give financial rewards to schools and staffs
based on accountability measures (Webster et al., 1994).

Analysis of the weaknesses of this model evaluated against the Joint Committee
Standards reveals that: (a) implementation and maintenance is costly unless used in a
large school district; and (b) it is difficult to correlate summative reports with
accountability to individual teachers and their input into school tests and other results.

Table 2 lists some of the critical decisions made during a teacher’s career using the three different teacher summative evaluation models (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 1995).

Summary

The purpose of career ladders is to create an avenue whereby teachers are able to advance to different levels within their career. Career ladders became popular in the

Table 2

*Summative Models’ Response to Teacher's Career*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summative Model</th>
<th>NBPTS</th>
<th>TVAAS</th>
<th>Dallas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision Situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post tenure Retention</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit Pay or Similar Benefits</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion / Career Ladder</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Teaching Force</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessment and Self-Development</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1980s, and later declined because of budget restraints and limited positions within the career ladder program.

Leading proponents in teacher evaluation Poston and Manatt (1992) and Scriven (1990) indicate that teacher evaluation fails to improve practice. Given this routine, a
sense of myopic vision towards the purpose of evaluation is perpetuated along with a
dose of skepticism (Root & Overly, 1990). The results from ineffective and inadequate
evaluation usually breed anxiety, fear, rejection, and resentment from teachers (Root &
Overly, 1990). Hence, teachers often perceive the process and outcome of evaluation as
subjective, unreliable, and a vehicle to fulfill administrators’ expectations (McLaughlin,
1990). This scenario has a negative impact on the evaluation instrument. Teachers
perceived the assessment instrument as unsound and unreliable.

The assessment of effective teaching must begin with what has been identified as
effective teaching strategies (Nolin, Rowand, & Farris, 1994). The literature shows that
effective teachers: (a) prepared for effective instruction, (b) present instruction in an
organized manner, (c) assess and monitor student progress, (d) manage the classroom
effectively, and (e) create and maintain a positive learning environment. Many of these
indicators of teacher effectiveness will be compared to the performance items in the CPS
instrument to help establish its validity.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the population and sample, variables, research questions and related hypotheses, research design and methodology, instrumentation and reliability, and data analysis.

The purpose of this study was to explore the degree of satisfaction of public school teachers in the Bahamas regarding the effectiveness of their evaluation instrument, the Career Path System (CPS).

Population and Sample

The target population for this study was 2,300 public school teachers in the Bahamas. A list of 119 evaluated teachers was identified from the files of the Career Path Unit at the Bahamas Ministry of Education. The balance of teachers, 1,981, represented those who had not applied to be evaluated for promotion to senior or master teacher. Both groups of teachers, evaluated and non-evaluated teachers, included the two levels—elementary and secondary teachers.

A stratified random sample of 300 teachers was drawn. The sample was comprised of 135 elementary teachers; 165 secondary teachers, representing level of teachers; 53 evaluated teachers; and 247 non-evaluated teachers, representing status of teachers.
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Variables

Independent Variables
There are two independent variables in this study:
1. Level of teachers with two groups, elementary and secondary.
2. Status of teachers with two groups, evaluated and non-evaluated.

Dependent Variables
The dependent variables in this study are the five domains, the 46 performance items, and the six items composing the general evaluation information section:
1. Teacher Planning—8 performance items
2. Teacher Observation—22 performance items
3. Classroom Management—7 performance items
4. Student Achievement—6 performance items
5. Record Keeping—3 performance items

Research Questions andRelated Hypotheses
The five domains, 46 performance items, and the six items composing the general evaluation information section represented the dependent variables for this research; and the level of teachers and status of teachers represented the independent variables. There were five research questions, and 11 null hypotheses. Research question 4 corresponded with five null hypotheses and were tested by two-way ANOVA; and research question five corresponded with six null hypotheses which
were likewise tested by two-way ANOVA. The data for the 11 hypotheses were analyzed at the .05 level assigned to the region of rejection.

This study addressed the following questions and hypotheses:

Research Question 1: How do teachers as a group perceive each item on the CPS on teacher effectiveness?

Research Question 2: How do teachers as a group perceive each domain on the CPS on teacher effectiveness?

Research Question 3: How do teachers as a group perceive the CPS instrument as a whole on teacher effectiveness?

Research Question 4: Is there a significant teacher level by evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction of teachers on the CPS on teacher effectiveness?

This question was answered with the following research hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1: There is a two-way teacher level by status interaction on the Teacher Planning domain of the CPS on teacher effectiveness.

Hypothesis 2: There is a two-way teacher level by status interaction on the Teacher Observation domain of the CPS on teacher effectiveness.

Hypothesis 3: There is a two-way teacher level by status interaction on the Classroom Management domain of the CPS on teacher effectiveness.

Hypothesis 4: There is a two-way teacher level by status interaction on the Student Achievement domain of the CPS on teacher effectiveness.

Hypothesis 5: There is a two-way teacher level by status interaction on the Record Keeping domain of the CPS on teacher effectiveness.
Research Question 5: Is there a significant teacher level by evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction on the General Evaluation Information (GEI).

This question was answered with the following research hypotheses.

Hypothesis 6: There is a significant two-way teacher level by status interaction on the level of satisfaction on the CPS motivating teachers to remain in the teaching career.

Hypothesis 7: There is a significant two-way teacher level by status interaction on the level of satisfaction on the CPS consisting of sound assessment criteria.

Hypothesis 8: There is a significant two-way teacher level by status interaction on the level of satisfaction on the CPS being given adequate orientation.

Hypothesis 9: There is a significant two-way teacher level by status interaction on the level of satisfaction on the CPS providing for adequate financial incentives for teachers.

Hypothesis 10: There is a significant two-way teacher level by status interaction on the level of satisfaction on the CPS motivating other persons to enter the teaching profession.

Hypothesis 11: There is a significant two-way teacher level by status interaction on the level of satisfaction on the CPS being satisfactorily implemented into the school system.

Research Design and Methodology

This research design was both descriptive and explorative in nature. It utilized a three-page, quantitative survey instrument to measure the perceptions of the
degree of satisfaction of public school teachers towards their evaluation instrument, the Career Path System. *Encyclopedia Britannica* (2007) asserts that the purpose of descriptive statistics is to facilitate the presentation and interpretation of data. Rohrer (1990) amplified this explanation further by stating that this approach “may also be coupled with more powerful (explanatory or predictive) research methods” (p. 54).

The survey method was selected to allow me access to many more subjects than is possible through an interviewing process. According to Pinsonneault and Kraemer (1993), one distinct characteristic of a survey is that information generally collected about a faction or sample of a population can be used to generalize the findings within the population. Hence, a survey method was employed to allow for generalizing the findings from the sample of teachers in the target area to the population of teachers in the Bahamas. In addition, a survey method was employed because it was economical and enabled rapid collection of data.

I contacted the Ministry of Education requesting permission to conduct the research. This was followed by a selection of a facilitator from the Research Department of the College of the Bahamas to supervise the survey. The facilitator arranged for hand delivery to the school of each respondent an envelope containing a survey instrument with a cover letter.

The cover letter included a statement of confidentiality and the name of the contact person in the event of questions. Surveys had a two-color code for level of teachers—elementary and secondary; and a colored dot as a code for status of teachers—evaluated and non-evaluated.

To standardize the administration of the survey, written guidelines were...
provided and discussion was held to minimize bias with the facilitator and the assistant. The coding of the survey form so that no names appeared on the face of the questionnaire and providing individual envelopes helped to ensure that the confidentiality of each teacher was maintained.

Of the 300 questionnaires that were sent out, 247 were completed and returned, representing an 83% overall response rate. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for recording and analyzing the data.

**Instrumentation**

The research CPS instrument was divided into two sections: part 1 and part 2. Part 1 was taken verbatim from the Bahamian teachers CPS evaluation instrument; and part 2 was composed of six questions referred to as the General Evaluation Information (GEI).

In part 1 of the CPS research instrument the Bahamian teachers’ CPS evaluation instrument was used. It is an instrument developed by a team from the Career Unit of the Ministry of Education. The instrument was originally developed in 1997 by the Department of Education and the Bahamas Teacher Union of Teachers, and revised and modified in 1999 with reference from York City/County Public School System teacher appraisal instrument (Career Path Unit, 2000). This resulted in a more precise measuring tool with minimum overlapping or duplication (p. 34).

The instrument embraces all the major teaching behaviors with a rating scale divided into five. This study included verbatim the five domains with 46 performance items divided into five scales. The following five domains are listed below with the number of performance items in each domain.
The CPS research instrument also included a scale in a closed format. This approach allowed for rapid quantifiable data and unambiguous coding (Losh, 2004). The closed format consisted of a 5-point Likert scale that was modified for the purpose of this study: Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Neutral = 3, Agree = 4, and Strongly Agree = 5. However for the purpose of analysis of the data, the threshold of 4 and above represented satisfactory, and below 4 represented unsatisfactory.

In part 2 of the research instrument, the following six GEI statements were selected to validate teachers’ responses on part 1 of the CPS instrument:

1. The CPS motivates you to remain in the teaching career.
2. The CPS consists of sound assessment criteria.
3. Teachers are given adequate orientation for the CPS.
4. The CPS provides for adequate financial incentives to teachers.
5. Other persons will wish to enter the teaching profession as a result of the CPS.
6. The CPS has been satisfactorily implemented into the school system.

Fifty teachers were randomly selected for the purpose of selecting six factors that would validate the responses of the CPS instrument. The various factors in the
six statements represent the key motivators for teachers to function effectively within the five domains and 46 performance items of the CPS instrument. Consequently, if teachers are agreeable to the following factors of the GEI: (a) remaining in the teaching career because of the CPS; (b) recognizing the CPS as having sound assessment criteria; (c) teachers being given adequate orientation for the CPS; (d) receiving adequate incentive due to the CPS; (e) the CPS attracting others into the teaching profession; (f) the CPS being satisfactorily implemented into the school system, then teachers would correspondingly function effectively in the five domains and the 46 performance items of the research CPS instrument. The GEI therefore would validate the responses of teachers on part 1 of the CPS instrument.

The survey method employed a Likert-type scale to measure teachers’ perceptions on each item. Vogt (1999) asserts that Likert-type scales tend to be reliable and can accommodate multidimensional attitudes. Each scale had five intensities with assigned values of 1 to 5, with 1 representing strongly disagree, to 5, strongly agree.

Based on the alpha reliability output, the following results were obtained for the five domains and the CPS instrument on a whole as follows:

1. The performance items in Teacher Planning have a reliability of 0.90 to 0.92.

2. The performance items in Teacher Observation have a reliability of 0.96.

3. The performance items in Classroom Management have a reliability of 0.84 to 0.87.

4. The performance items in Student Achievement have a reliability of 0.89
5. The performance items in Record Keeping have a reliability of 0.85 to 0.91.

6. The CPS instrument as a whole has a reliability of 0.88.

Since a high inter-correlation exists among the performance items in each domain and the CPS instrument as a whole, this suggests a common construct of indicators of teacher effectiveness.

**Data Analysis**

The returned responses of the Public School Teachers’ Perception of The Career Path Evaluation Instrument in the Bahamas survey instrument were scored by the researcher. The survey instrument was designed with forced-choice items which facilitated the assignment of codes to the responses. Statistical analyses were performed using Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) software package.

Questions from the survey were categorized for analysis. The first section of the survey contained 46 performance items. These items were divided into five domains. The first domain, Teacher Planning, contained 8 performance items. The second domain, Classroom Observation, contained 22 performance items. The third domain, Classroom Management, contained 7 performance items. The fourth domain, Student Achievement, contained 6 performance items. The fifth domain, Record Keeping, contained 3 performance items. The second section of the survey, the General Evaluation Information section, contained 6 items.

The preceding items in section 1 of the survey instrument and their analysis satisfy Question 1: “How do teachers as a group perceive each item on the CPS on
teach effectiveness?"; Question 2: “How do teachers as a group perceive each
domain on the CPS on teacher effectiveness?"; and Question 3: “How do teachers as
a group perceive the CPS instrument as a whole on teacher effectiveness?” For
comparative purposes, descriptive statistics were utilized to calculate means, and
mean of means on both the performance items and the domains. Teachers’
perceptions with means from 4 and higher were considered satisfactory, and
perceptions below 4 as unsatisfactory.

Research question 4 was answered with five hypotheses, numbers 1 to 5.
These hypotheses were analyzed under the respective domains—teacher planning,
teacher observation, classroom management, student achievement, and record
keeping. A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized with an alpha level
of <.05 to determine statistical significance.

Research question 5 was answered with the 6 hypotheses, numbers 6 to 11.
These hypotheses were aligned with the 6 items in section II of the survey instrument
and were analyzed in relation to the 46 performance items in section I. A two-way
analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized with an alpha level of <.05 to determine
statistical significance.

Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to analyze the level of perceptions of
public school teachers in the Bahamas towards their evaluation instrument, the Career
Path System. The research population consists of two categories of teachers: (a) level
of teachers—high school and elementary school; and (b) status of teachers—
evaluated and non-evaluated teachers. Chapter 4 presents the results of the data
The methodology employed in this research study is descriptive and explorative in nature. The researcher used a quantitative survey instrument that was delivered to 300 public school teachers in the Bahamas. A total of 247 or 83% of the surveys were completed and returned. The data were analyzed utilizing descriptive statistics (means, and standard deviation), and two-way ANOVA.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter is divided into several sections. The first section presents a brief description of the purpose of the study, and a description of the procedures. This is followed by a description of the population and sample. The major section of the chapter deals with the research questions, testing of the hypotheses, and the item analysis.

Purpose

The primary purpose of this research was to measure Bahamian public school teachers' degree of satisfaction regarding the effectiveness of their evaluation instrument—the Career Path System. It is hoped that the findings from this study, while adding to the knowledge base in the field of education, will also shed some light on major changes in the Bahamas and their impact on teachers' careers.

Due to the fact that no study has been done on the CPS instrument, this research will be one of the significant contributions to enhance the degree of validity and integrity of the CPS instrument. Validity, according to Trochim (2006), is the best available approximation to the truth of a given proposition, inference, or conclusion.
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Hence, one of the highlights of this study is to facilitate the development of the CPS into a premium evaluation instrument.

Population and Sample

Teachers were stratified into two groups: (a) status of teachers—evaluated and non-evaluated; and (b) level of teachers—elementary and secondary. A sample of 300 teachers was randomly drawn from a population of 2,300 public school teachers. Survey packets were sent to all 300 teachers representing a cross section of level and type of teachers. Two hundred and forty-seven were completed and returned during the 16 weeks of data collection.

The proposed stratified random sample was comprised of 135 elementary teachers, 165 secondary teachers, representing levels of teachers; 53 evaluated teachers, and 247 non-evaluated teachers, representing status of teachers. The total proposed sample contained 300 teachers.

Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics for the actual stratified random sample by status and levels of teachers. The actual stratified random sample of 247 teachers represented the respondents for this study. This sample was composed of 135 elementary teachers, 112 secondary teachers representing level of teachers; 52 evaluated teachers, and 195 non-evaluated teachers representing status of teachers.

Procedure

Once permission to conduct the study had been secured from the relevant authorities, a package containing letters and the CPS instrument in envelopes was sent to the facilitator at the College of the Bahamas in Nassau, Bahamas. Each CPS instrument
was color coded to distinguish between elementary and high-school level of teachers and evaluated and non-evaluated status of teachers.

Enclosed in each envelope were the following documents: (a) a letter outlining that the information obtained would be held in strictest confidence, and (b) the research document, composed of two parts: part 1—containing the CPS instrument, and part 2—the general evaluation information section.

After the sample had been obtained, each respondent was hand delivered their envelope at their respective school. The envelope and contents were later collected from the respondents by the facilitator at a mutually convenient time.

Table 3

**Descriptive Statistics of Sample by Status and Level of Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Evaluated</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Testing the Questions and the Null Hypotheses**

The five domains, 46 performance items, and the six items composing the general evaluation information section represented the dependent variables for this research; and the level of teachers and status of teachers represented the independent variables. There were five research questions and 11 null hypotheses. Research question 4 corresponded
with 5 null hypotheses and was tested by two-way ANOVA; and research question 5 corresponded with 6 null hypotheses which were likewise tested by two-way ANOVA. The data for the 11 null hypotheses were analyzed at the .05 level assigned to the region of rejection.

However, the means for the performance items under each domain, and the domains respectively, have been ranked in a hierarchical pattern from high to low. This represents a change from the format as it appears in the CPS instrument. The statistical analysis of the five research questions and corresponding null hypotheses is presented below.

Research Question 1

Question 1: How do teachers as a group perceive each performance item on the CPS on teacher effectiveness?

The 46 performance items represented the definitive area in which teachers were evaluated. Tables 4 to 8 present the teacher rating of the 46 performance items by domains: teacher planning, teacher observation, classroom management, student achievement, and record keeping; wherein Table 9 presents the mean values of the tables previously mentioned. Table 10 presents the range of the means for the 46 performance items as 3.83 to 4.62 and the mean of means as 4.28.
### Table 4

*Teacher Planning and Performance Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Outlines clearly, well-sequenced main ideas, concepts relevant to stated objectives.</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Presents clear, precise, curriculum-based instructional objectives stated in behavioral terms.</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Presents clear, varied, well sequenced activities appropriate to achieving objectives.</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Matches objectives to learning and assessment strategies and student needs/interest at the appropriate level of difficulty.</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Indicates use of available human and material resources to achieve objectives.</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Identifies an appropriate culminating activity as well as the conclusion.</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Describes clearly the organization of students for activities.</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Provides for the use of relevant materials, supplies, and equipment.</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total mean scores 4.44
### Table 5

**Teacher Observation and Performance Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Presents the lesson using concepts and language meaningful to the students and ensures that assignments are clearly and appropriately set out.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Poses questions which are well-structured and clear in meaning.</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Asks appropriate level of questions to which students respond successfully.</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Ends the lesson appropriately.</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Presents current, accurate information in an organized manner and at the appropriate level of difficulty.</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Uses terminology appropriate to the discipline and the level being taught.</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Writes and speaks English at an acceptable level and uses dialect appropriately.</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Uses activities which support objectives and accommodate varied learning styles.</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Demonstrate safe and proficient use of supplies and equipment.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Uses well-made instructional materials to promote student learning.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Matches task to students’ ability.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Provides meaningful examples and demonstrations which tap students’ everyday experiences and prior knowledge.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Provides feedback on the correctness or incorrectness of in-class work to encourage student growth.</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Re-teach/reinforces skills and concepts using a variety of methods and strategies.</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Draws attention to key points and emphasizes difficult areas by various techniques such as highlighting, underscoring, and signals.</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Introduces the lesson.</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Affirms a correct response appropriately and discourages unison or choral answering.</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Gets students on task promptly at the beginning of each instructional activity and maintains a high level of time on tasks.</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Provides continuous feedback after an incorrect or no response by probing, repeating the question, giving clues, allowing wait time.</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Makes timely use of educational technology, learning centers and teaching aids.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Makes appropriately provision for homogenous/heterogeneous grouping, individual differences, peer coaching and cooperative learning.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Shares the learning objectives when appropriate.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total mean score</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

*Classroom Management and Performance Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Emphasizes positive behavior and treats all students in a fair and equitable manner.</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Monitors all students and uses verbal and nonverbal techniques to re-direct off-task learners.</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Provides a set of rules for acceptable behavior governing students’ oral participation and movement during different types of instructional activities.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Conducts the lesson at an appropriate pace.</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Organizes furniture and equipment to facilitate teaching/learning activities and maintains a classroom that is neat and clean.</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Maintains well-organized learning centers, mounts visual aids and a representative display of students’ work to encourage and promote learning.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Distributes time appropriately to each step of the lesson and makes transition between activities within the lesson efficiently/smoothly.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total mean scores 4.38

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Table 7

*Student Achievement and Performance Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Students' work is presented in a format that is neat, attractive and</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appropriate to the discipline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Students' responses demonstrate understanding of main ideas or</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>concepts taught in the lesson.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The majority of students were able to complete the assigned tasks</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with a high rate of success.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Students' maintain reasonable work standards and adhere to due</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dates for assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Students' work shows evidence of creativity, originality, and</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imagination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Students' work shows evidence of the use of investigative skills.</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total mean scores</strong></td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Record Keeping and Performance Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Maintains accurate records to document students’ performance, progress and attendance.</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Routinely checks written and other assignments to provide prompt feedback and to monitor student progress.</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Maintains up-to-date and neatly presented records of schemes of work, forecasts, and lesson plans.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total mean scores</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 2

Question 2: How do teachers as a group perceive each domain on the CPS on teacher effectiveness?

The five domains represent the five categories of the CPS instruments. The means were employed for testing the degree of satisfaction of teachers within the five domains. Table 9 presents the means of the domains; Table 10 presents the range of the domains. Teachers as a group rated the five domains between 4.06 – 4.44. All five domains were rated above 4, with 4.33 as the mean of the means.

Research Question 3

Question 3: How do teachers as a group perceive the CPS instrument as a whole on teacher effectiveness?
The mean of means shown in Table 10 present the rating of teachers’ perception of the CPS instrument in its entirety. The mean of means for the five domains was 4.33 and for the 46 performance items it was 4.28. Teachers perceive the CPS instrument on a whole as satisfactory.

Table 9

*Means of Domains*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Planning</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Observation</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Keeping</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

*Range and Mean of Means for CPS Performance Items and Domains*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46 Items</td>
<td>3.83 – 4.62</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Domains</td>
<td>4.06 – 4.44</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 4

Question 4: Is there a significant teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the CPS domains?
Null Hypothesis 1: There is no significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Teacher Planning domain.

The null hypothesis was retained ($F_{1, 239} = .641, p = .424$). There is no significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Teacher Planning domain. Also, there was no significant main effect for teacher level ($F_{1, 239} = 2.25, p = .135$) or teacher evaluation status ($F_{1, 239} = .129, p = .719$). Table 11 presents these results. This means that whether teachers were elementary or secondary, or were evaluated or not evaluated, there was no difference on their means on perceptions of the effectiveness of the Teacher Planning domain composing the CPS.

Null Hypothesis 2: There is no significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Teacher Observation domain.

The null hypothesis was retained ($F_{1, 239} = .936, p = .334$). There is no significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Teacher Observation domain of the CPS. Also, there was no significant main effect for teacher level ($F_{1, 239} = 1.98, p = .160$) or teacher evaluation status ($F_{1, 239} = .052, p = .820$). Table 12 presents these results. This means that whether teachers were elementary or secondary, or were evaluated or not evaluated, there was no difference on their means on the effectiveness of teacher observation composing the CPS.
Table 11

Two-way Anova Table of Teacher Level by Teacher Evaluation Status on Teacher Planning Domain of the CPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>2.252</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>5.749</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.749</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level * Status</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>106.252</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107.458</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null Hypothesis 3: There is no significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Classroom Management domain.

Table 12

Two-way Anova Table of Teacher Level by Teacher Evaluation Status on Teacher Observation Domain of the CPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>1.983</td>
<td>.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>2.220</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.220</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level * Status</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>101.854</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102.713</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The null hypothesis was retained ($F_{1,238} = 2.139, p = .145$). There is no significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Classroom Management domain of the CPS. Also, there was no significant main effect for teacher level ($F_{1,238} = 2.498, p = .115$) or teacher evaluation status ($F_{1,238} = .862, p = .354$). Table 13 presents these results. This means that whether teachers were elementary or secondary, or were evaluated or not evaluated, there was no difference on their means on the effectiveness of the Classroom Management domain composing the CPS.

Null Hypothesis 4: There is no significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Student Achievement domain.

Table 13

Two-way Anova Table of Teacher Level by Teacher Evaluation Status on Classroom Management Domain of the CPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>2.498</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td>.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level * Status</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>2.139</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>91.003</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92.274</td>
<td>241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The null hypothesis was retained ($F_{1,237} = .448, p = .446$). There is no significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction.
with the effectiveness of the Student Achievement domain of the CPS. Also, there was no significant main effect for teacher level ($F_{1, 237} = 1.904, p = .169$) or teacher evaluation status ($F_{1, 237} = 2.311, p = .130$). Table 14 presents these results. This means that whether teachers were elementary or secondary, or were evaluated or not evaluated, there was no difference on their means with level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Student Achievement domain composing the CPS.

Null Hypothesis 5: There is no significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Student Achievement domain composing the CPS.

Null Hypothesis 5: There is no significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Record Keeping domain.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>1.904</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>1.284</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.284</td>
<td>2.311</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level * Status</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>131.703</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133.670</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The null hypothesis was retained ($F_{1, 240} = .458, p = .499$). There is no significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Record Keeping domain of the CPS. Also, there was no significant main effect for teacher level ($F_{1, 240} = 1.078, p = .300$) or teacher evaluation
status ($F_{1, 240} = 1.120, p = .291$). Table 15 presents these results. This means that whether teachers were elementary or secondary, or were evaluated or not evaluated, there was no difference on their means on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Record Keeping domain composing the CPS.

**Research Question 5**

Question 5: Is there a significant teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction on the General Evaluation Information (GEI)?

Null hypothesis 6: There is no significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction on the CPS motivating teachers to remain in the teaching career.

Table 15

*Two-way Anova Table of Teacher Level by Teacher Evaluation Status on the Record Keeping Domain of the CPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>1.078</td>
<td>.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>1.120</td>
<td>.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level * Status</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>161.822</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163.063</td>
<td>243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The null hypothesis was retained ($F_{1, 1} = 1.007, p = .317$). There is no two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction on the CPS motivating teachers to remain in the teaching career. Also, there was no significant
main effect for teacher level \((F_{1,\,1} = .357, p = .551)\) or teacher evaluation status \((F_{1,\,1} = 3.800, p = .052)\). Table 16 presents these results. This means that whether teachers were elementary or secondary, or were evaluated or not evaluated, there was no difference on their means on the level of satisfaction of the CPS motivating teachers to remain in the teaching career.

Table 16

*Two-way Anova Table of Teacher Level by Teacher Evaluation Status on the GEI First Statement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>4.396</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.396</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level * Status</td>
<td>1.164</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.164</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>272.985</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2140.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null Hypothesis 7: There is no significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction of teachers on the CPS consisting of sound assessment criteria.

The null hypothesis was retained \((F_{1,\,236} = .435, p = .510)\). There is no significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction on the CPS consisting of sound assessment criteria. There was no significant main effect for teacher level \((F_{1,\,236} = 2.461, p = .118)\); however, there was a significant main effect for teacher evaluation status \((F_{1,\,236} = 10.928, p = .001)\). Table 17 presents these results.
This means that whether teachers were elementary or secondary made no difference on their means on the CPS consisting of sound assessment criteria; but it did make a difference between teachers who were evaluated or not evaluated that the CPS consists of sound assessment criteria (evaluated = 3.45; not evaluated = 4.01). Table 18 presents these results.

Table 17

Two-way Anova Table of Teacher Level by Teacher Evaluation Status on the GEI Second Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>2.648</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.648</td>
<td>2.461</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>11.759</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.759</td>
<td>10.928</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level * Status</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>253.946</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1.076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3320.000</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18

Means and Standard Deviation Table for Teacher Evaluation Status—Evaluated and Not Evaluated Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated</td>
<td>4.011</td>
<td>1.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td>3.449</td>
<td>1.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.449</td>
<td>1.057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null Hypothesis 8: There is no significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction on the CPS being given adequate
orientation.

The null hypothesis was retained ($F_{1,236} = .114, p = .736$). There is no significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction on the CPS being given adequate orientation. Also, there was no significant main effect for teacher level ($F_{1,236} = .448, p = .504$) or status ($F_{1,236} = 1.965, p = .162$). Table 19 presents these results. This means that whether teachers were elementary or secondary, or were evaluated or not evaluated, there was no difference on their means on the CPS being given adequate orientation.

Table 19

*Two-way Anova Table on Teacher Level by Teacher Evaluation Status on the GEI Third Statement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>2.232</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.232</td>
<td>1.965</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level * Status</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>268.057</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2066.000</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null Hypothesis 9: There is no significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction of the CPS providing for adequate financial incentives for teachers.

The null hypothesis was retained ($F_{1,236} = .352, p = .553$). There is no significant two-way interaction on the level of satisfaction of the CPS providing for adequate orientation.
financial incentives for teachers. Also, there was no significant main effect for teacher level \((F_{1,236} = .652, p = .420)\) or status \((F_{1,236} = .627, p = .429)\). Table 20 presents these results. This means that whether teachers were elementary or secondary, or were evaluated or not evaluated, there was no difference on their means on the CPS providing for adequate financial incentives for teachers.

Table 20

*Two-way Anova Table on Teacher Level by Teacher Evaluation Status on the GEI Fourth Statement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level * Status</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>347.693</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1.473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2276.000</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null Hypothesis 10: There is no significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction of the CPS motivating other persons to enter the teaching field.

The null hypothesis was retained \((F_{1,236} = .330, p = .566)\). There is no significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction of the CPS motivating other persons to enter the teaching field. Also, there was no significant main effect for teacher level \((F_{1,236} = 1.020, p = .313)\) or status \((F_{1,236} = .457, p = .500)\). Table 21 presents these results. This means that whether teachers were
elementary or secondary, or were evaluated or not evaluated, there was no difference on their means on the CPS motivating other persons to enter the teaching field.

Table 21

Two-way Anova Table on Teacher Level by Teacher Evaluation Status on the GEI Fifth Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>1.235</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.235</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td>.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level * Status</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>285.587</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1.210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1830.000</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null Hypothesis 11: There is no significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction on the CPS being satisfactorily implemented into the school system.

The null hypothesis was retained ($F_{1,236} = .001, p = .971$). There is no significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction of teachers based on the CPS being satisfactorily implemented into the school system. Also, there was no significant main effect for teacher level ($F_{1,236} = .365, p = .547$) or status ($F_{1,236} = 1.444, p = .231$). Table 22 presents these results. This means that whether teachers were elementary or secondary, or were evaluated or not evaluated, there was no difference on their means on the CPS being satisfactorily implemented into the school system.
Table 22

Two-way Anova Table on Teacher Level by Teacher Evaluation Status on the GEI Sixth Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>1.699</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.699</td>
<td>1.444</td>
<td>.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level * Status</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>272.832</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1.156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1643.000</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

The results of this study were presented according to the scales or sections of the instrument used for data collection. The methodology employed in this research study is descriptive and explorative in nature. I used a quantitative survey instrument that was delivered to 300 public school teachers in the Bahamas. A total of 247 or 83% of the surveys were completed and returned. Statistical analysis was conducted with the use of two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and mean of scores. The tables of means and the two-way ANOVA graphically illustrated the data for each of the five domains, the 46 performance items, and the six statements on the General Evaluation Information section.

There were five research questions and 11 null hypotheses. Research questions 1, 2, and 3 were tested by utilizing the means; and research questions 4 and 5 corresponded with the 11 null hypotheses, which were tested by two-way ANOVA. The data for the null hypotheses were analyzed at the .05 level assigned to the region of rejection.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 5 presents a summary of the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, significance of the study, review of the literature, and the research methodology. The results are presented with conclusions regarding the findings of Bahamian public school teachers. Finally, recommendations for further studies are offered.

According to Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (1995), evaluation of educators is of national importance to a country; therefore the perceptions of teachers as major stakeholders towards their evaluation instrument are of vital significance. Evaluation and the evaluation instrument permeate a teacher’s career from its inception to the end: hiring, tenure, promotion, instructional purposes, discipline, reward, and dismissal. Career ladders represent one of the multiple approaches created to promote teachers to different levels of achievement for the purpose of attracting, motivating, and retaining teachers. Consequently, the evaluation instrument and evaluation process play an integral role in the Career Path System (CPS).

The Ministry of Education implemented the Career Path System in the Bahamas in 1999. The Career Path system is synonymous with the term career ladders in the
United States. The steps in the CPS represented a three-tiered system: junior rank or certified teacher II, senior teacher, and master teacher.

Historically, incentives for Bahamians were relegated to a single scale regardless of job demands and performance. Compared to administrators who were rewarded for their performance and position, teachers’ career mobility and financial rewards were limited. Consequently, the CPS represented an avenue whereby teachers were encouraged to remain in the classroom and be adequately compensated based on merit for their services.

However, from its inception the CPS generated questionable levels of perception among teachers pertaining to the evaluation instrument, assessment practices, preferential selection of candidates, quality of evaluators, and lack of teacher input. Therefore, this study empirically explored the issue of teachers’ perceptions toward the contents of the CPS evaluation instrument.

**Statement of the Problem and the Purpose of the Study**

To date no significant study on the perception of Bahamian teachers toward their evaluation instrument of Career Ladders or Career Path System has been done. Therefore, the primary purpose of this study was to determine whether there was a significant difference in perception between teacher level—primary or elementary teachers, and teacher status—evaluated or non-evaluated teachers on the effectiveness of the CPS instrument.
Significance of the Study

This study is important in that it was the first substantial research on the perceptions of Bahamian teachers towards their evaluation instrument, the Career Path System, to be carried out in the Bahamas. An analysis of the evaluation instrument of the Career Path System as perceived by Bahamian teachers will provide valuable insight to policy makers, administrators, and teachers in various ways.

The results of this study could be beneficial to policy makers as a basis for modifying, upgrading, and identifying strengths and weaknesses of the Career Path System instrument. A greater understanding of teachers’ perceptions could help to eliminate ambiguity and stress that arise due to misconceptions of teachers toward the Career Path System instrument and its objective. It is hoped that the results of this study could place more awareness on the perceptions of teachers and thereby enhance the goals of the Career Path System in the Bahamas.

This study may be useful to evaluators in that it could give them greater insight into the perceptions of how teachers view the Career Path System evaluation instrument. Consequently, this study could offer opportunities for better communication between the policy makers, evaluators, administrators, and other stakeholders.

Overview of the Literature

The literature review focused on career ladders, teachers’ perception toward the evaluation instrument, and an overview of summative evaluation models. Career ladders represented one of multiple approaches to teacher compensation. It created a vertical mobility on the career ladder for teachers to include positions of regular, junior, and
senior teachers. Odden and Kelley (2002) affirmed that career ladders originated for the purpose of addressing the horizontal career structure of teachers and to create the opportunity for advancement.

The concept of career ladders did not evolve without controversial debate. The primary issue centered on the fairness of the evaluation and the rewards. Cornett and Gaines (2002) emphasized that evaluations and evaluation instruments must be fair, must be perceived to be fair, and must be understood by teachers and others to be fair. It was also recognized that the rewards or financial aspect of the program became increasingly restrictive as it progressed into the second and third years. These two impediments emerged as the major reasons for the low sustainability level of career ladders in various states.

Despite the lack of longevity of career ladder programs, Southern Regional Education Board reported that the beneficial effects included increased student achievement, lower dropout rates, and increased graduation rates (National Association of State Boards of Education, 2002b). Currently the following states continue to have career ladders: Arizona, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Missouri, New York, Ohio, Tennessee, and Utah (Arizona Department of Education, 1998). The Arizona program is reputed for its commitment and longevity to the career ladder program since 1984. This program has undergone several modifications: participation is voluntary, revision of evaluation instrument, and sharing of the financial burden between the state and the district (Arizona Department of Education, 1998).

Teachers’ perceptions and attitudes towards evaluation instruments and processes such as those used for career ladders have been researched meticulously. Literature
investigation revealed two pertinent perceptions that teachers wrestled with. First, the perception that while the principle of evaluation appeared to be acceptable, the methods employed to arrive at the objectives were rejected. Second, the perception was that the outcome of evaluation should lead to professional growth, while it afforded an opportunity for administrators to be manipulative. Consequently, evaluation for many teachers represents a dichotomy of what should be good, sound, and professional, compared to a functionally deceitful, weak, and unprofessional entity (Gage, 1973). The impact of this dilemma for teachers translates into one of suspicion towards the evaluation instrument and process. Teachers value that their perceptions were being acknowledged and recognized.

Zelanak and Snider (1974) demonstrated in their research the importance of recognizing teachers’ perceptions. A comparative method was used on two groups of teachers who had different beliefs concerning the intentions of the evaluation instrument. The first group of teachers believed that the purpose of their evaluation instrument was for administrative matters, while the second group believed that the aim of their appraisal was for improving instruction. The results indicated that teachers who felt that the purpose of their evaluation was for improvement of instruction were in favor of the evaluation instrument and its purpose for improvement of instruction. However, a distinct negative attitude existed among teachers who perceived that the evaluation instrument and its utilization were for the purpose of dismissal, promotion, tenure, or permanent record file.
The outcome of Zelanak and Snider’s (1974) research is in general agreement with numerous other reports found in the literature documenting the inadequate and ineffective teacher evaluation instrument and practices (Darling-Hammond et al., 1983; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983; Scriven, 1981). Improved communication about teachers’ perceptions towards their evaluation instrument with members of the evaluation team may enhance the effectiveness and soundness of the instrument.

**Methodology**

This research study was descriptive and explorative in nature utilizing a quantitative survey instrument consisting of: (a) the CPS evaluation instrument and (b) the six general evaluation questions, to measure the perceptions of teachers. Statistical analysis was performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

A stratified random sample of 300 teachers was selected from 2,300 teachers in the Bahamas. The teachers were randomly selected from level (elementary and secondary teachers) and status (evaluated and non-evaluated teachers). Two hundred and forty-seven teachers responded to the survey, which represented a response rate of 84%.

Teachers were categorized in two ways: (a) level—high and elementary school teachers and (b) status—evaluated and non-evaluated teachers. The data were analyzed utilizing descriptive statistics (means and standard deviation) and two-way ANOVA.
Results and Discussion

Research Question 1

Research question 1 asked: How do teachers as a group perceive each item on the CPS on teacher effectiveness?

The results indicated that out of the 46 performance items constituting the CPS instrument, 44 of the performance items show a means above 4.00 and 2 of the performance items were below 4. The threshold mean in this study was 4. Hence, the results indicate that all teachers—both high school and elementary, and evaluated and non-evaluated—tend to be satisfied with 44 out of the 46 performance items, or approximately 96% of the CPS instrument. However, there were two performance items under the domain Student Achievement, which teachers perceived as neutral: (a) students' work shows evidence of creativity, originality, and imagination, and (b) students' work shows evidence of the use of investigative skills.

According to Jackson (2005) several important problems arise in any attempt to assess student creativity, originality, imagination, and investigative skill. First, the evaluator needs to have a clear definition of the criteria against which they will make a judgment. To be acceptable this criteria would demand validity and reliability as in any other form of assessment. Second, the above traits by it inherent nature may result in unpredicted outcomes and performances not included in the initial drafted criteria. Third, evaluation may easily evolve into a personal and subjective process, reflecting cultural biases and personal tastes of the evaluator. Fourth, the above traits involve students taking risks, yet assessment against explicit set of criteria reduces risk taking, hampering the student from working outside the criteria.
Therefore, teachers apparently are hesitant to include creativity, originality, imagination, and investigative skills of students as a part of teacher effectiveness unless there exists a more definitive and measurable criteria. The present format seems to be open-ended, and left to subjective interpretation of the evaluator; hence, teachers' inclination of disinterest toward the above two performance items.

Research Question 2

Research question 2 asked: How do teachers as a group perceive each domain on the CPS on teacher effectiveness?

The results of the means revealed that all five domains of the CPS instrument were rated above 4 on a 5-point scale. Teachers as a group rated the five domains between 4.06 – 4.44.

The overall results of research question 2 indicated that teachers perceived the five domains utilized in the CPS evaluation instrument as satisfactory irrespective of level or status. However irrespective of level or status there is an “approximate” order of preferences of the five domains from most satisfactory to least satisfactory as follows:

1. Teacher Planning and Record Keeping
2. Teacher Observation
3. Classroom Management
4. Student Achievement.

Of the five domains, four domains—Teacher Planning, Record Keeping, Teacher Observation, and Classroom Management—tended to focus on the teacher. The domain Student Achievement, which was student centered, was the least satisfactory as a valid measure of teacher effectiveness. An explanation for this might be that teachers view
their role as one that is supervisory in nature—planning, recording, and supervising students in the classroom, rather than student centered. In addition, as mentioned previously in question 1, teachers perceived two performance items as neutral due to not having direct control over student creativity, originality, and imagination.

Stronge (1997) suggests that evaluation instruments overemphasize the teacher and teaching, and that more focus should be on student achievement. He supports the view of integrated multiple methodologies in an assessment, and accommodation of current theories in cognitive learning in a creative manner to enrich classroom-based assessment. Stronge summarizes his position by stating that “the focus of our work in classroom shifts from assessing and evaluating sets of prescriptive teaching behaviors and the teacher to a primary concern for student learning” (p. 116).

Wiles and Lovell (1975) support Stronge’s stance that the central focus of an evaluation program must be improving the learning opportunities for students. Similarly, Roe and Drake (1974) conclude that the evaluation is for the purpose of better relating to client needs.

Consequently, according to research, since evaluation instruments need to emphasize more student achievement, the focus of the CPS needs to be refined and retooled to accommodate the latest research on student achievement. Such an alignment would be beneficial for the soundness of the CPS instrument, the teacher, the students, and ultimately the stakeholders.

Research Question 3

Research question 3 asked: How do teachers as a group perceive the CPS
instrument as a whole on teacher effectiveness?

The mean of means for the five domains was 4.33, and of the 46 performance items, the mean was 4.28. The results revealed that teachers of all categories—high school and elementary school, and evaluated and non-evaluated—perceived the CPS instrument on a whole as satisfactory. This tends to reinforce the answers to questions 1 and 2. However, two of the performance items, under the domain Student Achievement, are perceived by teachers as unsatisfactory as previously discussed in question 1.

Research Question 4

Research question 4 asked: Is there a significant school level by evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the CPS on teacher effectiveness?

This question was answered with the following research hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: There is a significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Teacher Planning domain.

Results indicate that whether teachers were elementary or secondary teachers or were evaluated or not evaluated, there was agreement with the effectiveness of the domain Teacher Planning composing the CPS. Teachers were in total agreement on this issue irrespective of level or status because they can probably identify this domain being aligned with their regular evaluation system.

Hypothesis 2: There is a significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Teacher Observation domain.
Results indicate that irrespective of level of status, teachers agreed with the effectiveness of the domain Teacher Observation composing the CPS. An explanation for teachers’ satisfaction with this domain is perhaps due to teachers being accustomed to having this domain as a component of their regular evaluation instrument.

Hypothesis 3: There is a significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Classroom Management domain.

Results indicate that irrespective of level or status, teachers agreed with the effectiveness of the Classroom Management domain composing the CPS. Both categories of teachers see their role as supervisors in the classroom and were satisfied with the domain Classroom Management composing the CPS instrument.

Hypothesis 4: There is a significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Student Achievement domain.

Results indicate that irrespective of level or status, teachers agreed with the effectiveness of the Student Achievement domain composing the CPS. However, teachers appear to be somewhat reluctant to accept two of the performance items under this domain as a part of teacher effectiveness. Stronge and Tucker (2000) bridge this gap by recommending that teacher effectiveness is best measured by student progress (gains over the previous year) rather than by student achievement level (based on national norms).

The overall results indicate that teachers perceive the domain Student Achievement as satisfactory, but are neutral about two performance items composing this
domain. Teachers' overall stance however is consistent with Schalock, Schalock, Cowart, and Myton (1993):

We regard evidence of learning gains by students taught as the most important accomplishment to monitor. We argue that student learning is both the professional touchstone for teachers and the reason why school exists, and that regardless of what else is examined in assessing a teacher's work or a school's worth, the learning gains of students taught must be taken into account. (p. 105)

My recommendation for the challenge of students' creativity, imagination, and investigative skills is that provision be made for under the umbrella of the intended learning outcome of the lesson for the unintended learning outcome, which was not predetermined within the unit. Hence this would provide an avenue for measuring the cognitive or thinking outcomes of the student, and also cultivate consistency in the application of judgment, comparability, and evaluation of teachers as it relates to the CPS instrument.

Hypothesis 5: There is a significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Record Keeping domain.

Results indicate that that irrespective of level or status, teachers agreed with the effectiveness of the Record Keeping domain composing the CPS. Teachers were unanimous with the effectiveness of the Record Keeping domain composing the CPS probably due to their expected role of keeping classroom records of whatever transpires in the classroom.

This is a prime example of the following teacher accountability systems that utilize teacher recorded data: the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), William Sanders's Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System, and William
Webster's Value-Added and Product Measures approach for the Dallas Independent School District. The goal of these accountability systems is student growth by analyzing and integrating multiple sources of assessment data (Stronge & Tucker, 2000).

**Research Question 5**

Research question 5 asked: Is there a significant teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the General Evaluation Information (GEI)?

This question was answered with research hypotheses 6 and 7.

Hypothesis 6: There is a significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the CPS motivating teachers to remain in the teaching career.

Results indicate that irrespective of high school or elementary teacher, and evaluated or non-evaluated teacher, there was no difference on their means on the level of satisfaction of the CPS motivating teachers to remain in the teaching career.

An explanation for this position is that teachers perceive the incentive pay from the CPS as contributing to the core values of their school—teaching and learning (Brandt, 1990). Hence teachers’ awareness of the opportunities that the CPS could provide for all teachers affirm their support for the CPS instrument. Another explanation may be that teachers are more strongly motivated by intrinsic rewards, such as student achievement and organizational conditions of work (Hawley & Rosenholtz, 1984); hence, teachers were not concerned whether the CPS instrument affected their motivation to remain in the teaching profession.
Hypothesis 7: There is a significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction of teachers with the CPS consisting of sound assessment criteria.

Results indicate that irrespective of the level—high school or elementary teachers—there was no difference whether the CPS consisted of sound assessment criteria. However, it did make a difference with teacher status—evaluated and non-evaluated teachers—whether the CPS consists of sound assessment criteria. The means (shown in Table 18) indicate that the evaluated teachers’ expectations of the CPS consisting of sound assessment criteria were higher than that of the non-evaluated teachers.

An explanation for this difference could be that the evaluated teachers had an experiential relationship with the CPS instrument and discovered that the performance items on the CPS consisted of sound assessment criteria. Therefore they endorsed the performance items on the CPS as valid measures of teacher effectiveness. Another explanation could be that being selected as the ‘pilot’ evaluated teachers may have mentally lessened their objectivity of the CPS consisting of sound assessment criteria; instead they assumed that the CPS instrument was sound. However, the non-evaluated teachers did not experience being assessed by the CPS instrument and therefore tend to be more cautious in their expectations of the CPS consisting of sound assessment criteria.

Stronge (1997) emphasizes that a sound evaluation instrument creates a climate for achievable objectives. The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1988) describes some of these guiding objectives as follows:

1. To provide effective service to students and society
2. To establish personnel evaluation practices that are constructive and of unnecessary threatening or demoralizing characteristics (p. 125).

Stufflebeam and Brethower (1987) and Stufflebeam and Sanders (1990) expounded on the benefits of the proper use of the Personnel Evaluation Standards provision for quality control to stakeholders and the overall personnel evaluation instrument. The following four benefits could represent the expectations of the evaluated and non-evaluated teachers in a sound CPS instrument:

1. Propriety (i.e., they are legally and ethically acceptable)
2. Utility (i.e., they are useful, informative, timely, and influential)
3. Feasibility (i.e., they are efficient, viable in the context of the organization, and relatively easy to use)
4. Accuracy (i.e., they are valid and reliable) (Stufflebeam & Brethower, 1987, p. 125).

Hypothesis 8: There is a significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the CPS being given adequate orientation.

Results indicate that irrespective of level or status of teachers, it did not make a difference on their means on the CPS being given adequate orientation. One explanation for this posture could be that the major features of the CPS instrument and its objectives were retained and were not compromised or diluted during the implementation stage. Odden and Kelley (1997) emphasized that a successful compensation change process requires collaboration throughout the entire process of development, design implementation, evaluation, and modification. According to Hart and Murphy (1990),
many major changes have failed for lack of continued attention to primary objectives and to good leadership.

Hypothesis 9: There is a significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the CPS providing for adequate financial incentive.

Results indicate that whether teachers were elementary or secondary, or were evaluated or not evaluated, there was no difference on their means on the CPS providing for adequate financial incentives for teachers.

Many factors have been researched in an attempt to find which ones promote levels of satisfaction among teachers. Despite the fact that both teacher level and status were unanimous in the CPS providing for adequate financial incentives, teachers are not normally motivated by this factor. According to Bishay (1996), pay incentives have been found to be unsuccessful in providing job satisfaction and motivation. Sylvia and Hutchinson (1985) explain that true job satisfaction is derived from gratification of the higher-order needs, such as social relations, esteem, and self-actualization rather than the lower-order needs.

The conclusion of the Harris Poll 2003 (Taylor, 2004) further supports the higher-order needs. The survey measured the level of teachers nine times over the last 20 years. In their most recent survey, 57% of teachers indicated that they were very satisfied with teaching as a vocation.

Hypothesis 10: There is a significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the CPS motivating other persons to enter the teaching field.
This means that irrespective of level or status, teachers did not make a difference on their means on the CPS motivating other persons to enter the teaching field. The literature supports the idea that schools have traditionally had an egalitarian pattern, and therefore have not been organized to highlight differences between teachers (Brandt, 1990). Hence, the CPS motivating other persons to enter the teaching field does not affect the views of teachers regarding the CPS as an effective instrument.

**Hypothesis 11:** There is a significant two-way teacher level by teacher evaluation status interaction on the level of satisfaction with the CPS being satisfactorily implemented into the school system.

The results indicate that irrespective of level or status, teachers did not make a difference on their means on the CPS being satisfactorily implemented into the school system. An explanation for this could be that teachers would prefer being complacent with the CPS initiation process and would rather observe the outcome of the evaluation. Another explanation is that confirmation of the performance items of the CPS became attractive to many because of the promise it holds for supporting teachers’ survival needs. According to Brandt (1990), lifestyle and mental health represent the fundamental basic needs influencing the career ladder attitude decisions of many teachers. These rewards are important to teachers as they allow teachers to continue a way of life that they are accustomed to and in some cases improve their lifestyle. Consequently, the CPS instrument was acceptable to all categories of teachers.

**Conclusions**

The major findings in this study show unanimity between high-school and
elementary school teachers and evaluated and non-evaluated teachers. There could be several explanations for this, cultural influences being one of these factors.

According to the Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs (2007) the United States historically has had close economic and commercial relations with the Bahamas. Both countries share ethnic and cultural ties, especially in education, and the Bahamas is home to approximately 30,000 American residents. In addition, there are about 110 U.S.-related businesses in the Bahamas and, in 2005, 87% of the 5 million tourists visiting the country were American. The U.S. also exports food supplies and manufactured goods such as vehicles and automobile parts, and hotel, restaurant, and medical supplies to the Bahamas.

Consequently, the impact of American culture on Bahamian culture is substantive on a country with a population of 323,000. In education, the United States is viewed as the citadel for learning. Hence, the American career ladder model for teachers, known as the Career Path System in the Bahamas, was adopted as a proven, tested educational method for teachers. Therefore, based on the results and discussion of this study, the following conclusions are drawn.

1. Both elementary and high-school teachers and evaluated and non-evaluated teachers perceived that 44 out of the 46 performance items are valid measures of teacher effectiveness on the CPS instrument. There tend to be more teacher-centered performance items than student achievement items.

2. Both elementary and high-school teachers and evaluated and non-evaluated teachers perceived the five domains composing the CPS as being valid measures of
teacher effectiveness on the CPS instrument. The domain Student Achievement is perceived as the least preferred of the five domains.

3. A great deal of unanimity exists with high-school and elementary teachers, and evaluated and non-evaluated teachers regarding the perception of the CPS instrument as a valid, sound instrument for measuring teacher effectiveness. This is supported in the literature by Stufflebeam and Brethower (1987). Stufflebeam and Sanders (1990) expounded on the benefits of the proper use of the Personnel Evaluation Standards provision for quality control to stakeholders and overall personnel evaluation instrument.

4. There is a great deal of unanimity with high-school and elementary school teachers, and evaluated and non-evaluated teachers regarding the CPS instrument as a valid measure of teacher effectiveness motivating them to remain in the teaching career.

5. Irrespective of categories, both high-school and elementary teachers, and evaluated and non-evaluated teachers were unanimous in their perceptions that the CPS instrument is not the major motivating factor for others joining the teaching profession. Latham (1998) posits that intrinsic rewards such as student achievement and job organization play a greater role in teacher motivation and job satisfaction than extrinsic rewards involving financial compensation.

6. There was a difference of perceptions between level of teachers—high-school and elementary teachers, and status of teachers—evaluated and non-evaluated teachers, regarding the CPS consisting of sound assessment criteria as a valid measures of teacher effectiveness. The high-school and elementary teachers accepted the CPS instrument as presented; however, the evaluated and non-evaluated teachers perceived that the CPS instrument must have sound, valid assessment criteria.
7. Both high-school and elementary school teachers, and evaluated and non-evaluated teachers were unanimous in their perceptions that adequate orientation to the CPS instrument has resulted in the CPS developing into an effective instrument.

8. Irrespective of level or status, teachers were unanimous in their support for the CPS instrument being the avenue for providing adequate financial incentive. However, Bishay (1996) supports the position that pay incentives have been found to be unsuccessful in providing satisfaction and motivation for teachers.

9. Both high-school and elementary school teachers, and evaluated and non-evaluated teachers were unanimous in their response that the CPS, as a valid measure of teacher effectiveness, could motivate other persons to enter the teaching field. Most business organizations have a vertical career track, hence it would be a smooth transition to a vertical educational career. This could attract others; hence teachers support the CPS instrument as a valid, sound, effective evaluation instrument.

10. The CPS being a valid instrument of teacher effectiveness for satisfactory implementation into the school system was unanimously agreed upon by teachers of all status and levels that this could promote the CPS to become an effective instrument. According to Brandt (1990) teachers could be satisfied that the major features of the CPS instrument and its objectives were retained and were not compromised or diluted during the implementation stage.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations for further research are made:

1. It is recommended that this study be expanded to include demographic information: age, gender, years of experience, highest earned degree, and current
2. A longitudinal study could be performed to study the changing perceptions of teacher level and teacher status over a 3-to-5-year period.

3. Qualitative research could be conducted on the perceptions of teachers to help identify factors which may not lend themselves to quantitative research.

4. It is recommended that this study be expanded to include administrators/evaluators.

5. It is recommended that this study be expanded to include predictive validity to enhance the CPS soundness.

6. It is recommended that rater and observer be trained in order to ensure interrater reliability.

7. It is recommended that more emphasis be placed on student learning by increasing the performance items in this area.

8. It is recommended that an awareness program be implemented that would sensitize teachers to the importance of the CPS instrument as a useful tool for assessing teacher effectiveness.
APPENDIX A

LETTERS
May, 16, 2001

Mr. Creswell Sturrup
Permanent Secretary
Ministry of Education
Nassau, Bahamas.

Dear Mr. Sturrup:

I am a former Bahamian teacher with the Ministry of Education (17 years), and a doctoral candidate (PhD), in the Educational Administration and Leadership Department at Andrews University Berrien Springs, Michigan. Currently, I am planning to conduct a survey study, which examines teachers' perceptions regarding the Career Path System evaluation instrument.

With your permission, I would like to survey 300 randomly selected public school teachers. It is intended that the results of this study will: a) provide the Ministry of Education with clearer insight regarding teachers’ currently held beliefs or views concerning the Career Path System instrument, b) define and guide the roles of stakeholders in the evaluation process, and c) provide resource information for future reference.

To administer the survey, I would like to: a) request a list of all teachers and their schools, who have been evaluated by the Career Path System instrument (this is necessary so that a random sample may be drawn from each stratum) and 2) conduct the survey study during the earlier part of June 2001, before the end of the school year.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter. I believe that the Ministry of Education participation in this survey study will prove to be worthwhile.

An early response would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Solomon Ward

10160 Garr Road
Berrien Springs
Michigan 49103
Tel. 1(616) 471-4536; Fax: 1(616) 471-6900
e-mail: solomon_edu@hotmail.com

Cc: Mrs. Iris Pinder, Director of Education
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

RE: MR. SOLOMON WARD - DISSERTATION "PERCEPTIONS OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS TOWARDS THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CAREER PATH SYSTEM"

Please be advised that Mr. Solomon Ward was given the necessary approvals and documentation by the Ministry of Education, Youth, Sports and Culture to complete the above captioned dissertation.

Sincerely,

Janice Knowles (Mrs.)
Senior Education Officer
Career Path Unit

Date: 13th July 2007
TO: SELECTED EDUCATORS CHosen FOR
CAREER PATH SYSTEM SURVEY

You have been chosen to join a select group of educators in assessing the Career Path System instrument. Your insights are taken seriously as the Ministry of Education makes decisions about promotion, teacher effectiveness and the improvement of teaching.

Please give us your frank, candid opinions. We are coding the survey forms so that no names appear on the face of the questionnaire. Precautions have been taken to ensure that no individual identities are divulged.

Since your response will speak for many others beside yourself, every survey form counts. Please complete the form IMMEDIATELY, as this will save us the expense of follow-up written and phone reminders.

Mr. Cephas Ward, professor in the School of Natural Science and Environmental Studies, College of the Bahamas, and evaluator with the Career Path Unit, Ministry of Education, is the facilitator for this research project. Please direct all inquiries to Mr. Ward at telephone 361-7428 or e-mail at sobahamas@hotmail.com

May I express, in advance, appreciation to you for your assistance.

Gratefully,

Solomon Ward (Ph.D. candidate)
Research Director
Career Path System Instrument Survey
APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENTS
Public School Teachers’ Survey
Perceptions of the Career Path System Instrument

Part 1. EVALUATION PROCEDURES: Below is a teacher evaluation instrument developed by the Ministry of Education. Indicate by circling a number 1-5, to what extent you disagree or agree with using these criteria as indicators of teacher effectiveness.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

A. Instructional Criteria are Assessed by Examining the Teacher’s Planning as Documented in Lesson Plans and Detailed Forecasts.

1. INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES
   a. Presents clear, precise, curriculum-based instructional objectives stated in behavioural terms. 1 2 3 4 5
   b. Matches objectives to learning and assessment strategies and student needs/interest at the appropriate level of difficulty. 1 2 3 4 5

2. CONTENT
   a. Outlines clearly, well-sequenced main ideas, concepts relevant to stated objectives. 1 2 3 4 5
   b. Indicates use of available human and material resources to achieve objectives. 1 2 3 4 5

3. TEACHING/LEARNING ACTIVITIES
   a. Present clear, varied, well-sequenced activities appropriate to achieving objectives. 1 2 3 4 5
   b. Describes clearly the organization of students for activities. 1 2 3 4 5
   c. Identifies an appropriate culminating activity as well as the conclusion. 1 2 3 4 5
   d. Provides for the use of relevant materials, supplies and equipment. 1 2 3 4 5

B. Instructional Criteria are Assessed by Observing the Teacher During a Lesson.

4. INTRODUCTORY ACTIVITIES
   a. Introduces the lesson e.g. links previous lesson to present topic by questioning, summarizing, etc. 1 2 3 4 5
   b. Shares the learning objectives when appropriate (i.e. what is to be learned or accomplished). 1 2 3 4 5

5. DIAGNOSIS OF STUDENTS’ ABILITY LEVEL WITH RESPECT TO THE EXECUTION OF THE LESSON.
   a. Makes appropriate provision for homogenous/heterogenous grouping, individual differences peer coaching/ cooperative learning. 1 2 3 4 5
   b. Matches tasks to students’ ability. 1 2 3 4 5

6. EXPLANATION OF MAIN IDEAS/CONCEPTS AND SKILLS
   a. Presents the lesson using concepts and language meaningful to the students and ensures that assignments are clearly and appropriately set out. 1 2 3 4 5
   b. Uses terminology appropriate to the discipline and the level being taught. 1 2 3 4 5
   c. Draws attention to key points and emphasizes difficult areas by various techniques such as highlighting, underscoring and special signals (e.g. This is important). 1 2 3 4 5

7. QUESTIONING TECHNIQUES
   a. Poses questions which are well-structured and clear in meaning. 1 2 3 4 5
   b. Asks appropriate levels of questions (e.g. recall, comprehension, application, synthesis, analysis, evaluation), to which students respond successfully. 1 2 3 4 5
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C. Classroom Management Criteria are Assessed by Observing the Teacher During a Lesson

14. MANAGEMENT OF STUDENT BEHAVIOUR
   a. Monitors all students and uses verbal and non-verbal techniques to re-direct off-task learners. 1 2 3 4 5
   b. Provides a set of rules for acceptable behaviour governing students' oral participation and movement during different types of instructional activities. 1 2 3 4 5
   c. Emphasizes positive behaviour and treats all students in a fair and equitable manner. 1 2 3 4 5

15. MANAGEMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL TIME
   a. Distributes time appropriately to each step of the lesson and makes transition between activities within the lesson efficiently and smoothly. 1 2 3 4 5
   b. Conducts the lesson at an appropriate pace i.e. slowing presentations when necessary for student understanding but avoiding unnecessary slowdowns. 1 2 3 4 5

16. MANAGEMENT OF THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT
   a. Organizes furniture and equipment to facilitate teaching/learning activities and maintains a classroom that is neat and clean. 1 2 3 4 5
b. Maintains well organized learning centres, mounts visual aids and a representative display of students' work to encourage and promote learning. 1 2 3 4 5

D. Student Achievement is Assessed by Listening to Students' Responses, Examining, Work-books /student Portfolios, Completed Assignments, Projects etc. and the Teacher's Markbook.

17. STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT
   a. Students' responses demonstrate understanding of main ideas/concepts taught in the lesson 1 2 3 4 5
   b. The majority of students were able to complete the assigned tasks with a high rate of success. 1 2 3 4 5
   c. Students maintain reasonable work standards and adhere to due dates for assignments...... 1 2 3 4 5
   d. Students' work shows evidence of creativity, originality and imagination.......................... 1 2 3 4 5
   e. Students' work shows evidence of the use of investigative skills e.g. reading, interviewing, interpreting, recording, etc ...................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
   f. Students' work is presented in a format that is neat, attractive and appropriate to the discipline. 1 2 3 4 5

E. Record Keeping is Assessed by Examining Documents Related to Teacher's Long-term Planning, Student Performance and Attendance Records, Students' Exercise/workbooks, etc.

18. RECORD KEEPING
   a. Maintains up-to-date and neatly presented records of schemes of work, forecasts and lesson plans............................................................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
   b. Maintains accurate records to document students' performance, progress and attendance (e.g. attendance registers for teacher's class and subject specialization groups, markbooks, progress reports and individualized educational plans for special students.)..................... 1 2 3 4 5
   c. Routinely checks written and other assignments e.g. (students' portfolios, workbooks and exercise books) to provide prompt feedback and to monitor student progress........................... 1 2 3 4 5

Part 2. GENERAL EVALUATION INFORMATION: The following statements are designed to reflect your beliefs concerning the Career Path System Instrument (CAPSI), that you have just completed. Indicate your selection by circling the appropriate scale: 1 - strongly disagree to 5 - strongly agree.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

1. The CAPSI motivates you to remain in the teaching career.................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
2. The CAPSI consists of sound assessment criteria................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Teachers are given adequate orientation for the CAPSI....................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
4. The CAPSI provides for adequate financial incentives to teachers........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
5. Other persons will wish to enter the teaching profession as a result of the CAPSI .............. 1 2 3 4 5
6. The CAPSI has been satisfactory implemented into the school system............................... 1 2 3 4 5

OTHER COMMENTS (?)

THANK YOU!
Table 23

**CPS Rotation Component Matrix**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b6c</td>
<td>Draws attention to key points and emphasizes difficult areas by various techniques such as</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b6b</td>
<td>Uses terminology appropriate to the discipline and the level being taught.</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b5b</td>
<td>Matches tasks to students' ability.</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b5a</td>
<td>Makes appropriate provision for homogenous/heterogenous grouping, individual differences</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a3b</td>
<td>Present clear, varied, well-sequenced activities appropriate to achieving objectives</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a1b</td>
<td>Matches objectives to learning and assessment strategies and student needs/interest at the</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b12a</td>
<td>Ends the lesson appropriately e.g. by reviewing/summarizing main points of the lesson</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a3c</td>
<td>Identifies an appropriate culminating activity as well as the conclusion</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b8a</td>
<td>Presents current, accurate information in an organized manner and at the appropriate level</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a3b</td>
<td>Describes clearly the organization of students for activities</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b4a</td>
<td>Introduces the lesson e.g. links previous lesson to present topic by questioning, summarizing</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b7a</td>
<td>Poses questions which are well-structured and clear in meaning.</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a1a</td>
<td>Presents clear and precise curriculum objectives stated in behavioral terms</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b7d</td>
<td>Affirms a correct response appropriately and discourages unison/choral answering</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a3d</td>
<td>Provides for the use of relevant materials, supplies, and equipment.</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b8b</td>
<td>Provides meaningful examples and demonstrations which tap students' everyday</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a2a</td>
<td>Outlines clearly, well-sequenced main ideas, concepts relevant to stated objectives</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d17c</td>
<td>Students maintain reasonable work standards and adhere to due dates for assignments.</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d17f</td>
<td>Students' work is presented in a format that is neat, attractive, and appropriate to the</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d17d</td>
<td>Students' work shows evidence of creativity, originality and imagination.</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d17a</td>
<td>Students' responses demonstrate understanding of main ideas/concepts taught in the lesson.</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d17e</td>
<td>Students' work shows evidence of the use of investigative skills e.g. reading, interviewing,</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c16b</td>
<td>Maintains well organized learning centres, mounts visual aids and a representative</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d17b</td>
<td>The majority of students were able to complete the assigned tasks with a high rate of</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b10a</td>
<td>Makes timely use of educational technology (e.g. computers, overhead projectors, etc.)</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c16a</td>
<td>Organizes furniture and equipment to facilitate teaching/learning activities and maintains</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b9b</td>
<td>Gets students on task promptly at the beginning of each instructional activity and maintains</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b10c</td>
<td>Demonstrates safe and proficient use of supplies and equipment.</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b10b</td>
<td>Uses well-made instructional materials (e.g. charts, puppets, audio-video tapes, models)</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c15a</td>
<td>Distributes time appropriately to each step of the lesson and makes transition between</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b4b</td>
<td>Shares the learning objectives when appropriate (i.e. what is to be learnt or accomplished).</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c14b</td>
<td>Provides a set of rules for acceptable behaviour governing students' oral participation and</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c14a</td>
<td>Monitors all students and uses verbal and non-verbal techniques to re-direct off-task learners</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c14c</td>
<td>Emphasizes positive behaviour and treats all students' in a fair and equitable manner</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b13a</td>
<td>Writes and speaks English at an acceptable level and uses dialect appropriately.</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b7b</td>
<td>Asks appropriate levels of questions (e.g. recall, comprehension, application, synthesis,</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b7c</td>
<td>Provides feedback after an incorrect or no response by probing, repeating</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b11a</td>
<td>Provides feedback on the correctness or incorrectness of in-class work to encourage</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b11b</td>
<td>Re-teach/reinforces skills and concepts using a variety of methods and strategies.</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a2b</td>
<td>Indicates use of available human and material resources to achieve objectives</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c15b</td>
<td>Conducts the lesson at an appropriate pace i.e. slowing presentations when necessary</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e18a</td>
<td>Maintains up to date and neatly presented records of schemes of work, forecasts and</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e18b</td>
<td>Maintains accurate records to document students' performance, progress and attendance</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e18c</td>
<td>Routinely checks written and other assignments e.g. (students' portfolios, workbooks and</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 24

*Means and Standard Deviations for the Five Variables of the CPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary (N = 135)</td>
<td>High School (N = 110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Planning</td>
<td>4.46 .62</td>
<td>4.31 .76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Observation</td>
<td>4.43 .62</td>
<td>4.33 .68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>4.42 .58</td>
<td>4.33 .69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>4.09 .70</td>
<td>4.01 .79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Keeping</td>
<td>4.47 .79</td>
<td>4.38 .86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25

Means and Standard Deviations for Teacher responses to GEI and 5 Survey Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>MNGEI</th>
<th>TEACHPLN</th>
<th>TEACHOBS</th>
<th>CLASSMAN</th>
<th>STUDACH</th>
<th>RECKEEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elem. School</td>
<td>Non Evaluated</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.8421</td>
<td>4.4578</td>
<td>4.4139</td>
<td>4.3857</td>
<td>4.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.7898</td>
<td>.6005</td>
<td>.6137</td>
<td>.5929</td>
<td>.7049</td>
<td>.7700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.0750</td>
<td>4.5054</td>
<td>4.5402</td>
<td>4.6286</td>
<td>4.3233</td>
<td>4.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.7713</td>
<td>.7384</td>
<td>.6903</td>
<td>.4957</td>
<td>.6855</td>
<td>.9048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.8769</td>
<td>4.4648</td>
<td>4.4326</td>
<td>4.4217</td>
<td>4.0953</td>
<td>4.4704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Non Evaluated</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.6453</td>
<td>4.3341</td>
<td>4.3562</td>
<td>4.3345</td>
<td>3.9861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.7965</td>
<td>.7519</td>
<td>.6170</td>
<td>.6442</td>
<td>.8395</td>
<td>.8859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.9167</td>
<td>4.2569</td>
<td>4.2892</td>
<td>4.3238</td>
<td>4.0722</td>
<td>4.4389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.8321</td>
<td>.8007</td>
<td>.8366</td>
<td>.8210</td>
<td>.6799</td>
<td>.8005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.7170</td>
<td>4.3130</td>
<td>4.3379</td>
<td>4.3316</td>
<td>4.0100</td>
<td>4.3894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.8110</td>
<td>.7626</td>
<td>.6805</td>
<td>.6929</td>
<td>.7962</td>
<td>.8604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Non Evaluated</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.7622</td>
<td>4.4070</td>
<td>4.3902</td>
<td>4.3647</td>
<td>4.0272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.7964</td>
<td>.6677</td>
<td>.6142</td>
<td>.6134</td>
<td>.7611</td>
<td>.8179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.9826</td>
<td>4.3563</td>
<td>4.3896</td>
<td>4.4457</td>
<td>4.1727</td>
<td>4.5300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.8028</td>
<td>.7785</td>
<td>.7839</td>
<td>.7190</td>
<td>.6865</td>
<td>.8423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.8062</td>
<td>4.3967</td>
<td>4.3901</td>
<td>4.3812</td>
<td>4.0572</td>
<td>4.4340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.8009</td>
<td>.6904</td>
<td>.6506</td>
<td>.6356</td>
<td>.7472</td>
<td>.8226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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