

**INVESTIGATION INTO THE TEACHER'S STEWARDSHIP
AND ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS FOR CLASSROOM EVALUATION:
LDS SEMINARY TEACHER EVALUATION**

D. SPENCER NORDFELT

B.S., Brigham Young University, 1998

A Project
submitted to the Faculty of Education
of the University of Lethbridge
in partial fulfillment of the
Requirements for the degree

MASTER OF EDUCATION

LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA

July 24, 2001

Abstract

The purpose of this study was twofold: (a) prepare a formal description of the expectations associated with the stewardship of a released-time seminary teacher and (b) create classroom assessment instruments to be used by seminary teachers for self-analysis and students for evaluative feedback in four areas of classroom assessment: classroom learning environment, teacher characteristics, student development, and status of students on factors extraneous to the classroom. Five hypotheses were tested within the LDS Church Educational System to provide data upon which to recommend use of the instruments. The results from testing the hypotheses revealed: (1) there is no difference in the results of assessment instruments when they are distributed either by a teacher, a supervisor, or a peer-teacher, (2) teachers and students are not congruent when their assessments of the classroom experiences are compared, (3) the congruence between the teacher and student assessments is not influenced by length of the teacher's previous teaching experience, (4) teachers with one to three years of teaching experience receive higher assessments than those with more years of teaching experience, and (5) teacher preferred classes receive higher assessments than randomly selected classes.

Acknowledgments

This creative project is a reality only through the assistance, counsel and support of special individuals. First, my gratitude to the Department of Education at the University of Lethbridge and specifically, the Masters of Education Program for providing me the most worthwhile educational experience I have had. My appreciation to Dr. David Townsend for allowing me open field in which to test my professional development and for being a special friend and advisor.

I am grateful to the LDS Church Educational System for providing material support and accepting this study as investigative research into a critical area in the seminary system. To Dr. Jack Stone for his personal interest and effective guidance. I would like to acknowledge the administrators and teachers of the Canada Central area for their willing cooperation and assistance. My appreciation to Annette Walker for her statistical assistance.

To Bryan, Debbie, and Ben Drewry who have helped me in many ways during this project. To Dennis and Glenda for being role models in many aspects and for their great examples. To Kaleb and Drew – I love each of you and acknowledge your own special way of supporting me. Finally, to my wonderful companion, Joy, for her patience and ability to sacrifice as we both have made a dream come true.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
Table of contents	v
List of tables	ix
The Problem and Research Procedures	1
The Problem	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Background	2
Questions	3
Hypotheses	5
Instrumentation Rationale	6
Assumptions	7
Delimitations	8
Limitations	9
Definitions of Terms	9
Significance of the Study	11
Research Procedures	12
Organization of the Remainder of Study	17
Review of Related Literature	18
Teacher Evaluation Prior to the 90s	18
Reasons for Teacher Evaluation	18

Problems of Teacher Evaluation	19
Research Designs Employed in Studies of Teaching Success	20
Use of Student Ratings in Teacher Evaluation	22
Teacher Evaluation in the 90s	23
Introduction	23
Emphasis of Teacher Evaluation in the 90s	24
Who Should Evaluate?	28
Performance Aspects in Evaluation	30
Accountability and Evaluation	33
Problems Encountered in Teacher Evaluation	36
Use of Student Ratings in Teacher Evaluation	44
Summary	49
Methodology	54
Investigation into the Seminary Teacher’s Stewardship	54
Development of the Student Assessment Questionnaire	54
Statement Selection	55
Questionnaire Scales	56
Positively Keyed Statements	59
Response Mode	61
Establishing Norms	62
Teacher Assessment Form: “Teacher Self- Assessment in Seminary” TS-AIS	66

Procedures Implementing Statistical Analysis	63
Findings	65
Stewardship Expectations of LDS Released-Time Seminary Teachers	65
Data Relating to Research Hypotheses	69
Hypothesis One	69
Hypothesis Two	76
Hypothesis Three	76
Hypothesis Four	79
Hypothesis Five	79
Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations	91
Review of the Study Design	91
The Problem	91
Purpose of Study	92
Hypotheses	92
Significance of the Study	93
Methodology	94
Stewardship investigation	94
Assessment questionnaires	95
Experimental control procedures	96
Summary of Findings	97
Teacher's Stewardship	97
Hypothesis One	97

Hypothesis Two	98
Hypothesis Three	98
Hypothesis Four	99
Hypothesis Five	99
Conclusions	100
Recommendations	101
References	103
Appendices	107
A. Minutes of the SES Planning Meeting Including Statement of Authorization	109
B. Sources and References Documenting the Research to Establish the Expectations of a Released- Time Seminary Teacher	112
C. Coordinator Instructions Sheet to Distribute Forms: SAIS and TS-AIS	115
D. Teacher Instruction Sheet to Distribute Forms: SAIS and TS-AIS	118
E. Student Assessment in Seminary Computer Form and Hand Tabulation Form	117
F. Teacher Self-Assessment in Seminary Computer Form and Hand Tabulation Form	120
G. TS-AIS Summary Form	123
H. Parent Consent Letter	125
I. Teacher Consent Letter	126

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1.	Numbers of Students, Teachers, and Classes	70
2.	Scale I Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments as Influenced by the Type of Authority Figure to Distribute Assessment Forms to Students	71
3.	Scale II Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments as Influenced by the Type of Authority Figure to Distribute Assessment Forms to Students	72
4.	Scale III Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments as Influenced by the Type of Authority Figure to Distribute Assessment Forms to Students	73
5.	Scale IV Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments as Influenced by the Type of Authority Figure to Distribute Assessment Forms to Students	74
6.	Composite Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments as Influenced by the Type of Authority Figure to Distribute Assessment Forms to Students	75
7.	Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance (paired t-test) between SAIS and TS-AIS Assessments	77
8.	Deviation Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of Differences Between SAIS and TS-AIS Assessments Across Variables of Teaching Experience and Seminary Districts	78
9.	Scale I Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments According to Length of Teaching Experience	80
10.	Scale II Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments According to Length of Teaching Experience	81

11.	Scale III Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments According to Length of Teaching Experience	82
12.	Scale IV Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments According to Length of Teaching Experience	83
13.	Composite Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments According to Length of Teaching Experience	84
14.	Scale I Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments According to Random and Teacher-Preferred Method of Class Selection	86
15.	Scale II Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments According to Random and Teacher-Preferred Method of Class Selection	87
16.	Scale III Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments According to Random and Teacher-Preferred Method of Class Selection	88
17.	Scale IV Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments According to Random and Teacher-Preferred Method of Class Selection	89
18.	Composite Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments According to Random and Teacher-Preferred Method of Class Selection	90

The Problem and Research Procedures

The Problem

One of the complex challenges facing educational agencies and institutions is the evaluation of teacher effectiveness. Educational administrators are charged with the responsibility of monitoring the effectiveness of teachers and developing inservice programs to enhance positive teacher development. Teachers, who are the subjects of evaluation, approach the process with a wide range of commitment and appreciation.

Historically, the seminaries in the Church Educational System (CES) of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints have used different procedures to evaluate seminary teachers. Prior to the late 1980s, supervisor ratings were used. In the decade of the nineties, student feedback in the form of student ratings was utilized. In the latter part of the 1990s, emphasis was directed toward a multi-variant approach where several indicators were used to determine teacher effectiveness.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was twofold:

1. To identify the expectations associated with the stewardship of teachers in the LDS released-time seminaries.
2. To construct assessment questionnaires and determine their use to obtain student and teacher feedback regarding:
 - a. classroom learning environment
 - b. teacher characteristics
 - c. student development

- d. status of students on factors outside of classroom

Background

In 1988 Richins and a group of interested teachers in the northern Utah area developed a questionnaire known as the Student Evaluation of Seminary (SES). The SES was developed from a counseling questionnaire used to assess rapport or the quality of the relationship established between counselor and client. Historically, the SES has been revised and changed in an attempt to keep it useful in obtaining student input regarding conditions within the classroom.

By the year 1997, the SES was being used by district coordinators in eighty-five of the ninety released-time seminary districts then in existence. In the preservice training program, the SES was used as an aid in selecting prospective released-time teachers. (Sudweeks, 1999)

The purpose and design of the SES instrument was to enable supervisors to collect subjective student ratings in an objective, systematic manner. The SES was organized so that it produced data for seven scales. Six were intended to measure different dimensions of teacher effectiveness, one of which was the factor of rapport. The seventh scale was intended to measure student characteristics.

Sudweeks (1999) determined through a re-evaluation of the SES that scores from the seven scales had a direct correlation with the rapport established between teacher and students. SES scales were intended to be independent measurements but were actually found to be significantly influenced by the quality of rapport. Because of this, it was recommended that interpretation and diagnosis of teacher effectiveness using scores from the separate scales be discouraged, if not eliminated.

Other recommendations made by Sudweeks (1999) included:

1. The acquiescent response set should be . . . investigated.
2. Student ratings of teachers should be used only as a means of helping teachers recognize and correct weaknesses in their teaching. SES ratings should not be relied upon (solely) in making decisions about terminating or retaining teachers.
3. Possible reactive effects of the use of the SES should be investigated. It is not unlikely that teachers consciously perform differently in the classroom because of their fear of how they may be rated by their students.
4. CES Administrators are probably justified in interpreting a teacher's median rating on the SES composite scale as an indicator or the extent to which that teacher has or has not developed rapport with his students. (pp. 25-26)

Questions

The use of the SES instrument was investigated through the study accomplished by Sudweeks (1999). Implications involving the use of replacement questionnaires also needed to be analyzed. This study received permission from the LDS seminary department of the Church Educational System. Questions, with their possible answers were developed to provide an investigative framework. Experimental hypotheses and research procedures were developed from that process. The following background information and related questions were used in the development of this study.

SES forms to obtain student ratings have been administered by seminary department field supervisors. Teachers have not been used to administer the SES instrument to their own students. Reasons for this lack of involvement may be due to supervisors failing to trust the ability of teachers to obtain reliable feedback for evaluation. Teachers may tend to influence their students in a way to skew the results. If student ratings are used to help determine teacher status and stability within the seminary program, the department may feel a need to control the use of the evaluation instrument.

Teachers are sensitive to the selection of their classes for evaluation. Some classes, they feel, may be more representative of their state of teaching effectiveness. If supervisors use the feedback from student evaluations to make administrative decisions, the selection of the class is important.

1. Can teachers, using standard procedures, obtain reliable feedback from students that would be similar to the results obtained from field administrators?
2. Is class selection a critical factor in order to obtain representative feedback from students when conducting classroom evaluations?

The process of teaching includes the process of analyzing performance. During the 1990s, the source of classroom evaluations for the seminary department was centered upon student feedback. Teachers were the subjects of the classroom evaluation. Using the SES format, teachers were not given an opportunity to assess their own performance, or the conditions operating within the classroom. With teachers being the subjects of evaluation, seminary department emphasis upon accountability for the classroom experience was directed to the teacher.

3. Should teachers fill out a formal evaluation form concurrent with their students when classroom evaluations are processed?
4. Should some of the emphasis upon classroom accountability be directed towards students?
5. How congruent would teachers' assessment of classroom conditions be to their own students' assessments of the same conditions?

6. To help maintain congruence, how often should teachers receive student feedback from formal evaluative instruments?

Rushton (1999), in a study to assess the relationship between student ratings and selected characteristics of religion teachers in the Institute program of the LDS Church Educational System, determined that younger teachers with less teaching experience were rated higher than older teachers with more teaching experience. Rushton's findings added an additional aspect to seminary teacher evaluation.

7. Do younger seminary teachers receive higher classroom assessments than teachers with more teaching experience?
8. Does length of teaching experience influence the degree to which the teachers are congruent with their students' feelings?

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were developed from the questions introduced above and were tested within the LDS Church seminary system:

1. There is no significant difference in the assessments given by students on the factors of learning environment, teacher characteristics, student development, and student status when rating forms are administered by either supervisors, peer-teachers, or teachers, to their own classes.
2. Classroom assessments made by teachers will not differ significantly from the assessments made by the teachers' students on the factors of learning environment, teacher characteristics, student development, and student status.

3. The difference between assessments made by teachers and the assessments made by the teachers' students will not differ significantly across the three categories of teaching experience or between seminary districts.
4. The assessments obtained on the factors of learning environment, teacher characteristics, student development and student status, from students who are taught by teachers with varying lengths of teaching experience, will not differ significantly.
5. Student assessments on the factors of learning environment, teacher characteristics, student development, and student status which were obtained from classes that teachers selected, representing their best teaching effort, will not differ significantly from the assessments of teachers' classes which were randomly selected.

Instrumentation Rationale

The seminary system of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS) has experienced tremendous growth and expansion since its inception in 1912. Since then, the role expectation associated with the released-time teacher has changed to meet the needs of this growing educational system.

Teacher evaluation has been an integral aspect of this growth. Student feedback has been a primary source of information to assess teacher effectiveness in the classroom, and represents a focal point for continuous institutional introspection. Any evaluation questionnaire used to obtain student feedback should be representative, reliable and valid, which are critical characteristics of effective measurement. The questionnaires endorsed by

the seminary department of the LDS Church Educational System need to maintain those same psychometric properties.

On October 13, 2000, a meeting was held in the LDS Church offices to “discuss and plan for the future development of the SES instrument” (see Appendix A for minutes). Participants in this meeting included central office administration and interested personnel. As a result of this and follow-up meetings, it was felt that new questionnaires needed to be developed for the Canada Central Area. Further, it was proposed that the new instruments should be based upon an analysis of present and/or projected expectations directed to the stewardship of a released-time seminary teacher within the classroom. The new questionnaires would represent a synthesis of those expectations in statement form.

In order to assess the present expectations associated with the seminary teacher, it was agreed a review of the printed materials commonly available would be undertaken.

Assumptions

For the purpose of this study, the following assumptions were made:

1. There has been a need in the LDS seminary system to clarify for the released-time teacher those significant elements essential to the LDS teacher stewardship.
2. The “Student Evaluation of Seminary” instrument has not generally met the needs of the seminary department or field administrators in making effective assessments through the use of student feedback.
3. The procedures used to develop the questionnaires for this study were sufficiently appropriate to provide initial reliability and validity to the instruments.

4. The new questionnaires and recommendations arising from this study will be utilized by the seminary department.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to the following conditions:

1. Released-time seminary teachers and students were the subjects for the research.
2. The subjects were drawn from the Canada Central Area located in the Southern Alberta seminary district.
3. The data used to test the hypotheses were collected during the second semester of the 2000-01 school year.
4. The research dealing with the role expectations of a released-time seminary teacher was based upon printed talks and directives from the LDS Church and seminary authorities which address the teacher's role (see Appendix B for a list of references).
5. The only instrument used to obtain students' assessment in seminary was the form especially prepared for this study, "Student Assessment in Seminary."
6. The only instrument used to obtain teachers' assessment of their classes was the instrument especially prepared for this study, "Teacher Self-Assessment in Seminary".
7. The independent variables are identified in the section on Research Procedures in connection with the use of the Analysis of Variance testing process.

Limitations

The following limitations may have affected the generalizability of the findings of this study:

1. In some seminaries, the questionnaires were distributed and filled out the week prior to the conclusion of school.
2. Parts of this study depended upon teachers following exact instructions pertaining to procedures as well as giving verbal direction to students.
3. As some classes were divided into three response groups, those students remaining with their teacher were aware that this arrangement was not typical of how the teachers were normally evaluated by students.

Definitions of Terms

Specific terms used in this study are defined as follows:

Seminary. The LDS religious education program through which theology and religion are offered to ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grade students on a regular schoolday basis. It is part of the extensive educational system of the LDS Church and provides additional and supplementary courses to those usually taught in the public school. (McKay, 1977) Enrollment in seminary is open to students of all denominations, although participation is predominantly LDS. It can be taken on a released-time, non-released time, or home study basis.

The Church. A short title for the name of the religious organization officially known as the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

CES. Church Educational System. An acronym for the unit of the Church responsible for the education of its members and correlation of all educational agencies.

SES. Student Evaluation of Seminary. An acronym referring to an instrument used in the seminary system to obtain students' evaluation of their class and teacher.

Field administrators. A classification for this study referring to associate area directors and seminary principals who are responsible for the supervision of the seminary program and administrators of CES policies in each administrative area.

Coordinator. A title associated in the seminary system to the position of Associate Area Director.

Peer teacher. Any other seminary teacher (except the Principal) in each seminary building.

SAIS. Student Assessment in Seminary. An acronym for the new questionnaire constructed for this study and used to obtain students' assessment of their classroom experience and their teachers' characteristics.

TSAIS. Teacher Self-Assessment in Seminary. An acronym for the new questionnaire constructed for this study and used to obtain teachers' assessment of the classroom situation, students' experiences, and their own teacher characteristics.

Stewardship. A concept implying a stated set of conditional responsibilities which are developed through the agency of the individual without interference. Elements within stewardships are the principles of service, independence and initiative, counsel and consent, and accountability. (From an unpublished report presented by the Curriculum Council at Brigham Young University, 1995)

Assessment. The act or process of setting an estimated value or worth. Assessment is used in this study interchangeably with the terms evaluation and rating, yet disposes the

negative connotations of absoluteness and harshness which are associated with the other two terms.

Significance of the Study

The LDS seminary system has been organized to meet specific needs. From the official manual “Program Description and Operational Guidelines” for the seminary system comes the following:

From its inception, the purpose of the seminary and institute program was to assist the home in cultivating and nourishing the divine nature of the youth of the Church through a weekday religious education program. This intent has continued unaltered over the years and remains today as the basic objective.

Through the growth and development of the program, however, three pillars of emphasis have stood as primary guides in structuring and operating the seminaries and institutes.

First, the medium for helping young people recognize and mature in their eternal relationship with God, with fellow men, and with self, has been the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Second, every effort has been extended to employ energetic men of faith, character, and integrity - competent men who are young in feeling, who love youth, who command their respect and admiration, and who are capable of exercising an influence for good over them; individuals who are true friends of education, who understand and are in sympathy with the nature and needs of youth.

Third, a continued concern has been toward developing an instructional environment that encourages a companionship between the youth and the restored gospel of Christ, an environment that nurtures active, intelligent, and sincere Latter-day Saints, that settles them in their faith in Jesus Christ; that assists them in making the necessary adjustments in life; and associated with the covenants they make. (p. 2)

Institutional evaluation helps insure the system is executing from within the philosophical foundations underlying the Church. Local program evaluation helps maintain a quality faculty and a successful program on the local level. Teacher evaluation within the classroom adds a third dimension to the system’s analysis.

It is intended that the results of this study will be used by seminary administration and supervisors to:

1. Educate seminary faculty as to the desired characteristics of teachers and qualities within the classroom which should receive primary focus and attention.
2. Encourage and aid teachers in the process of introspection and personal analysis as to their own performance and the environment they have operating within each of their classes.
3. Identify areas for faculty inservice.
4. Provide teachers a motive for positive change and improvement.
5. Establish opportunities between administrators and teachers to discuss personal stewardships and give positive support to each of their respective roles.
6. Focus attention upon the significance of self-esteem as an attribute to successful seminary teaching.
7. Provide emphasis upon students' accountability in developing the type and quality of seminary experience they desire.

Research Procedures

The following procedures were employed to meet the objectives of this study:

1. On October 13, 2000, a meeting was held at the LDS Church Offices to "discuss and plan for the future development of the 'Student Evaluation of Seminary' instrument". Minutes of the meeting are found in Appendix A.
2. Endorsement of the study reported herein was obtained from the Commissioner's Office of the LDS Church Educational System.

3. The Director of Seminary Records and Reporting was assigned an advisory role to coordinate and assist the direction of this study so that CES needs are met through the course of the research procedures.
4. A thirty-one reference bibliography of talks and directives from LDS Church and seminary authorities was selected. As each document was read, a list of descriptive statements was made to develop a comprehensive perspective into the stewardship role of a released-time seminary teacher.
5. The literature was reviewed in order to evaluate the developments made in the field of teacher evaluation on the secondary school level. Recommendations coming from studies cited in the research were used to construct assessment instruments for the purposes of this study and guide its development.
6. Two questionnaires were developed: The Student Assessment in Seminary (SAIS) form and the Teacher Self-Assessment in Seminary (TS-AIS) form. These two forms provided assessment feedback from teachers and students in the categories of :
 - a. Learning environment within the classroom
 - b. Characteristics of the teacher
 - c. Development of the student
 - d. Status of students on factors outside the classroom

The four categories are identified as being separate scales within the instruments.

7. For field testing purposes, the student forms were administered to approximately 200 seminary students at the Calgary seminary. This was done to test the readability of the forms on the high school level. Modifications were made following the field test.
8. The distribution of the questionnaires was divided into two parts. The following methods were employed to control the experimental aspects of this study and test the hypotheses:
 - a. Five seminary districts were chosen in Southern Alberta. Each district possesses historical differences involving the use of student feedback to assess teacher effectiveness.
 - b. The Associate Area Directors for each of the five seminary districts was trained to follow standard procedures. Each Director followed the same format to distribute the assessment forms within each seminary and classroom. Each of the Directors used assistants to manually distribute the assessment forms. Within each classroom, a formal introduction was used to explain the purpose of the instrument and offer procedural details on how to fill out the forms.
 - c. The students and teachers within each seminary were given the assessment forms during the same teaching day.
 - d. All of the data from the five seminary districts were collected during the same two week interval immediately preceding the break for teacher convention in June.

- e. Methods traditionally used to process classroom evaluations were followed. Students were not keyed to their participation in an experimental study.
 - f. Data for the first hypothesis was provided by randomly selecting three teachers and two class periods within each high school seminary. Each teacher selected had three groups formed from each of his two classes. Random processes were used to select the students for each group. The first group of students stayed with their teacher and received the assessment form from him. Students in groups two and three received their assessment forms from either a peer-teacher or an administrative supervisor. For purposes of simplicity, the procedures previously described will be defined as Part I.
 - g. Data for all other hypotheses came from the assessment forms which were distributed to students and teachers by the same administrative supervisors as in Part I. Again, for the purposes of simplicity, the procedures previously described will be defined as Part II.
9. Analysis of Variance formulas were used to test the hypotheses. Specific formulas involved a paired t-test and F-ratio using a one-way and two-way Analysis of Variance. The findings were considered significant at the .05 level. The statistical formulas were used to take into account the following independent variables:

- a. Different authority figures used to distribute the SAIS forms to students
 - b. Categories of teachers arranged by length of teaching experience
 - c. Class selection determined either through the teacher's choice or a random process
 - d. Paired assessments between teachers and their students using the TS-AIS and SAIS forms
 - e. Geographic distribution of assessments according to seminary district
10. The dependent variable was the results from student and teacher assessments as influenced by the independent variables.
 11. Both the student and the teacher assessment forms were printed so that a computer could tabulate the data.
 12. After the questionnaires were manually scanned for inappropriate marks and errors, they were taken to the BYU Testing Center. At the Testing Center, the results from the questionnaires were transferred to a tape for computer processing.
 13. Quantitative values were obtained through statistical computation. Weighted values were assigned to the response modes within each statement. The weighted values of 0, 1, 2, and 3 were used to compute individual student scores for each of the statements on the assessment forms. Statement means for each class were computed using the scores of all students within the class. Class means for each scale represented the

sum of the statement means within the scale. The combined class means represented the sum of the scale means.

14. Two computer programs were used to categorize and compute the statistical values from the data. The two programs used were Statistical Package for Social Sciences and Mermac.

Organization of the Remainder of Study

In the report of this study, the remaining chapters were arranged according to the following:

Chapter 2 contains a summary of the related literature prior to the beginning of the 1990s. In addition, the chapter contains a review covering the developments of teacher evaluation subsequent to the early 1990s.

Chapter 3 presents the methods used to investigate the stewardship of a released-time seminary teacher. Included in Chapter 3 are the development processes for the questionnaires, “Student Assessment in Seminary” and “Teacher Self-Assessment in Seminary”. The chapter concludes with the statistical and procedural guidelines used in administering the experimental and descriptive aspects of the study.

The findings from the data collected from the assessment questionnaires given to teachers and students are found in Chapter 4. The findings are reported in relation to each hypothesis. Chapter 5 contains a summary of the problems, procedures, and data along with conclusions and recommendations based on the findings.

Review of Related Literature

This study was commissioned by the LDS Church Educational System to produce original research and instruments for evaluation. It has acquired the characteristic of being a foundation study. Nevertheless, it has also utilized and built upon the work previously done by Richins (1993). Therefore, the review of literature is divided into two sections. Section one contains a summary of the literature and research on teacher evaluation that Richins (1993) had compiled prior to 1993. In the second section, the literature associated with the concept of evaluation was analyzed further, bringing into focus the trends of teacher evaluation that relate to the decade of the 1990s.

Teacher Evaluation Prior to the 90s

Richins (1993) used four categories to study the concept of teacher evaluation. These categories consisted of: (1) reasons for teacher evaluation, (2) problems encountered in teacher evaluation, (3) research designs employed in studies of teaching success and (4) use of student ratings in teacher evaluation.

Reasons for Teacher Evaluation

Research into teacher competence began before the 20th century. It came into prominence about 1910 and has been the source of much research since. However, little progress has been made to give operational definition to teacher effectiveness. (Richins, 1993)

Richins (1993) cited two reasons for teacher evaluation. The first dealt with the accountability of administration to make decisions relative to tenure, promotion, dismissal, assignment, and salary. These factors also contributed significantly to the threat teachers

felt from these evaluations. The second reason built upon teacher development and improved performance. Brighton and Rose (1985) suggested that the latter should be emphasized more. The New Jersey Education Association supported that feeling as they encouraged more stimulation from teacher evaluation, rather than defeatism. They also wanted to expand the base by utilizing colleagues, experts, and even individual teachers themselves to aid in the evaluation process.

Wagoner and O'Hanlou (1988) summarized much research by declaring that teachers who are doing favorably and can see a positive reward favor teacher evaluation. In contrast, teachers who were rated below average were not as favorable, although they may or may not experience a threat through the process. Brighton and Rose (1985) saw teacher rating as a process tool to achieve institutional goals, rather than an end in itself.

Problems of Teacher Evaluation

Richins (1993) cited the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development of the National Education Association which appointed a commission on teacher evaluation in 1988. The commission's report was typical of the resistance toward supervisor ratings that was found in the literature. Supervisor ratings were seen as undemocratic and a violation of the concept of human equality. The commission also reported that supervisor ratings did not help teachers work together to improve school environment. Measuring teacher effectiveness has continued to be elusive in part because it involves measuring human qualities which are difficult to reduce. Accordingly, because merit pay is based upon supervisor's ratings of teacher effectiveness, there has been much resistance to it. (Rogers, 1998 and Popham, 1991)

Barr (1981) stated that many different methods and styles can produce the same educational goals. What is effective for one may not be for another. The difficulty, according to Brighton and Rose (1985), in evaluating teacher effectiveness lay in establishing clearly defined criteria. Attempts to identify some have produced such elements as pupil progress, teacher traits, teacher performance and observable behavior of students.

Pupil progress has been the more ideal criterion for measurement, but has been found difficult to measure accurately. With pupil progress in mind, Walker (1985) in a Kappa Delta Pi publication, reported that a child's subject-matter achievement is more closely related to his own ability and previous record than any help from a teacher.

Other challenges compounding the problem of teacher evaluation dealt with developing instruments which yielded valid and reliable information. Beecher (1986) stated that the teacher's presence contaminated the response to the questionnaires administered. Howsan (1989) also dealt with the subjectivity as opposed to the desired objectivity within student feedback. Beecher (1989) claimed that this was reciprocated in the problem of teachers evaluating students and applying marks on grades.

Research Designs Employed in Studies of Teaching Success

There have been numerous studies to develop and validate research designs to help determine teaching success. Earlier studies looked at teacher failure rather than aiding teacher improvement. Beecher (1989) reported on the difficulty of predicting teaching ability based upon previous academic scholarship as well as practice teaching. Beecher's (1989) and Estes' (1984) research linked personality traits to teacher effectiveness. This helped establish what should be taught in college teacher preparation courses.

Beecher (1989) reported that students' estimates of teacher success were lower than mutual ratings from colleagues, or supervisors' ratings of the teacher. His research showed a disparity between these two sources for evaluating teaching success. Studies did show that pupil ratings of teachers were closely comparable to the ratings teachers gave themselves. (Thornock 1989; Nelson, Bicknell and Hedlund, 1986)

In 1979, The Ohio Teacher Record made a significant contribution to guide the measurement of teacher effectiveness from a narrow framework to dealing with the growth of the individual teacher. Other studies followed which supported this change of emphasis. (Nelson, Bicknell and Hedlund, 1986)

During the 1970s, a greater emphasis was directed toward the use of psychological theory and carefully planned measuring devices. Tuckman (1990) reported that psychometric sophistication of some instruments and methods was awkward and inefficient. To alleviate his dissatisfaction, he developed an instrument called the Student Perception of Teaching Style (SPOTS) which was offered for the efficient measurement of teacher effectiveness.

Richins (1993) stated that there was a need for further research on teacher competence. He cited Howsan (1980) who reported on the efforts by the National Board Association, the National Education Association Department of Classroom Teachers, and the American Association of School Administrators to further the research in this area. Later, developments came in 1991 from the California State Legislature to require the evaluation of all certified employees in the field of education.

Use of Student Ratings in Teacher Evaluation

According to an opinion poll conducted by Nation's Schools in October of 1990, school administrators didn't feel the teachers wanted student input into the evaluation process. The poll of the teachers did not support that feeling. (Nation's Schools, 1990)

Richins (1993) reported that teacher ratings by pupils revealed a high degree of reliability. He also reported that there was not a high correlation between evaluations made by teachers, administrators, students, and peers. Richins (1993) indicated that this may be due to different expectations on the part of these four groups.

Bledsoe (1991) reported that student ratings were reliable. Even though there may be some bias, student ratings were valuable sources of information concerning student reactions to the behavior of the teacher. Kolesnik (1990) felt that students see the teacher in action more often and know better than principals and supervisors how well they have been taught. Richins (1993) cited many supportive studies for the defense of student involvement in teacher evaluation.

Some concerns about student ratings focused on students' consistency and accuracy in observing and defining effective teaching. Thorndike and Hagen (1989) identified two factors that were significant variables in teacher ratings. The first was the rater's willingness to rate honestly and conscientiously. The second was the ability to rate consistently and correctly, even with the best intentions.

Another concern centered on the rating instrument as a means of collecting valid and reliable information. Howsan (1980) reported that when student ratings were found to be reliable they could also be considered valid since they gave an accurate measure of student opinion and not necessarily a measure of teacher competence.

Teacher Evaluation in the 90s

Introduction

“In order to find out what teaching is by observing someone doing it, we need to know what teaching is already.” This statement by Green (1991) forms the context in which the question and challenge of teacher evaluation in the 1990s is centered. Green quoted Plato making a similarly paradoxical point in one of his most familiar dialogues, *Meno*. There, Plato asked:

How is it ever possible to discover something new? For in order to discover something, I must know what it is that I am looking for; otherwise, I shall not know when I have found it. But if I already know what I am looking for, then I do not need to look; I already know it. The paradox rests on an obvious ambiguity in the word “know”, but it is nonetheless an important paradox since, as we shall see, it can be raised with respect to every philosophical question that we may wish to ask. (p. 3)

Smith (1991) indicated that in the 2500 years that the subject of teacher evaluation has been given attention, little progress has been achieved. “Despite all of our efforts, we apparently have no general accepted conceptual system, psychological or otherwise, by which either to formulate or to identify the skills of a teacher.” (p. 3) Later, Rosenshine and Furst (1993) added discouraging words to the research fire by stating that:

It is possible that the patterns of effective teaching for different ends are so idiosyncratic that they will never be isolated; it is possible that studying teaching in natural settings is unproductive because the settings are not functional for the desired outcomes. . . . At the moment there has not been enough research to make any firm statement about any of these concerns. (p. 175)

The National School Public Relations Association (NSPRA) (1994) in a report entitled, “Evaluating Teachers for Professional Growth” cited evidence that educational, governmental, and business interests have all joined the attempt to add additional information to the question of what teaching, as well as teacher evaluation, is all about.

The NSPRA (1994) report offered the following from the Belmont (California) School

District:

Evaluation is the process of making considered judgments concerning the professional accomplishments and competencies of all certified employees, based on a broad knowledge of the areas of performance involved, the characteristics of the situation of the individuals being evaluated, and the specific standards of performance pre-established for their positions.

Evaluation should promote awareness of the strengths and weaknesses of all certified personnel, provide for growth and improvement and encourage beneficial change. It is much broader than any single assessment technique or instrument, and it is a necessary function in maintaining a viable profession. Evaluation of personnel should be directed to the total educational process in order that children are able to develop to the best of their abilities. It should be constructive, fair and equitable. Communication between the evaluator and the evaluatee should be ongoing. (p. 5)

Wilson (1995) saw a cyclical occurrence of methods, ideas and definitions. He felt that teacher evaluation tended to be like clothes. Whatever is in vogue at the time is utilized extensively by those who are attempting to remain modern and current. He contended that if you stay around long enough the “hot” methods of today will probably recycle to be the new discovery of the future. He developed his idea further by stating that:

Each school district develops an evaluation process that is going to be most agreeable to the teachers, the administrative staff, the parents, the students, and the board of education. There is no perfect system. But whichever system is utilized, the purpose for which it is to be used should be clearly delineated and understood by all participants. (p. 4)

Emphasis of Teacher Evaluation in the 90s

A survey from the Education Research Service (ERS) (1998) entitled, “Evaluating Teacher Performance” indicated that 97.9 percent of the total number of responding school systems conducted some type of formal evaluation of teaching performance. The rationale for evaluations being performed during the 90s remained, according to the

literature, relatively constant. Two factors were still prevalent: accountability and teacher development. (Wilson, 1995; Herman 1993; Hadfield 1996)

These two factors have been the major focus of research. The NSPRA (1994) report identified that what was new in the school districts of the United States during the 90s was the intensive search for improved ways to evaluate and to standardize these ways. According to the report, impetus for these two movements came from two groups: (1) teachers who sought security from fair, objective standards of evaluation and (2) the public, on the other hand, who sought assurance that the tax dollar was well spent. The professional school administrator, acting as a middle man, had a sensitive role in seeing that the needs of both were met as adequately as possible while achieving the ultimate goal of everyone - improved education for children.

Basic to the rationale of teacher evaluation were the assumptions educators had as they approached the subject. Darland (1994) writing in the School Management Institute (SMI) publication entitled Teacher Evaluation Today offered these four assumptions: (1) the desire for personal improvement is universal; (2) public schools are better than they used to be; (3) there is a need for more educational reform; and (4) there are attempts within the country to undermine public education.

Hatfield (1994) in a paper published through the ERIC Clearinghouse added eight more assumptions which related to teacher evaluation:

1. Teacher characteristics do not correlate with success.
2. Evaluation is situational and does not have a fixed standard.
3. Evaluation of pupils to determine teacher success is questionable.
4. Some evidence indicates a teacher's performance declines after five years.
5. Teacher behavior is consistent and can be predicted.
6. Teacher behavior is observable.
7. Differences exist in teacher behavior.
8. There is not a good and a bad teacher in any sense. (p. 3)

Wilson (1995) saw two major purposes for teacher evaluation as the improvement of instruction and the documentation of inefficiency. Herman (1993) broadened the base for the rationale of teacher evaluation and suggested eight major reasons that all school districts should consider:

(1) improvement of performance, (2) motivating employees to more closely attain their potential, (3) letting the employee know what is expected of him, (4) providing input information for administrative decisions, (5) determining whether or not tenure is to be granted, (6) determining merit pay provisions, (7) differentiating staff assignments, and (8) deciding on the staff characteristics to be developed in terms of educational, experiential and other factors important to local staff balance. (p. 29)

In contrast, the ERS (1998) survey showed a study of school districts across the nation and issued—in order of rank—the results of teacher evaluations as being:

To help teachers improve their teaching performance; to decide on renewed appointment of probationary teachers; to recommend probationary teachers for tenure or continuing contract status; to recommend dismissal of unsatisfactory tenured or continuing contract teacher; to select teachers for promotion to supervisory or administrative positions; to qualify teachers for regular salary increments; to select teachers for special commendation; to select teachers for layoff during reduction in force; to qualify teachers for longevity pay increments; and to qualify teachers for merit pay increments. (p. vii)

A study by Zelnak and Snider (1994) pointed out that the perceptions of teachers about the evaluation process were important. The study compared the attitudes of teachers who believed the intent of evaluation was for administrative purposes with those of teachers who believed that the intent of evaluation was for the purpose of improving instruction. The study indicated, conclusively, that participating teachers who felt evaluation was for instructional purposes were supportive of evaluations. In contrast, teachers who felt that evaluation was for administrative purposes—dismissal, assignment

changes, the involvement of permanent record files, teacher tenure—viewed the process in a very negative manner.

Zelnak and Snider (1994) did not feel the results of this study were surprising. If teachers believed that the evaluation process would reduce their status or would be used in a detrimental manner to their job function, the likelihood of a negative reaction was predictable. They also felt that dedicated teachers, who really believed the principal's major goal was the improvement of instruction, would be more open to suggestions for changing their approach to instruction.

Teachers have argued a need to be more involved in the evaluative process. The NSPRA (1994) report supported that argument, indicating there is a growing trend to do just that. The ERS (1998) survey identified that one-third of the school districts in their recent studies required teachers to evaluate themselves. Other school districts suggested self-evaluation as an option and encouraged teachers to share the results with their principal.

There emerged, then, the faculty versus the administration versus the evaluation triangle. Teachers wanted evaluation to be “formative” (i.e. aimed at improving instruction). Administrators wanted that, but felt a need to be accountable to the public and students. This called for “summative” evaluation, supporting decisions on whether to retain or dismiss a teacher. This dilemma was summarized in the introductory questions to a task force report on personnel evaluation systems for the Davenport (Iowa) Community School District as printed in the NSPRA (1994) report.

1. What are the goals of an evaluating system?
2. Who will do the evaluating?
3. How will these evaluators be trained?
4. Who will develop an evaluation instrument?

5. How will evaluation results be used?
6. What kind of evaluation data is relevant?
7. What are the sources of evaluation data?
8. How many times will an employee be evaluated?
9. What are the appeal procedures if the employee disagrees with the evaluator?

G. E. Grube, principal of the Bergenfield (New Jersey) High School, was quoted in the NSPRA (1994) report as saying:

The critical points in evaluation appear to be (1) getting the staff to accept positive evaluation and (2) getting the staff to understand that classroom observation is but a small part of the overall process. To achieve either, the administrator must be personally committed to these points and not merely giving lip service to fairness, honesty, improvement, etc. (p. 7)

There was a growing trend during the 1990s to avoid single dimensional approaches to evaluation, whether it was student ratings only, or classroom observation only, or supervisor ratings only. Since then, the trends have moved toward a multi-dimensional approach, to give fairness and completeness to the picture of teacher evaluation and accountability. (ERS, 1998)

Who Should Evaluate?

Another major concern with teacher evaluation is the question of “who evaluates?” As previously stated, teachers are demanding more involvement. Students who are the object or product of the teaching process are coming into their own and establishing their place and rights in the process. This aspect will be developed in a later section on the use of student ratings. The superintendent, administrative heads, principals, assistant principals, department heads, colleagues, students, public or community interests, and finally the teachers themselves all add their names to the list. (ERS, 1998; NSPRA, 1994)

Traditionally, the responsibility has rested mainly upon the principal or direct supervisor, with, more recently, a small contribution from student feedback and from

teachers themselves. The process has been strengthened through colleague or peer evaluation as well. Each of these sources providing input and perspective into teacher evaluation have operational concerns for administrators.

The NSPRA (1994) report cited the Reynolds School District No. 7 in Multnomah County, Oregon:

The most important job of a principal is to assess the effectiveness of his teaching staff. This facet is infinitely more important than filling out forms, doing routine office jobs, serving on committees, making budgets and the like. It is felt that in order to make an honest appraisal of each teacher, one-half of each principal's time should be spent in the classroom. (p. 10)

Before the 80s, when there was not so much heard about accountability, the teacher evaluation task often assumed a discounted value, as was identified in a quote from the America School Board Journal (1994): "We didn't mind the old building principal's method of teacher evaluation because the rating forms didn't mean so much. They were stashed away in the teacher's files and never used to make book on 'bad' teachers." (p. 40)

During the 90s emphasis changed, with some principals reporting they spent up to 90% of their time performing functions related to evaluation, classroom visits, conferences, and inservice training, and many districts identifying teacher evaluation as the major duty of the principal. (NSPRA, 1994)

Accompanying the trend toward more teacher participation in their own evaluation was the involvement of teachers' peers in the process. Many teachers favored peer evaluation simply because they felt a fellow teacher was more competent to judge what transpired in the classroom than a supervisor who had "lost touch with the problems of the classroom." (Olds, 1993, p. 6) The NSPRA (1994) report identified some problems with

peer evaluation. A common problem was finding the time and money; another problem was training, which compounded the first two. Teachers needed to be released from their own classroom long enough to accomplish the process as well as to be trained to evaluate properly.

Another major problem identified was the reluctance of teachers to judge their fellow teachers. To alleviate some of these problems, Gordon, a research executive for the California Teacher Association, recommended a team approach to evaluation with the teacher, a peer, the principal, and if necessary, a subject specialist participating. (NSPRA, 1994)

A new, yet historically old aspect of the evaluation process involves the teacher himself or herself. Olds (1994) felt that the evaluatee's skill became the key skill in the evaluation process. It minimized the need for an evaluator. The summary of the NSPRA (1994) report concluded that many teacher groups felt that teacher evaluation in some form is here, will stay, and may expand. Therefore, if teachers wanted evaluation to be done right, according to their understanding, teachers had better be involved in it from the beginning to end. Teachers, according to the report, should be involved in shaping the policies, setting the goals, designing the instruments, and carrying out the procedures; and to this end, many associations were making teacher evaluation a negotiable item in contract bargaining.

Performance Aspects in Evaluation

In the mid 1990s, Armstrong developed a case for self-evaluation by discussing a new concept called "performance evaluation". (Armstrong, 1994)

New scientific management approaches such as Management by Objectives (MBO) and Planning Program and Budgeting Systems (PPBS), when properly conceived, have performance evaluation built into their designs. Olds (1993) stated that the essential components of MBO were (1) the setting of objectives, (2) some form of review of progress toward objectives, (3) some appropriate action, and (4) the setting of new objectives.

MBO may play many roles: planning, appraisal, determination of rewards, and increased motivation. With respect to the latter role, Reddin (1991) said, "If properly introduced, MBO has a high motivational content, especially if objectives are mutually set with superiors, if the superior is seen more as a coach and less as a judge, and if those who consistently perform well are ultimately rewarded." (p. 17)

Although it is not labeled as MBO, an example of this perspective in an educational setting is provided by Harclerod (1991):

Accreditation by this association (Northwest Association) is based on the institution's total strength and in particular upon the success of the institution and each of its constituent parts in formulating and accomplishing its specific objectives. The clarity of institutional objectives and the effectiveness of organization and operation in the attainment of these objectives are of chief concern in final appraisal. (p. 7)

Self-evaluation fits into this process. Olds (1993) felt that if individuals had primary responsibility for carrying out a given work teaching assignment, they then would have to be significantly involved in the evaluation process, especially if improved performance and development were to be achieved.

Redfern (1998), an advocate of Evaluation by Objectives, stated that it is a form of clinical supervision. He noted the following basic difference between what he called conventional evaluation and evaluation by objectives:

It is a means rather than an end in itself. It makes evaluation a positive rather than a negative experience. The role of the person being evaluated is elevated; feedback information becomes more useful in contributing to modification in current performance. Results are stressed more than activities. (p. 8)

The ERS report (1998) stated that the largest percentage (59.5%) of school districts used a prescribed checklist of performance standards for rating teachers at some point in the evaluation process. According to ERS (1998) surveys on teacher evaluation, there were approximately four times as many school districts in 1997 using evaluation by objectives (EBO) procedures as there were in 1992.

The ERS survey also summarized the research showing the advantages and disadvantages of using objectives to evaluate performance. Among the advantages were the following:

1. The method encourages evaluator and evaluatee to operate as a team and to concentrate on improvement.
2. Evaluator and evaluatee can focus on the procedures they are using, how they are functioning in leadership roles, and how they can concomitantly meet their goals and the goals of the school system.
3. Assessment of teacher effectiveness involves several types of evaluation, including self-evaluation and student evaluation.
4. There is less tendency for the personality of the teacher to become an issue.
5. A teacher involved in this process is more apt to realize he or she is the principal participant in his or her own development and is responsible for it.

Among the disadvantages were the following:

1. It has been difficult for teachers to identify and formulate realistic job targets.

2. PBO evaluations require a relatively long span of time to ascertain the gains students have made, while long time spans are not suitable for effective feedback.
3. The translation of outcomes into behavioral terms can simplify outcomes in such a way that learning is weakened.
4. Assessing teaching by student gains neglects other factors such as socio-cultural and school environments, administrative leadership, and budget constraints.
5. New skills and training for the effective utilization of this procedure are necessary. (p. 12)

Accountability and Evaluation

Accountability has been an ongoing evaluation problem. Early in the 1990s, Lessinger (1990) cited a demand by the public that professional educators be held responsible for the results they achieved. The traditional measures of success used by schools (resources employed, teachers available, and buildings provided) were no longer sufficient; the public wanted to know whether young people could read, could get and hold jobs, or could go as far in school as their abilities warranted. Accountability came to mean that persons working in the field of education should be answerable for such things. (Lessinger, 1990)

As professionals, teachers felt they should not be subject to any kind of reward-punishment structure imposed by society. Hayman and Napier (1995) pointed out a weakness in their argument. Although professionals should have a highly developed sense

of responsibility, they, like other mortals, were prone to lack objectivity in judging their own performance and deciding what their rewards should be.

They concluded that educators must be answerable to society. Acceptable conditions under which “accountability” was to become a reality were described in the following way by Hayman and Stenner (1991):

We take ‘accountability’ to be characterized by at least these features: (1) there must be specific products, outcomes, or intents which are clearly defined and accepted as responsibilities of the institutions or agents being held accountable; (2) there must be standards which define acceptable levels of performance relative to these products, outcomes, or intents; (3) there must be accepted and valid ways to determine the extent to which the products, outcomes, or intents have been achieved; and (4) there must be some reinforcement system - that is, an incentive-penalty mechanism - for rewarding the responsible agent if performance exceeds specifications and penalizing the responsible agent if performance falls below specifications. (p. 99)

Accountability was not centered upon the teacher’s performance only. The ERS (1998) survey showed many states were requiring that all professionals in education be held accountable for their performance. Some state legislatures passed accountability laws that, among other things, often mandated teacher evaluation. As of 1997, the twelve states with laws requiring evaluation of professional employees were California, Connecticut, Florida, Kansas, New Jersey, Oregon, South Dakota, Virginia, Idaho, Washington, North Carolina and Pennsylvania. (Education Commission of the States, 1997)

The Stull Act adopted by the California State Legislature in 1991 was one of the most extensive of such laws. The Stull Act required districts in California to evaluate all certificated employees at least every other year in terms of student achievement. The law stipulated that districts had to adopt written, uniform guidelines that provided: (1) standards of expected student progress; (2) evaluation of professional competence in

relation to these standards; (3) evaluation of related duties normally required; and (4) evaluation of the learning environment (i.e. is discipline maintained?). (NSPRA, 1994)

King and Jordon (1992), in an attempt to accommodate the legislative mandate in California, printed a booklet of suggestions with the following foreword:

The Stull Bill, a legislated mandate for the evaluation and assessment of the performance of certificated personnel of school districts in California, is looked upon with mixed feelings. Some see it as a threat - a way for school districts to get rid of undesired personnel. Some see it as just another unmanageable mandate which, if ignored, may go away. Some see it in a more positive way - as a guideline for possible improvement of the education made available to children.

Much work was accomplished because of these legislative mandates for accountability, and many people argued that the knowledge and information base of teacher evaluation was significantly increased. Superintendent Sellery, in speaking for Grossmont Union High School District in LaMes, California, listed three benefits coming from the Stull Bill:

(1) procedures to implement the act will be used only if they strengthen the teacher's role; (2) goals will be developed by subordinates and these goals will be the basis of mutual evaluation; (3) and the act required that success of the teacher be based on the success of the learner, and this principle would apply all the way up the supervisory ladder so that the success of the principal would be based on success of the teacher and success of the superintendent on success of the principal.

The Michigan Education Association in its booklet, "Teacher Evaluation: A Statement by Teachers", pointed out that teacher evaluation provided:

a continuous record which is the best long range protection against unjustified criticism. Teachers operate in a system which is characterized by great instability. Those administrators, teachers, and pupils of today are not likely to be available in five years. A continuous record, then, provides testimony as to the teacher's effectiveness, which may be necessary in a time of crisis. (NSPRA, 1994, p. 54)

Evaluation was seen as one of the keys to improved school operation, from the classroom level up. Hayman and Napier (1995) felt that what was needed, however, was a

different kind of evaluation than had been used in the past. For them evaluation had to be viewed as integral to the educational process at all levels, not as something that begins or ends with particular projects. Evaluation had to be viewed as something natural to organizational stability and growth. Evaluation must be seen as cutting across the entire learning spectrum, and it could not be confined solely to measuring performance on intellectual tasks, programs of curricular development, or teacher performance. Hayman and Napier argued that evaluation had to assume an educational climate that:

1. Fosters communication among peers and subordinates involving shared problems and the collaborative solution to them;
2. Reduces defensiveness among various levels of the educational system;
3. Facilitates a climate for natural change and growth within the organization;
and
4. Encourages self-appraisal and personal development in both academic and nonacademic pursuits. (p. 11)

Problems Encountered in Teacher Evaluation

According to Berliner (1996), “ostrichism” has been a common disease often afflicting education. Behavioral symptoms include the practice of sticking one’s head into the sand when problems appeared, in the hope that the problems would go away. One set of problems in evaluation was identified by Teilhet (1994). He cited a study of self-concept among white collar workers in California. At the bottom of the list of twenty-three groups, in concept of self, were public school teachers. There was a correlation that the higher the anxiety, the lower the concept of self; and the lower the anxiety, the higher

the concept of self. The immediate source of anxiety among public school teachers was a feeling of incompetence, which accounted for 90% of the anxiety.

This anxiety factor has been the source of many problems in evaluations. Teilhet (1994) stated that in most other quasi-professions, or white collar professions, the practitioners became excited when peers came to watch. In the public schools, people get wide-eyed and shaky in the hands with peers or other people observing them. He also suggested that there has been almost a pathological avoidance of admitting that teachers could make mistakes.

Berliner (1996) concluded that an important step in the systematic study of any phenomenon is the recognition of what problems existed in that research area. Addressing those problems, rather than assuming they would go away, or that they did not apply, would enhance the likelihood that studies of teacher effectiveness would be fruitful. He felt the problems with research in evaluation could be loosely grouped into three categories concerned with the instrumentation, methodology, and statistics used in studying how teachers affect the achievement of students.

Berliner (1995) felt that we must come to grips with the inadequacy of standardized tests, the unknown predictive validity of tests from special teaching units, the problem of building multi-variant outcome measures, the problems of measuring appropriateness of teacher behavior, the lack of experience in choosing an appropriate unit of analysis for describing teaching behavior, and the lack of stability of many teachers' behavior.

Further, he felt that we needed time to consider the problems of how student background affected measures of teacher effectiveness, what subject matters should be

examined and how normative standards and volunteer teachers affected what could be said about teachers and teaching. Continuing, he asked how individual students reacted to teaching skills, how students monitored and interpreted teachers' behavior in ways which may or may not coincide with how educational theorists interpreted the phenomenon and the need for time and resources to do constructive validation and studies of the generalizability of measures of teacher effectiveness. Berliner concluded by stating a need for guidance on what techniques to use for measuring changes in the achievement of students in natural classrooms:

When we have finished examining this potpourri of problems, issues, and concerns, we will be ready to begin the scientific study of teaching. And if we cannot deal with all of these problems, perhaps we should simply acknowledge that teaching is, after all, a very complex set of events which cannot be easily understood. (p. 15)

Glass (1994) represented many in the field by stating that we still don't have a clear understanding of the elements of teacher effectiveness. Polhemus (1995) indicated that for sixty years, educators have been concerned with assessing staff "effectiveness". He encouraged a change of emphasis to competence rather than staff effectiveness. He identified three basic ways of assessing teaching: (1) by using presage criteria (teacher characteristics); (2) by using product criteria (pupil gain); or (3) by using process criteria (teaching activities). He stated that teacher characteristics could be identified but they do not differentiate teaching acts.

Orlosky (1993) discussed factors that influenced the selection of competency criteria and pointed out the difficulty of preparing teachers to perform competently if those criteria were not specified. The NSPRA report (1994) combined its informational sources to produce six areas of attributes that were seen as common from district to district. They were: (1) teacher/pupil relationships; (2) classroom management and procedures; (3) staff

relationships; (4) community relationships; (5) professional attributes; and (6) professional growth.

The NSPRA (1994) report quoted the Michigan Education Association as they commented on the three environments in which teachers were often evaluated: community, institution and classroom. The Association took the position that:

The behavior of the teacher in the community environment was not an appropriate criterion for formal evaluation of teacher performance but the teacher's behavior in the institutional environment was subject to formal evaluation in terms of conformity to institutional regulations. (p. 12)

The Association recommended that in the classroom, the teacher's technical competence be assessed in terms of: planning and organizing in relation to stated goals, knowledge of the subject matter, methodology, classroom control, client relationships, and the management and the condition of the milieu.

The most thorough examination of the dimensions of teacher effectiveness was that of Hunter (1993). She broke down the teaching process into eleven discrete but interrelated components:

1. Deliberate separation of genuine educational constraints from the ethnic, financial, intellectual, or emotional excuses that constitute typical and acceptable excuses for learning failure.
2. Determination of what a student has already learned and what he or she is ready to learn.
3. Identification of productive learning behavior for achieving a particular learning task for a particular learner.
4. Determination of an instructional objective that is specific in context and perceivable in terms of learned behavior.
5. Identification of the principles of learning that are relevant to the accomplishment of the instructional objective.
6. Adaptation of those principles to the particular situation of each learner.
7. Incorporation of professional ethics as the teacher uses his or her attributes plus his or her competencies in the specific learning area in order to enhance the learner's probability of success.
8. Synthesis of decisions one through seven in the deliberate design or blueprint for a teaching - learning episode.

9. Teacher's observation of the learner in order to augment or correct the decision-making process.
10. Constant monitoring of the learner's progress to yield essential current information that may modify or validate the design for learning.
11. On the basis of evaluative data, teachers must decide whether to reteach, practice and extend, move on, or abandon ship if the objective is not appropriate for the learner at the time. (p. 21)

Polhemus (1998) added that student gain could be reassessed, but there was difficulty in knowing how much was a result of the teacher's efforts and how much was a result of variables the teacher couldn't control.

Thompson (1995) addressed the problems of communication in the evaluation of teachers by principals. She placed additional emphasis on the low frequency of principal evaluation and the associated teacher dissatisfaction. Teachers did not find the evaluation system helpful in providing guidance in their teaching tasks. Rather, teachers reported relative ignorance of the criteria and samples on which principals based their evaluation.

Thompson (1995) and her colleagues found, further, that the lower the frequency of communicated evaluations reported by the teacher, the more dissatisfied were the teachers and the less helpful were the evaluations in improving the quality of teaching. These results suggested that an increase in the frequency of evaluations would increase teacher satisfaction, increase the teachers' belief that evaluations could provide helpful guidance, and not be perceived as a threat to their professional autonomy.

The professional status of teachers has traditionally been an issue closely associated with teacher evaluation. Teachers desired recognition as professionals with a certain amount of freedom from being monitored. Teacher evaluation has often been considered a threat to teachers' ideas of professionalism. (Natriello, 1997)

Stemnock (1992) stated that teachers, as professionals, wanted freedom in their work and, therefore, did not want frequent evaluations. The author suggests that in the schools he studied, the evaluations were so infrequent that more frequent evaluations might have provided helpful guidance and probably would not have threatened autonomy.

Covert (1995) questioned teachers' desire for increased professionalism by exploring certain facets of the professional model that teachers might find unattractive. Among these were the threat of malpractice litigation, the responsibilities of a profession if entry into that profession were not controlled, the dominant position of the professional in relation to the client, and the shroud of secrecy accompanying professionalization.

Another problem associated with teacher evaluation was the financial aspect. Marcus (1995) identified that in competition for stable or shrinking resources, support tended to go to existing programs. Unless there was legislative mandating or other public pressures, financing for teacher evaluation programs might not be given high priority. Related to that was the fact that the adoption of a program of evaluation would require the education of administration and faculty so they could understand and administer the program. This was considered a costly process, in terms of money and time.

Another aspect to the resistance given by school administrators to their evaluative role was identified by Beckman (1994). He noted three concerns other than the financial aspect: (1) restrictions on time, (2) inadequate instruments and techniques, and (3) the humanizing de-emphasis with the quantification emphasis. He added the suggestion that teachers should be able to offer feedback to the administration in a non-threatening process.

Redfern (1994), as he looked to the future, identified other challenges that may enhance or negate advances that have been developed in teacher evaluation. In his article entitled “Looking Ahead”, he saw the following scenarios:

1. There will be more legal mandates for evaluation.
2. State Legislators will require evaluation but allow the profession to create the methodology.
3. Teachers and other personnel will operate in peer roles as evaluation plans are developed.
4. Collective bargaining will complicate the process.
5. Evaluation will become more comprehensive and total.
6. More creative approaches to evaluation will come from the professionals.
7. More positive acceptance of evaluation will come from teachers, administrators, associate leaders and board members. (p. 19)

While they conceded that the well-intentioned classroom teacher was constantly seeking more effective ways of doing his or her job, Hayman and Napier (1995) felt that certain problems were inevitable, such as:

1. People become comfortable with familiar behavior even when it is recognized as ineffective.
2. Changing familiar behavior may necessitate the expenditure of considerable energy in relatively unfamiliar areas.
3. Since people seldom voluntarily put themselves in a vulnerable position, and since any move toward new (untested) behavior (methods) presupposes some increased vulnerability, few people will subject themselves to the risks involved in experimenting with new methods or behaviors.
4. Since a move to new methods often suggests that previous approaches were in some way “wrong” or “inferior” (thus casting a negative reflection on the teacher), a positive, developmental attitude toward teaching (which legitimizes experimentation and attempts at new behavior) is rare.
5. Typically, the classroom is an island isolated from new ideas, where teachers do their own thing, seeking little from the outside. This situation may stem in part from the fact that supervision is often conducted from a perspective of (judgment) or evaluation rather than assistance and is seldom seen as helpful. The classroom becomes a source of refuge - a personal arena of influence and control. (p. 83)

Through further discussion, they felt that teachers who wanted to engage in self-improvement would have to be in a position to recognize and understand the discrepancy

that may exist between their actual behavior and their intended behavior. They would have to seek information that would either confirm or not confirm their own behavior in light of their goals and in light of what was best for their students. The author felt this self-appraisal could be based on three major questions. First, how does a teacher receive the most accurate account of what occurs in the classroom? Second, how does the teacher's behavior influence student performance in terms of explicit behavior? Finally, what possible alternatives in the teacher's own teaching strategies and personal behavior might lessen the existing discrepancies between actual and intended behavior and the resulting outcomes.

An important component in answering those questions was the role of the evaluator. Hayman and Napier looked at the evaluator's role as well as offering an overview of the problems involved in teacher evaluation in the following summary:

1. As evaluation is redefined and is conceived as an integral part of the overall educational process, the role of "evaluator" must also be redefined. The evaluator himself, as well as the people with whom he works, must have a clear understanding of this new role. The group with whom he works is likely to include all professionals in the school district.
2. Traditionally, evaluation has been perceived by school personnel as an imposition and, particularly in recent years, it has been resisted by many in both overt and covert ways.
3. In light of this resistance and the changing definition of evaluation, the evaluator must be much more understanding of the organization in which he is working and be responsive to present attitudes, past experiences, and current expectations.
4. Trust and rapport between the evaluator and those involved in evaluation should be developed, with special attention to issues of confidentiality and participative collaboration during both the developmental and ongoing phases of the evaluation process.
5. Participants in an evaluation should, as much as possible, be aware of the benefits that the evaluation will bring. Who is to receive what information should be made clear, as should the practical uses of the information.
6. It is critical that the evaluator consider such factors as the following before initiating the evaluation process:

- a. His role as resource figure helper, and facilitator rather than his role as interpreter, judge, or critic.
- b. The cost in time, energy, and risk to each participant.
- c. The issue of dissemination.
- d. The problem of focusing on manageable goals, which are likely to lead to meaningful data beneficial to the client population.
- e. The problem of whether data once generated will be used effectively, given the climate and current norms within the particular organization.
- f. Methods for reducing resistance to the evaluation process so that it can become a positive thrust for the organization. (p. 130)

This section concludes with one of the most sensitive issues involved in teacher evaluation: personnel assessment versus dismissal procedures. The NSPRA (1994) bulletin included the following statement issued by the Professional Practices Council, Florida Department of Education, which supported their belief that teacher evaluation should be kept separate from procedures to identify and dismiss incompetent personnel.

Clearly, it is neither realistic nor productive to use the vehicle of periodic personnel assessment as a means of increasing the list of persons who are identified as incompetent to perform in the classroom. Rather, it should be used as a means of reducing the list. The process of identifying and dealing with the suspected incompetent should be an entirely different process.

Identification of possible incompetents will come from a variety of other sources which will be more direct than the traditional global evaluation and more diffused than an in-service-related personnel assessment. Colleagues, parents, or students may complain; administrators may observe inefficiency or incapability which requires a close examination of an individual's performance. (p. 19)

If teacher evaluation is to remain accepted, productive and supported by the faculty and staff, dismissal procedures, tenure, merit pay and other anxiety-laden outcomes need to be clearly separated from teacher evaluation that promotes introspection and teacher development. (NSPRA, 1994)

Use of Student Ratings in Teacher Evaluation

During the 1990s, the phrase "client-centered" became popular for describing student participation in the teacher evaluation process. Client-centered referred to any

situation in which school personnel were evaluated by subordinates in addition to supervisors. Redfern stated in AASA's School Administrator (March, 1992) that "client-centered evaluation is exactly what the beating on the superintendent's door, that began in the sixties, is all about." He added:

The need to which client-centered evaluation responds is by now familiar. It is people's need for more involvement in controlling matters that affect their daily lives . . . The merit of client-centered evaluation is that it affords those who are served and led by professional school personnel a channel for direct, concrete participation in an administrative function that is vital to increasing the schools' productivity - evaluation. (p. 11)

Halberg (1995), after completing extensive research on the subject of student evaluation of teachers and administrators, listed four reasons why students' right to give feedback was strong and gaining a foothold in the evaluative process. (1) There has been a dramatic increase of its use; (2) A growing body of research and literature has begun to change early skepticism to widespread confidence in the ability of students, from the intermediate grades to graduate schools, to make reliable and valid judgments of teaching performance; (3) A nation-wide focus upon accountability - the public's right stemming from the sixties to require quality of product; (4) A somewhat negative aspect of the trend toward client-centered evaluation has emerged in attitudes of students toward teachers.

The ERS (1993) survey found that by the middle of 1993, nearly one out of four school districts surveyed had some form of student evaluation of teachers and that it was the more frequently used type of client-performed evaluation. A survey conducted by the National School Public Relation Association in 1994 yielded similar results.

Halberg (1995) cited Centra's research from the Educational Testing Services. Centra found much to recommend the practice of student evaluation, at least on the college level. He indicated that teachers who overrated themselves on their own self-

evaluation forms tended to modify their teaching styles after finding their students disagreed. He also stated that incorporating student ratings into faculty evaluation procedures could have a positive effect upon students. At least each student felt that he or she was helping the institution make important educational decisions. Centra characterized student evaluations as “no less trustworthy than other methods now available to assess teaching performance, and when combined with other methods, they probably contribute to a fair judgment.” (p. 5)

Centra’s statements were supported in a report on “Teacher Evaluation to Improve Learning” by the Ohio Commission on Public School Personnel Policies (March, 1992). According to the report, research indicated that informational feedback from students was an effective means of influencing teacher behavior. In fact, student feedback could sometimes be more effective in changing teacher behavior than supervisory feedback. An additional advantage of student evaluation was its availability to teachers whenever they wished to use it. Thus, evaluation could be an ongoing process and did not have to be dependent upon the assistance of a principal or supervisor.

According to Halbert (1995), the movement toward client-centered evaluation was, in part, satisfying the demand for action, the demand for answers, the demand for information, the demands for involvement from students, teachers, and the general public. Redfern (1993) recommended that no segment of the client community or the professional staff felt they were being denied a voice in assuring the performance of those in authority.

As increased validity has been accorded to student feedback, concerns have arisen over the process of interpreting the results of student ratings. What importance should be attached to a relatively low rating on a student attitude scale? Nadeau (1995), after an

extensive literature review involving 119 studies, formulated four statements on student ratings of instruction: (1) we must remember the basic definition of validity; (2) we must clarify what it is that a particular teacher is trying to do or proposes to do in a given classroom; (3) we must be clear about defining what we want to obtain from student ratings; and (4) we must make a greater effort to measure student performance as a result of or in spite of what the teacher intended to do and what actually was done.

Hayman and Napier (1995) recommended that if students felt their opinions were valued and would be used to improve a course or a teacher's behavior, they would be willing to complete a well-designed and meaningful evaluation instrument. The problem was that most evaluations were conducted at the end of the course. Evaluations were given when the students, whose opinions were being sought, no longer had a basis for comparing present or future methods, behavior, or content. The perfunctory nature of such evaluations and the belief that their results would not be used would certainly reduce their value for all concerned. For evaluations to be useful, Hayman and Napier (1995) recommended the following conditions should exist: (1) The teacher should have previously developed a climate of openness and trust within the classroom, and students should have perceived this effort on his or her part to improve what occurs in the classroom. (2) There should be more than one evaluation during the course of the school year. (3) The data gathered should be made public in the classroom and should be discussed in relation to possible alternatives. (4) Attempts should be made at altering present conditions and then measuring the degree to which the new approaches have had an impact.

Unless these conditions are realized, the chances are that students, regardless of their age and sophistication, will not take the evaluation seriously. Students are the recipients of teaching methods and they do have strong feelings about them. Under proper conditions, students could provide the interested teacher with an invaluable resource. Of course, potentially forthright and constructive replies may become punitive, and may be seen as immature, if students are frustrated in their efforts to communicate. (Hayman and Napier, 1995)

In a 1994 study of high school student evaluations of teachers, Eastridge (1996) stated that students generally ranked the following categories of instructional skills as important for successful teachers: teachers should be knowledgeable; should possess a sense of humor; should be tolerant with students; should be able to listen; should be interested in students as individuals; and should maintain a warm and friendly attitude. Three other studies cited by Eastridge (1996) indicated that high school teachers improved their evaluation ratings as a result of student feedback, while the opposite was true when teachers were evaluated by an authority figure.

The 1997 ERS study sought information on the extent to which students participated in the formal evaluation of teachers. A review of board policies, teacher contract clauses, evaluation procedures, and evaluation forms indicated that some schools suggested, or even required, that students evaluate teachers but added that the results were for the sole use of the teacher and would not become part of the permanent record.

Marshall (1991) explored reasons for students demanding the right to “grade” professors in his article “Reverse Grading”. He stated that:

By reciprocal justice, for example, if one side graded, so can the other. The two wrongs, however, instead of neutralizing each other, are compounded. The principles and errors are parallel, and consequences are as serious.

A second reason for the students' urge to criticize lies in their natural self-assurance. Today, if they consider the first few weeks of a course a bore, the teacher and subject never get a chance.

Youths' resentment of authority is another factor. Intrinsic in this resentment is a significant desire for retaliation. Teachers always please some students and irritate others.

A fourth reason for students rating their mentors is that they are now urged to do so. To ask an inexperienced student for his opinion is a flattering and appealing diversion, and administrative approval is always welcome.

Fifth, students may rationalize that appraisal is a moral duty. Occasionally a new idea is effective, of course, but taking criticisms literally, though commonly done, is exceedingly hazardous. However, the relief students feel when they have a chance to speak out may be mildly beneficial. (p. 7)

Jacobsen (1993), a Wisconsin teacher of English and social studies, recommended in her article, "Should Students Evaluate Teachers?", that students should become involved if: (1) a mutual feeling of trust has been developed between students and teacher; (2) such information is used solely for the improvement of instruction and not for determining salary, tenure, or promotion; (3) the evaluation instrument is cooperatively developed or agreed upon by teacher and students; (4) findings are discussed with students and with others at the teacher's discretion.

Summary

The complexities in the field of teacher evaluation were as real and as involved in the decade of the 90s as they were beforehand. Educational, governmental and business interests joined the effort to establish a more concrete and enduring knowledge base of the subject.

Teacher evaluation seemed to follow cycles as current thinking took backstage to new approaches and methods. In actuality, some were often rebirths of methods used years before.

Most school systems throughout the United States and Canada had done some type of formal teacher evaluation process. Among the eight to ten most frequently stated reasons and objectives for this process, two were dominant and usually specified as most critical: administrative accountability and aiding positive teacher development.

The research literature compiled during the 1990s provided depth to the evaluative elements already being analyzed rather than expanding the breadth of the subject. Teachers were asserting themselves more in being responsibly involved in their own evaluative process.

Teachers were looking at their formative needs (i.e. aimed at improving instruction and personal performance) in being considered and fulfilled through the evaluative process. Administration recognized that, but extended evaluation to help fulfill their own summative needs, also. When the two were inappropriately brought together, conflict and anxiety often resulted.

The trend, using single dimensions to give summative conclusions to teaching effectiveness, was reversed. The movement of the 1990s showed multi-variant approaches and methods to yield more complete scenarios of teaching effectiveness.

The supervisor maintained a dominant position in the evaluative process. Other input such as self-assessment, peer-teacher and student assessment, as well as the opinions of specialists, all were added to the list of sources of valid and informative feedback.

As an aid to increasing teacher performance, the use of objectives became popular. This trend was developed through such methodologies as Management by Objective (MBO), Planning Program and Budgeting Systems (PPBS) and Evaluation by Objective

(EBO). As with most methodologies, they were replete with potential advantages and disadvantages.

During the 1990s, the concept of accountability achieved dominant status. It was manifested in education in the form of greater expectations and demands by the public upon the appropriated tax dollar. It also prompted legislative mandates, such as the Stull Act in California, which initiated the development of performance standards centered on various levels of personnel. Many of the positive results of these mandates remained to be determined. One positive view reminded teachers that in order for their good performances to be used later as evidence to support their cause, they had to be documented.

Some educators approached the problems of teacher evaluation like the proverbial ostrich, hoping that they would dissolve or disappear on their own. One of the problems dealt with self-concept among public school teachers which related to the anxieties involved in the evaluation process. Other problems researched in the 1990s included some associated with valid and effective instrumentation; unclear definitions as to what successful teaching is; conflicts stemming from who evaluates the teacher and how the data is used; ineffective communication skills, lack of awareness on the teacher's part for the basis or elements of evaluation; teacher's desire for academic freedom and professional status, financial constraints associated with time and human resource restrictions without additional funding; inherent resistance to change and opening up teachers to analysis which assumes some degree of personal failure.

Probably the most sensitive issue involved in teacher evaluation was the personnel assessment versus dismissal procedures. It has been a most clearly stated conclusion of the

research that the two procedures should be kept separate. If the teacher evaluation process was to remain accepted, productive and supported by the faculty and staff, dismissal procedures, tenure, merit pay, and other anxiety laden outcomes needed to be clearly separated from teacher evaluation designed to promote introspection and teacher development.

The difficulties inherent in the complexities of the teaching process have always made it difficult to carry out effective and revealing research. For example, while a great deal of work has been done in trying to relate pupil gains with teaching effectiveness, it has remained hard to determine how much of the gain made by pupils is a result of the performance of the teacher in comparison to other situational components. In sum, it has been very difficult for researchers to tie down the required skills necessary to distinguish good versus bad teaching. Most studies have seemed to end with a final recommendation, “more research is needed”.

“Client-centered” evaluation became a popular term in the past decade. It was characterized by the students having more and more input and control over teachers who taught them. The research has shown a rising popularity for student ratings. Four reasons seemed to be repeated as to why students felt they had a right to give feedback: there has been a dramatic increase of its use; a growing body of research and literature has begun to change early skepticism to widespread confidence in the ability of students to make reliable and valid judgments of teaching performance; a nation-wide focus on accountability; and a somewhat negative aspect of the trend in attitudes of students toward teachers which could possibly be relieved if they felt they had a voice.

A strong majority of Canada's and the United States' school districts were reported to be using some form of student evaluations. Student feedback was viewed as having more impact than supervisory critiques to initiate teacher change. Another advantage was its availability. Teachers did not have to be dependent upon the assistance of a principal to administer evaluation forms.

Still, there were and there continue to be problems involved with student feedback. There is still a lack of certainty over what importance should be placed upon low or high ratings. As well, if students feel their opinions will not be used or considered, they will not take the time to give thoughtful or accurate information. In addition, a general conclusion is that teachers, who have not developed the proper climate in class, will have difficulty making the data public to students so that possible alternatives can be considered.

Appropriate uses of student feedback has given students a sense of having "a voice" and given them cause for providing accurate and reliable input. Teachers are being increasingly encouraged to use student input and bring the results to the attention of the students so that open and honest discussion can take place and effective change on both sides can be initiated.

Methodology

Investigation into the Seminary Teacher's Stewardship

The investigation into the role of the released-time seminary teacher was based upon talks and directives of Church and seminary authorities. The only talks or directives considered for analysis were those which related to the teacher's role or gave expectation of that role. Thirty-one documents were selected from among the sources available through local seminaries and the seminary department in the LDS Church offices.

As each document was read, a list was made of those statements or concepts relating to the teacher's assignment which the author stressed as being sine qua non in importance. To improve content validity, a frequency distribution was made to determine the number of times each statement or concept was cited. Further, a heavier weighting was assigned to the expression of administrative heads of the LDS Church, Church Educational System and the Department of Seminaries and Institute.

Adding perspective to the teacher's role, informal interviews were conducted from among contacts made with seminary teachers during the 2001 spring semester and with teachers in the Canada Central Area during the 2000-01 school year. The interviews appraised teachers' knowledge of their own role expectation and how that knowledge developed. One of the recommendations made from this study resulted from the interviewing experience.

The completed list identifying teacher expectations was distributed to the LDS Church Commissioner of Education, the Director of Reports and Records in the seminary department and the Area Director for the Canada Central Area. In addition, teachers in

Southern Alberta seminaries were given copies of the list. Each individual was asked to offer comments or make recommendations on ways to improve the document. The returned documents were directed toward simplifying and condensing the material, where possible.

Development of the Student Assessment Questionnaire

One of the ways in which teachers receive emphasis to the classroom aspect of their seminary stewardship is through department sponsored paper and pencil assessments. Each definitive statement conveys a value that the seminary department places upon that concept. Every time seminary classes are evaluated through the use of assessment instruments, both teachers and students are reminded of departmental expectations involving the classroom experience.

Statement Selection

The statements comprising the student questionnaire used in this study were selected as being representative of those expectations which are relevant to the classroom experience. A panel composed of five teachers and one coordinator was used to select and refine the statements into a final copy.

Before the form was printed in final form, a test to determine whether students have difficulty reading through and understanding the contents was made through a pilot review. The form was administered to approximately 200 students from the Calgary seminaries. Students selected were from grades nine through twelve. Through reading each statement, they indicated whether the statement was clearly understood, not clearly understood, or contained words which they did not understand. If the latter was marked,

students underlined the specific words they were unsure of. Following an analysis of their responses, eight of the thirty-four statements were reworded.

Approximately 50 percent of the pilot group indicated they clearly understood each statement. 30 percent of the students marked one to four statements they felt were unclear. All of the statements identified by this group were reworded for the final form. Each student in the remaining 20 percent identified an average of fifteen statements with which they had difficulty. Students in the third group generally displayed reading difficulties with high school level materials.

Questionnaire Scales

In the review of literature, three categories upon which to base classroom assessments were identified. The first category contained presage criteria or characteristics of the teacher. The second category consisted of product criteria or gains made by students which were a result of their classroom experience. Process criteria made up the third category. They related to the teaching and learning environment operating within the classroom. (Polhemus, 1995)

The statements selected for the student questionnaire were placed into one of the three categories identified. Each category was identified as a separate scale within the final instrument. Five additional statements were added to make a fourth scale called student status. Four of the five additional statements assessed factors outside the classroom experience and were taken directly from the SES instrument. According to Richins (1993), who developed the SES form and used it in making classroom evaluations, the four statements retained from the SES produced feedback which was “reliable and important to consider when evaluating within the classroom” (from notes taken during interviews with

Richins in 2000). The fifth statement was added to provide students with an opportunity to assess the amount of positive effort they had expended in class to insure a good seminary experience. Included in Scale IV were two statements added for demographic purposes.

Scale I consisted of eleven descriptive statements assessing the classroom learning environment. The eleven statements were preceded by the phrase, "in this seminary class", to give continual reference to the student's classroom experience. The eleven statements in Scale I are: In this seminary class:

1. we have a feeling of friendship among our class members.
2. we feel comfortable in expressing personal feelings.
3. we are encouraged to set and work toward worthwhile goals.
4. our devotionals leave us with good feelings.
5. we have learning activities which keep us involved and hold our interest.
6. students have some choice in how they earn their grade.
7. our student leaders help us enjoy seminary.
8. our time is spent studying the scriptures.
9. our tests are used to help us learn.
10. we are expected to attend and be on time.
11. we have enjoyable and stimulating classroom experiences.

Scale II contained ten descriptive statements, listing various aspects of the teacher's style, quality and effectiveness. The ten statements were preceded by the phrase, "our teacher", which directed the reader's attention to their teacher. The ten statements in Scale II are: Our teacher:

12. takes into consideration the needs and feelings of the students.
13. recognizes me as an important individual and values my ideas.
14. makes us feel responsible for our behavior and classroom experience.
15. goes the second-mile to help students have success experiences in seminary.
16. reaches out to those who are not positive toward their seminary experience.
17. explains things so we can clearly understand him/her.
18. helps create a spiritual feeling in class.
19. handles classroom conflicts without creating negative feelings.
20. enjoys his/her teaching experience with us.
21. has a way of teaching that I enjoy.

The six descriptive statements in Scale III were used to examine the progress or growth factor of the student which resulted from interactions with the teacher, other students and classroom activities. The statements in Scale III were preceded by the introductory phrase, “because of experiences in this class”. The six statements in Scale III are: Because of experiences in this class:

22. I am developing better feelings about myself.
23. I am receiving help with personal problems I may have.
24. I am reading, marking and studying the scriptures.
25. I am gaining greater faith and love for the Savior.
26. I am learning how to apply the scriptures to my personal life.
27. I am recognizing the warm feelings of the spirit.

Scale IV contained five descriptive statements with two demographic statements relating to year in school and gender. Scale IV had no introductory phrase. The seven statements of Scale IV are:

28. I enjoy my classroom experience at the high school (or jr. high school).
29. My feelings concerning seminary before enrolling in this class were good.
30. I attend my church meetings.
31. I want religion to be an important part of my life.
32. I have put forth an honest effort to have a good seminary experience.
33. My year in school.
34. My sex.

Statements were placed on the questionnaire form so that students would read each statement within the context of the scale criteria. Studies reported by various researchers (Jacobsen, 1993; Hayman and Napier, 1995; Richins, 1993) indicated that student ratings were found to be both valid and reliable under certain conditions. Students desired a voice within the processes of teacher selection. Students were responsive to evaluations if the findings were discussed with them. Responsive feedback came from students if there appeared to be adequate time left in the school schedule to initiate recommended changes. Placing the statements within each of their respective scales also accommodated immediate analysis. Using the questionnaire format, teachers could visually scan through the forms to analyze student assessments within the criteria of each scale.

Positively Keyed Statements

One of the criticisms of the SES which Sudweeks (1999) identified was the minimal number of negatively keyed statements. Sudweeks felt that “coordinators wanted

to provide teachers with opportunities to obtain feedback regarding strengths and weaknesses.” (p. 8) A concern for negative statements was their impact upon teacher’s self-concept. The study cited earlier by Teilhet (1994), identified a concern with self-concept and anxiety among public school teachers. According to Teilhet, the immediate source of anxiety among the teachers was a feeling of incompetence, accounting for 90 percent of the anxiety.

Felker, as reported in a study on leadership by Zollinger (1999), discussed the development of self-concept in his book entitled, “Building Positive Self-Concept”.

Zollinger summarized Felker’s book and offered this concluding statement:

The central assumption of this book has been that it is good. . . to have a positive view of (ourselves) . . . This positive view of self forms the platform upon which other positive learning experiences can be built. It is important for each individual to secure valid feedback within their environment which serves to strengthen their self-esteem. Strong feelings of worth or self-esteem enable individuals to approach their failings and inadequacies with greater confidence to initiate constructive change. (p. 28)

Several researchers (Herman, 1993; Olds, 1994; Redfern, 1998;) felt that teachers were supportive of the evaluation process if it supported them as teachers and improved their teaching performance. Zelnak and Snider (1994) pointed out that perceptions of teachers about the evaluation process were important. Hayman and Napier (1995) contended that teacher evaluation should reduce defensiveness between the teacher and the evaluation process. Evaluation should encourage self-appraisal and foster communication.

The purpose of the study reported, herein, did not investigate the implications of negative feedback upon teachers’ attitudes toward being evaluated. However, it was necessary to determine the direction of the profile for the statements used on the SAIS

form. The sources, previously cited, provided insight into the decision to positively key each statement. The exclusion of negative statements on the assessment form provided a positive profile throughout the assessment process.

Processes exist that can be used to gather negative aspects of the teacher or classroom. One process utilizes the supervisor who acts as an observer within the classroom. Negative traits, which may be observed, can be discussed realistically and within an appropriate context. Another process utilizes open-ended questions. Through written response, students are able to identify specific factors they feel negative or even positive about. The negative traits identified can be assessed using the perspective of the student. Frequent mention of a negative trait within the classroom evaluation would provide a source of concern. The concern for traits, identified solely by individual students, would not carry the same emphasis. Open-ended questions can be used and responded to on the back of formal assessment forms such as the SAIS, or they can be used independently of them.

Response Mode

The method used to obtain student assessments on each statement of the SAIS was designed to be simple and easy to use, yet provide a range of reaction or feeling to each statement. Four whole numbers were used to indicate a low to high assessment of the stated trait or quality. One indicated, not an absence of the quality, but the lowest rating in terms of relationship. Four was associated with the highest assessment which could be given. The numbers two and three represented points in between, to determine values greater than one and less than four.

Statements yielding mid to high assessment were intended to support the confidence of the teacher. Statements yielding low assessment provided, in a positive profile, personal or classroom characteristics needing emphasis or introspection. Statement, scale, and composite means scores for student responses within the class, were obtained by using the weighted values of 0, 1, 2, and 3 respectively. The weighted values produced a range of means with a possible low mean of zero. Scale mean scores were the sum of the statement means within each scale. Composite means score was the sum of the scale means.

Establishing Norms

Richins (1993) did an empirical study of the SES. A purpose of his study was to establish norms for interpreting the various scales. Whenever standard scores are the product of evaluation, there is the possibility that the distribution of average assessments for all teachers possess characteristics of a normal curve. SAIS scores and means obtained from further studies could be used to establish norms. However, the value of making comparisons between individual teachers to the characteristics of the normal curve needs to be carefully considered.

As has been reported herein, teachers are supportive of evaluation if the process encourages self-appraisal, communication and helps them improve their teaching performance. Teachers desire positive and successful experiences for each of their students within their classroom. The data from the SAIS forms can help teachers determine to what extent students are having those kinds of positive experiences. Although comparative norms can be an aid to analysis, they can also complicate the

analysis process and detract from specific classroom conditions which should receive more attention.

Teacher Assessment Form: "Teacher
Self-Assessment in Seminary"
TS-AIS

The TS-AIS form was developed so that teachers could formalize their own classroom assessment. The teacher form, TS-AIS, was a direct extension from the student form, SAIS. With the use of the student form for comparison, teachers can determine congruence between their own and to their students' perceptions. All of the scales and statements from the SAIS form were used with the exception of the last two demographic statements. The statements were reworded so that teachers could use their own frame of reference to assess teacher characteristics, the classroom learning environment and how they viewed student development within their classes. Statements from Scale IV assessed the degree to which teachers were aware of student factors extraneous to the classroom setting.

The TS-AIS summary form was developed so that the data from the SAIS and the TS-AIS forms could be combined for analysis without using the services of a computer. The summary form is included even though the data contained herein was computer processed.

Procedures Implementing
Statistical Analysis

To aid in processing and tabulating all of the results, a blank BYU computer form was obtained. The SAIS and the TS-AIS formats were printed onto the BYU forms. All of the results from the questionnaires were transferred to a magnetic computer tape. Because of problems with decoding, the information on the tape was transferred to IBM computer

cards at the LDS Central Computer Center in Salt Lake City. Through the facilities of the BYU Computer Services, the card deck was processed and statistical values were computed and used in analysis.

Codes to identify individual teachers and classes were developed so that computer identification was possible. Each teacher within the two seminary districts was assigned a three-digit identification number. Three additional numbers were added to the first three digits in order to discriminate the independent variables described in the research procedures found in Chapter 1.

The two statistical systems used to tabulate the data through the IBM computer were Statistical Package for Social Science and Mermac. The Mermac system was also used to clean and sort the data by eliminating scores which had come from any questionnaire having incorrect marks or codings.

Findings

Stewardship Expectations of LDS Released-Time Seminary Teachers

Through the methods describe in Chapter 3, a formal description of the stewardship expectations of released-time seminary teachers was developed. The following description represents a synthesis of talks and directives from LDS Church and seminary authorities which addressed the teacher's role within the seminary system.

Released-time seminary teachers are expected to:

1. Have an established personal relationship with Heavenly Father and His Son, Jesus Christ.
2. Bear a vibrant testimony of the Restoration and the significance of prophets, both historical as well as living.
3. Be loyal to the teachings of the living prophets and church leaders at all levels.
4. Have a successful marriage and family life (if single, be attitudinally inclined toward the same).
5. Be worthy of a temple recommend and maintain the endorsement of spiritual worthiness from ecclesiastical leaders.
6. Possess moral courage and integrity. Be honest in all dealings and a wise steward of talents and personal property. Possess intellectual courage to affirm eternal principles which may not be in harmony with worldly philosophies.

7. Be able to communicate effectively the truths of the gospel and personal expressions.
8. Continually increase in an understanding of the gospel and the historical context of the scriptures.
9. Exemplify the Savior's way through Christian living. Maintain congruence between what is said and what is done.
10. Be receptive to and teach with the spirit.
11. Assist the home in cultivating and nourishing the divine nature of the youth of the church.
12. Work to be fully productive during the number of hours each day which are required on the job. Be willing to go the second mile in time and effort when special results are desired.
13. Possess personal characteristics which enhance positive rapport with students, teachers and associates.
14. Be observed as being:
 - a. an energetic person of faith, character and integrity
 - b. young in feeling and flexible
 - c. someone to respect and admire
 - d. well-rounded and balanced in life
 - e. positive and enjoyable to be around
 - f. someone who enhances the dignity and self-worth of others
 - g. friendly and appropriately interested in others
 - h. well-groomed with a neat appearance

- i. someone who retains individual accountability
 - j. a wise counselor
 - k. understanding and sympathetic to the nature and needs of youth
 - l. a true friend of education
15. Establish a learning environment that:
- a. builds a bridge between the youth and the truths of the gospel of Jesus Christ
 - b. nurtures active, intelligent, independent and covenant-making Latter-day Saints
 - c. settles the youth toward their faith in Jesus Christ
 - d. assists them in making constructive progress in life
 - e. increases their commitment toward their covenants
 - f. develops positive goal-setting and achieving behaviour
 - g. encourages individual ownership and accountability for personal attitudes and behaviour
 - h. utilizes variety, stimulates interest and participation
 - i. encourages serious study and contemplation of the gospel
 - j. utilizes evaluative techniques to determine teaching and learning effectiveness
 - k. maintains proper classroom attendance and punctuality

- l. produces a minimal number of students who transfer, withdraw or end their participation in LDS educational programs
16. Center Classroom activities around the scriptures so that:
 - a. students open and use their scriptures most everyday
 - b. students are motivated to read on their own in addition to studying the scriptures in class
 - c. students become familiar with the basic 100 scriptures as well as other significant passages
 - d. an understanding will develop and application will follow
 - e. students will gain an ability to teach others the gospel using their knowledge of the scriptures
17. Follow the approved course outline to teach the basic doctrines and objectives as approved by the Church Board of Education.
18. Teach content as well as feeling, giving students a balance between the cognitive and the affective domain.
19. Understand, accept, and promulgate all aspects of the Church Educational System.
20. Work continually in recruiting efforts.
21. Assist in training and developing teachers for professional or priesthood assigned teaching service.
22. Serve in ecclesiastical assignments with enthusiasm and dedication.

23. Work to become an effective and efficient supervisor, administrator and teacher who edifies and exemplifies obedience to the commandments.
24. Pay special attention to administrative details (i.e. student records, seminary reports and special assignments).
25. Promote positive public relationships.
26. Maintain an attractive private office and build a personal library from resources collected through a developing growing edge.
27. Participate in a physical fitness program which contributes to physical and emotional stamina and alertness.

Data Relating to the Research Hypotheses

The data collected from the procedures defined as Part I and Part II are reported to test the hypotheses. The subjects for Part I were 1443 students from forty-six classes. Students from each of the forty-six classes were divided into three test groups. The data for testing the first hypothesis came from Part I. In Part II, there were sixty teachers and 2639 students from 118 classes. The remaining hypotheses were tested from data collected in Part II. Number distributions are depicted in Table 1.

Hypothesis One

There is no significant difference in the assessments given by students on the factors of learning environment, teacher characteristics, student development and student status when rating forms are administered by either a supervisor, a peer-teacher or a teacher to his own classes. From Tables 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, the scale mean assessments of each test group using either the classroom teacher, or peer-teacher, or a supervisor to distribute the rating forms were Scale I: 23.11, 22.94, 22.73 - Scale II: 24.32, 23.47,

Table 1			
Numbers of Students, Teachers and Classes: LDS Seminary Teacher Assessment Study 2001			
Categories	Part I	Part II	Combined
Students	1443	2639	4082
Teachers	-----	60	60
Classes	46	118	164

Table 2

Scale I Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments
As Influenced by the Type of Authority Figure to Distribute
Assessment Forms to Students: LDS Seminary Teacher
Assessment Study 2001

Source	N	Mean	df	MS	F	P
Authority Figure						
Teacher	485	23.11				
Peer-Teacher	476	22.99				
Supervisor	477	22.73				
Combined	1438	22.95				
Between Groups			2	23.28		
Within Groups			1437	28.44		
					.819	NS

Scale I: Classroom Learning Environment

Table 3						
Scale II Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments As Influenced by the Type of Authority Figure to Distribute Assessment Forms to Students: LDS Seminary Teacher Assessment Study 2001						
Source	N	Mean	df	MS	F	P
Authority Figure						
Teacher	485	24.32				
Peer-Teacher	476	23.47				
Supervisor	477	23.46				
Combined	1440	23.76				
Between Groups			2	79.02		
Within Groups			1436	33.71		
					2.34	NS

Scale II: Teacher Characteristics

Table 4

Scale III Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments
As Influenced by the Type of Authority Figure to Distribute
Assessment Forms to Students: LDS Seminary Teacher
Assessment Study 2001

Source	N	Mean	df	MS	F	P
Authority Figure						
Teacher	484	11.85				
Peer-Teacher	472	11.70				
Supervisor	474	11.65				
Combined	1432	11.74				
Between Groups			2	6.84		
Within Groups			1428	16.67		
					.41	NS

Scale III: Student Development

Table 5						
Scale IV Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments As Influenced by the Type of Authority Figure to Distribute Assessment Forms to Students: LDS Seminary Teacher Assessment Study 2001						
Source	N	Mean	df	MS	F	P
Authority Figure						
Teacher	485	11.86				
Peer-Teacher	474	11.75				
Supervisor	477	11.64				
Combined	1438	11.75				
Between Groups			2	6.0		
Within Groups			1434	7.15		
					.84	NS

Scale IV: Student Status

Table 6

Composite Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments
As Influenced by the Type of Authority Figure to Distribute
Assessment Forms to Students: LDS Seminary Teacher
Assessment Study 2001

Source	N	Mean	df	MS	F	P
Authority Figure						
Teacher	485	71.13				
Peer-Teacher	477	69.62				
Supervisor	478	69.32				
Combined	1442	70.04				
Between Groups			2	356.11		
Within Groups			1438	243.03		
					1.47	NS

23.46 - Scale III: 11.85, 11.70, 11.65 - Scale IV: 11.86, 11.75, 11.64 and Composite: 71.13, 69.62 and 69.32. Table 6 contained the data from a composite of all the scales.

The F-ratios from each of the four scales and the composite of .819, 2.34, .41, .84 and 1.47 indicated that the variance within each of the three experimental groups of students compared to the variance between each test group was not statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence. Scale I, II, III, and IV represented the four factors defined in the first hypothesis.

Hypothesis Two

Classroom assessments made by teachers will not differ significantly from the assessments made by the teacher's students on the factors of learning environment, teacher characteristics, student development and student status. Table 7 shows the means between TS-AIS (teacher) and SAIS (class) assessments with average deviation (d) and t-ratios for each scale with additional supporting data.

Scale I assessed Classroom Learning Environment and yielded an averaged deviation of .6 between teacher and class means assessments. The t-ratio of 1.67 was significant at the .05 level. Scale II assessing Teacher Characteristics did not yield a significant t-ratio. Student Development from Scale III produced an average deviation of .822 and a t-ratio of 3.43 which was significant at the .01 level of confidence. The fourth scale assessing Student Status also produced a statistically significant t-ratio of 9.85 at the .01 level of confidence with an average deviation factor of 1.675. Considering the difference between teacher and classroom assessments on Scales I, III, and IV, the t-ratios of 1.67, 3.43 and 9.85 were found statistically significant. The difference in the assessments from Scale IV was not found to be statistically significant.

Table 7
 Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance (paired t-test) between SAIS and
 TS-AIS Assessments: LDS Seminary Teacher Assessment Study 2001

Source	Means		- d	SD	t-ratio	P
	TS-AIS (Teachers)	SAIS (Class)				
Scale I: Classroom Learning Environment	25.3	24.2	.6	3.98	1.67	.05
Scale II: Teacher Characteristics	24.7	24.8	.197	3.71	.58	NS
Scale III: Student Development	13.4	12.5	.822	2.62	3.43	.01
Scale IV: Student Status	10.4	12.0	1.675	1.99	9.85	.01
SAIS Composite	73.8	73.5	.51	9.87	5.56	.01
Teacher N = 118 Class N = 118 Student N = 2639						

Hypothesis Three

The difference between assessments made by teachers and the assessments made by the teachers' students will not differ significantly across the three categories of teaching experience or between seminary districts. The data contained in Table 8 indicated that the deviation means between the teachers and the class assessments grouped according to the three categories of one to three years, four to nine years, and ten or more years of teaching experience were .12, -.07 and .26 respectively. The deviations were a result of the combined deviations from the two seminary districts. The negative sign indicated that on the raw data, the teacher's assessment was lower than the class mean assessment. F-ratios from between levels of teaching experience and district by teaching experience interaction were not statistically significant. The assessments between the two districts yielded an F-ratio of 22.35 which was significant at the .01 level of confidence.

Hypothesis Four

The assessments obtained from students on the factors of learning environment, teacher characteristics, student development and student status who are taught by teachers with varying lengths of teaching experience will not differ significantly. From Tables 9, 10, 11, and 12, the mean assessments of each student test group who were taught by teachers having one to three years, four to nine years and ten or more years of teaching experience were Scale I: 2.91, 23.18, 24.76 - Scale II: 25.82, 24.11, 25.11 - Scale III: 12.81, 12.02, 12.81 and Scale IV: 12.09, 11.72 and 12.12. Table 13 contained the data from a composite of all the scales.

The F-ratios from each of the four scales of 28.54, 14.68, 13.83 and 6.23 were statistically significant. The scales represented the four factors defined within the fourth

Table 8										
Deviation Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of Differences Between SAIS and TS-AIS Assessments Across Variables of Teaching Experience and Seminary Districts: LDS Seminary Teacher Assessment Study 2001										
	Deviation Means						df	MS	F	P
	Raymond N	N	Lethbridge N	N	Combined					
Years Teaching Experience										
1 - 3	-4.43	8	6.2	6	.12	14				
4 - 9	-4.79	16	3.36	22	-.07	38				
10 or More	-2.85	37	4.24	39	.26	66				
Combined	-3.57	61	4.11	57	-.14	118				
Between Districts							1	2,021.27	22.35	.01
Between Levels of Teaching Experience							2	1.44	.02	NS
District by Teaching Experience Interaction							2	36.79	.408	NS
Within Cells							112	90.44		

Note: The negative sign indicated that on the raw data, the teacher's assessment score was lower than the class mean assessment.

Table 9						
Scale I Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments According to Length of Teaching Experience: LDS Seminary Teacher Assessment Study 2001						
Source	N	Mean	df	MS	F	P
Years Teaching Experience						
1 - 3	294	24.91				
4 - 9	866	23.18				
10 or more	1475	24.76				
Combined	2635	24.26				
Between Groups			2	752.63		
Within Groups			2632	26.37		
					28.54	.01

Scale I: Classroom Learning Environment

Table 10						
Scale II Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments According to Length of Teaching Experience: LDS Seminary Teacher Assessment Study 2001						
Source	N	Mean	df	MS	F	P
Years Teaching Experience						
1 - 3	294	25.82				
4 - 9	864	24.11				
10 or more	1473	25.11				
Combined	2631	24.86				
Between Groups			2	426.160		
Within Groups			2628	29.031		
					14.68	.01

Scale II: Teacher Characteristics

Table 11						
Scale III Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments According to Length of Teaching Experience: LDS Seminary Teacher Assessment Study 2001						
Source	N	Mean	df	MS	F	P
Years Teaching Experience						
1 - 3	294	12.81				
4 - 9	857	12.02				
10 or more	1463	12.87				
Composite	2614	12.58				
Between Groups			2	207.518		
Within Groups			2611	15.01		
					13.83	.01

Scale III: Student Development

Table 12						
Scale IV Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments According to Length of Teaching Experience: LDS Seminary Teacher Assessment Study 2001						
Source	N	Mean	df	MS	F	P
Years Teaching Experience						
1 - 3	294	12.09				
4 - 9	865	11.72				
10 or more	1463	12.12				
Composite	2614	12.58				
Between Groups			2	46.19		
Within Groups			2628	7.41		
					6.23	.01

Scale IV: Student Status

Table 13

Composite Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments
According to Length of Teaching Experience: LDS
Seminary Teacher Assessment Study 2001

Source	N	Mean	df	MS	F	P
Years Teaching Experience						
1 - 3	294	75.62				
4 - 9	866	70.82				
10 or more	1475	74.70				
Combined	2635	73.53				
Between Groups			2	4822.45		
Within Groups			2632	219.56		
					21.97	.01

hypothesis. Table 13 shows the composite analysis of all scales combined. The F-ratio of 21.97 was also significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis Five

Student assessments on the factors of learning environment, teacher characteristics, student development and student status which were obtained from classes that teachers selected, presenting their best teaching effort, will not differ significantly from the assessments of teacher's classes which were randomly selected. As depicted in Tables 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18, the means obtained from the test groups representing two methods of class selection according to each scale were Scale I: 23.32, 25.23 - Scale II: 24.20, 25.53 - Scale III: 12.14, 13.06 - Scale IV: 11.74, 12.24 and Composite: 71.23 and 75.91. There was a statistical difference in the assessments between random and teacher preferred classes with F-ratios of 93.25, 39.91, 37.21, 21.78 and 66.18 respectively. Each scale, as well as the composite F-ratio, was significant at the .01 level of confidence.

Table 14

Scale I Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments
 According to Random and Teacher Preferred Method of Class
 Selection: LDS Seminary Teacher Assessment Study 2001

Source	N	Mean	df	MS	F	P
Method of Class Selection						
Random	1328	23.31				
Teacher-Preferred	1306	25.23				
Combined	2634	24.27				
Between Groups			1	2420.37		
Within Groups			2632	25.96		
					93.25	.01

Scale I: Classroom Learning Environment

Table 15						
Scale II Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments According to Random and Teacher Preferred Method of Class Selection: LDS Seminary Teacher Assessment Study 2001						
Source	N	Mean	df	MS	F	P
Method of Class Selection						
Random	1326	24.20				
Teacher-Preferred	1304	25.53				
Combined	2630	24.86				
Between Groups			1	1151.15		
Within Groups			2628	28.84		
					39.91	.01

Scale II: Teacher Characteristics

Table 16

Scale III Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments
 According to Random and Teacher Preferred Method of Class
 Selection: LDS Seminary Teacher Assessment Study 2001

Source	N	Mean	df	MS	F	P
Method of Class Selection						
Random	1317	12.14				
Teacher-Preferred	1296	13.6				
Combined	2613	12.59				
Between Groups			1	556.143		
Within Groups			2611	14.95		
					37.21	.01

Scale III: Student Development

Table 17

Scale IV Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments
 According to Random and Teacher Preferred Method of Class
 Selection: LDS Seminary Teacher Assessment Study 2001

Source	N	Mean	df	MS	F	P
Method of Class Selection						
Random	1325	11.74				
Teacher-Preferred	1305	12.24				
Combined	2630	11.09				
Between Groups			1	160.54		
Within Groups			2628	7.37		
					21.78	.01

Scale IV: Student Status

Table 18

Composite Mean Scores and Analysis of Variance of SAIS Assessments
 According to Random and Teacher Preferred Method of Class
 Selection: LDS Seminary Teacher Assessment Study 2001

Source	N	Mean	df	MS	F	P
Method of Class Selection						
Random	1328	71.23				
Teacher-Preferred	1306	75.91				
Combined	264	73.55				
Between Groups			1	14374.83		
Within Groups			2632	217.21		
					66.18	.01

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Chapter 5 contains a review of the study design, including a summary of the problem, purpose of the study, hypotheses and significance of the study. A summary of the methods used to investigate the role of a seminary teacher, the development of assessment instruments, and experimental control procedures employed is presented. The remainder of the chapter contains a summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Review of the Study Design

The Problem

The seminary system of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has experienced tremendous growth since its inception in 1912. With this expansion, the role of the seminary teacher has been modified to meet the needs associated with this growth. The LDS seminary system has maintained continuous history involving the use of classroom evaluations to help determine teacher effectiveness. The SES instrument has been used in the seminary since the early 1990s to evaluate teacher effectiveness within the classroom. In 1999, the use of the SES instrument was investigated. The results indicated that the instrument did not discriminate on factors of teacher personality, rapport, learning environment, preparation and organization, skill in methodology, or teacher effectiveness. Instead, each scale had a high correlation to the quality of rapport established between the teacher with his students. Prompted by these results, a determination was made to develop new assessment instruments. These instruments would be developed from the present and/or projected expectations associated with the stewardship of a released-time seminary teacher.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was twofold:

1. The identification of expectations associated with the stewardship of teachers in the LDS released-time seminaries.
2. The construction of assessment questionnaires and determination of use to obtain student and teacher feedback regarding:
 - a. classroom learning environment
 - b. teacher characteristics
 - c. student development
 - d. status of students on factors outside of classroom

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were developed and tested within the LDS Church seminary system:

1. There is no significant difference in the assessments given by students on the factors of learning environment, teacher characteristics, student development, and student status when rating forms are administered by either a supervisor, a peer-teacher, or a teacher to his own classes.
2. Classroom assessments made by teachers will not differ significantly from the assessments made by the teachers' students on the factors of learning environment, teacher characteristics, student development, and student status.

3. The difference between assessments made by teachers and the assessments made by the teachers' students will not differ significantly across the three categories of teaching experience or between seminary districts.
4. The assessments obtained from students on the factors of learning environment, teacher characteristics, student development, and student status who are taught by teachers with varying lengths of teaching experience will not differ significantly.
5. Student assessments on the factors of learning environment, teacher characteristics, student development, and student status which were obtained from classes that teachers selected, presenting their best teaching effort, will not differ significantly from the assessments of teachers' classes which were randomly selected.

Significance of the Study

The over-all objectives of the seminary program are to assist the home in developing the divine nature of LDS youth through the medium of gospel study, a dedicated faculty, and a stimulating and effective classroom environment. To determine whether the objectives are being met, the seminary program has been committed to the principle of evaluation in every level of operation. This study was commissioned by the seminary program to investigate the stewardship of a released-time seminary teacher and develop assessment instruments with a recommendation for use. It is intended that the results of this study will be used by seminary administration and supervisors to:

- a. Educate seminary faculty as to the desired characteristics of teachers and qualities within the classroom which should receive primary focus and attention.
- b. Encourage and aid teachers in the process of introspection and personal analysis as to their own performance and the environment they have operating within each of their classes.
- c. Identify areas for faculty inservice.
- d. Provide teachers a motive for positive change and improvement.
- e. Establish opportunities between administrators and teachers to discuss personal stewardships and give positive support to each of their respective roles.
- f. Focus attention upon the significance of self-esteem as an attribute to successful seminary teaching.
- g. Provide emphasis upon students' accountability in developing the type and quality of seminary experience they desire.

Methodology

Stewardship investigation. The investigation into the stewardship of a released-time teacher was accomplished by selecting and analyzing talks and printed directives from Church and seminary authorities as they addressed the role of the teacher. Only those elements which were stressed as essential were included as final descriptors. To improve content validity, a frequency distribution was made to determine the number of times each statement or concept was cited. Further, a heavier weighting was assigned to the expression of administrative heads of the LDS Church, Church Educational System and

the Department of Seminaries and Institute. Adding perspective to the teacher's role, informal interviews were conducted from among contacts made with seminary teachers during the 1999 summer term and with teachers in the Canada Central area during the 1999 - 2000 school year. A pre-assessment of the final list was made by selected CES and seminary administrators and teachers.

Assessment questionnaires. The two questionnaires developed from this study were used to obtain feedback from students and teachers about the conditions operating within the seminary classroom. The SAIS form was developed with the following content and organization:

1. Thirty-four statements were included to provide information about (a) classroom learning environment, (b) characteristics of the teacher, (c) student progress and development, and (d) student status on factors outside of the classroom. The statements were placed on the assessment form in relation to the categories with which they were related. Each category of statements was considered a separate scale within the assessment instrument.
2. A positive profile was maintained by positively keying each statements' terminology.
3. Students discriminated on each statement through the use of numbers which related to a low to high assessment of the stated quality or condition.

The TS-AIS form was developed so that teachers could formalize their own classroom assessment. The teacher form, TS-AIS, was a direct extension from the student form, SAIS. With the use of the student form for comparison, teachers can determine to what extent they are congruent to their students' feelings. All of the scales and statements

from the SAIS form were used with the exception of the last two demographic statements. The statements were reworded so that teachers could use their own frame of reference to make assessment.

Experimental control procedures. The SAIS and TS-AIS forms were distributed within two separate modes of operation to carry out the experimental and descriptive aspects of the study. Part I involved the distribution of assessment forms to students only, which were selected and grouped according to random processes. Part II utilized the assessments of both students and their respective teachers. Therefore, both SAIS and TS-AIS forms were distributed to the participants in Part II. Assessment forms were coded in order to identify the following independent variables which related to the hypotheses:

- a. Different authority figures used to distribute the SAIS forms to students.
- b. Class selection determined either through the teacher's choice or a random process.
- c. Categories of teachers arranged by length of teaching experience.
- d. Paired assessments between teacher and their students using the TS-AIS and SAIS forms.
- e. Geographic distribution of assessments according to seminary district.

Data from the questionnaires were processed, tabulated and assigned statistical values using the computer services at BYU and the two statistical programs of SPSS and Mermac.

Summary of the Findings

The data for this study were analyzed according to the stewardship expectations of a seminary teacher and within the five hypotheses cited earlier. The summary of these findings is presented according to the teacher's stewardship and the hypotheses.

Teacher's Stewardship

There were twenty-seven areas of expectation associated with the stewardship of a released-time seminary teacher. Number fourteen contained twelve modifying elements which related to the observable characteristics of the teacher within the classroom. Number fifteen also contained twelve modifying elements which related specifically to the classroom learning environment. Number sixteen contained five modifying elements which related to the emphasis upon the scriptures within the classroom. Part of the total stewardship description involved expectations associated with the seminary classroom experience. Numbers 11, 12, 13, 14 (a through l), 15 (a through l), 16 (a through e), 17, and 18 all related to the category of the classroom experience. The remaining expectations were centered upon the teacher's expanded CES assignment in areas other than classroom emphasis and in being able to exemplify Christian and LDS values.

Hypothesis One

Hypothesis one was there is no significant difference in the assessments given by students on the factors of learning environment, teacher characteristics, student development, and student status when rating forms are administered by either a supervisor, a peer-teacher or a teacher to his own classes. Teacher, peer-teacher, and supervisors were the authority figures used to distribute the SAIS forms to students. The F-ratio from each scale showing variance of SAIS scores between the three groups with

different authority figures were: .819, 2.34, .41 and .84 respectively. The four ratios were not statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence. The composite test F-ratio of 1.47 also failed to show statistical significance. Therefore, the hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis two was that classroom assessments made by teachers will not differ significantly from the assessments made by the teacher's students on the factors of learning environment, teacher characteristics, student development, and student status. Teacher assessments were paired with class assessments and the differences were observed and tested. The t-ratio from Scale I was 1.67 and significant at the .05 level of confidence. Scale III and IV produced t-ratios of 3.43 and 9.85 which were statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence. The null hypothesis, when related to the three scales identified above was rejected on the basis of the significant t-ratios at the .05 and .01 levels of confidence. Scale II did not yield a statistically significant t-ratio. Therefore, the aspect of the hypothesis which related to Scale II failed to be rejected.

Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis three was that the difference between assessments made by teachers and the assessments made by the teachers' students will not differ significantly across the three categories of teaching experience or between seminary districts. Differences from teacher and student assessments were analyzed according to test group characteristics based upon the previous teaching experience of the teachers and seminary district locale. The F-ratio from between levels of teaching experience and district by teaching experience interaction were not statistically significant. The hypothesis, when related to the three

categories of teaching experience and district by teaching experience interaction failed to be rejected. The F-ratio of 22.35 showing variance between the two seminary district assessments was significant at the .01 level of confidence. Therefore, the aspect of the hypothesis which related to variance between seminary districts was rejected with .01 level of confidence.

Hypothesis Four

Hypothesis four was the assessments obtained from students on the factors of learning environment, teacher characteristics, student development, and student status who are taught by teachers with varying lengths of teaching experience will not differ significantly. The variance in the quality of assessments made by students was analyzed according to the previous teaching experience of the teacher. The F-ratios of 28.54, 14.68, 13.83 and 6.23 from the four SAIS scales were statistically significant at the .01 confidence level. The SAIS composite F-ratio of 21.97 also showed significance at the .01 level. Based upon the statistical significance, the hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis Five

Hypothesis five was that student assessments on the factors of learning environment, teacher characteristics, student development, and student status which were obtained from classes that teachers selected, presenting their best teaching effort, will not differ significantly from the assessments of teachers' classes which were randomly selected. The variance in the quality of assessments made by students was analyzed according to the method used to select the teacher's class for evaluation. All of the F-ratios (93.25, 39.91, 37.21 and 21.78) from each of the SAIS scales were significant at the .01 level of confidence. In addition, the F-ratio (66.18) from the test composite carried

statistical significance at the .01 confidence level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based upon the findings of this study. It was concluded that:

1. The stewardship of a released-time seminary teacher is diverse, complex and requires a dedicated educator and member of the LDS Church; an effective teacher/counselor producing classroom environments that meet seminary objectives; an administrator/leader who fulfills expanded CES assignments; and an individual who exemplifies Christian and LDS values.
2. Teachers, using standard procedures, can distribute to their own students paper and pencil assessment forms and receive similar feedback for assessment as if supervisors or peer-teachers administered the forms.
3. Teachers and students perceive similarly the characteristics of the teacher as identified on the SAIS form. Teachers and students show significant differences when assessing the learning environment within the classroom, the development or progress made by the student and the factors extraneous to the classroom setting.
4. Different lengths of teaching experience do not influence the congruence between the teacher assessment when compared to his/her classroom student assessment. However, there is a significant difference between the assessments from teachers located in separate seminary districts. Variations

relating to the use and application of student feedback in the evaluation process may account for the differences between seminary districts.

5. Different lengths of teaching experience does have an influence upon classroom assessments given by students. Classes taught by younger teachers receive a higher mean assessment than classes taught by teachers with more teaching experience.
6. To initiate classroom assessments, the selection of a class from a teacher's schedule is critical to provide the type of analysis desired. Classes representing the teacher's best teaching effort yield significantly higher assessments than do those classes which were randomly selected.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the findings and conclusions stated above. It is recommended that:

1. CES Administration validate this investigation into seminary teacher expectations and finalize the list of those expectations for publication and distribution to the teachers within the seminary system. It is further recommended that in-service programs be developed to provide authoritative reference to all CES expectations associated with the seminary teacher's stewardship.
2. A blue-ribbon panel of specialists be organized to extend the efforts of this study to finalize the SAIS and TS-AIS forms. It is also recommended that seminary department guidelines be prepared to determine the use and application of feedback utilizing the SAIS and the TS-AIS forms.

3. Additional studies be conducted to provide statistical validity and reliability to the SAIS and TS-AIS instruments.
4. Through the services of a staff assignment having no supervisory responsibility, teachers be provided with the SAIS and TS-AIS forms and instruction manuals or any other supportive assistance so that they can initiate classroom assessment for personal introspection and classroom analysis. Further, teachers be encouraged to use both assessment forms to develop congruence between their own assessment with that of their students.
5. Further studies be conducted to investigate the causal factors underlying the differences in teacher to student classroom assessment within seminary districts.
6. Additional study be directed to the causal factors underlying the differences in the quality of student assessments, using the length of teaching experience as the variable.

References

- Armstrong, H. (1994). The promise and the problem. Teacher Evaluation Today. Ed. Robert Olds. Worthington, Ohio: School Management Institute.
- Barr, A. S. (1981). (Ed.) Wisconsin studies of the measurement and prediction of teacher effectiveness: A summary of investigation. Madison, Wisconsin: Dembar Publications.
- Beckman, W. R. (1994). The secondary school administrator and teacher evaluation. Teacher Evaluation Today. ed. Robert Olds. Worthington, Ohio: School Management Institute.
- Beecher, D. E. (1969). The evaluation of teaching. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Berger, E. (1994, May). The evaluation of teachers. NASSP Bulletin, 58, 147-152.
- Berliner, D. C. (1996, Spring). Impediments to the study of teacher effectiveness. Journal of Teacher Education, 27: 1, 5.
- Bledsoe, J., et al. (1991). Factors related to pupil observation reports of teacher and attitudes toward their teacher. Journal of Educational Research, 65 119.
- Borich, G. D. and Maddan, S. K. (1997). Evaluating classroom instruction: A sourcebook of instruments. Menlo Park, California: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Brighton, S. and Rose, G. (1985). Increasing your accuracy in teacher evaluation. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Brody, J. A. (1997, July). A good teacher is harder to define than find. The American School Board Journal, 164, 25-8.

Coleman, J. S. et al. (1986). Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Covert, J. R. (1995, January). Second thought about professionalism. Educational Forum,

Darland, D. C. (1994). Let's face the obstacles to sound evaluation. Teacher Evaluation Today. ed. Robert Olds. Worthington, Ohio: School Management Institute.

Eastridge, H. E. (1996, September). Student evaluation and teacher performance. NASSP Bulletin, 60, 48-54.

Estes, R. W. (1984). Prediction of inservice teaching ratings received during student teaching at the Brigham Young University. Unpublished Master's Theses, Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University.

Glass, G. V. (1994). Teacher effectiveness. Evaluating Educational Performance. ed. Herbert J. Walberg. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Cooperation.

Green, T. F. (1991) The activities of teaching. Syracuse University, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Harclerod, F. F. and Cornel, J. H. (1991). (Eds.) Monograph six: Assessment of colleges and universities. Iowa City, Iowa: The American College Testing Program.

Hayman, J. L. and Napier, R. N. (1995). Evaluation in the schools: A human process for renewal. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Heath, R. W. and Nielson, M. A. (1994). Performance-based teacher education. Review of Educational Research, 44, 463-84.

Herman, J. J. (1993). Developing an Effective school staff evaluation program. New York: Packer Publishing Company, Inc.

- Howson, R. B. (1980). New designs for research in teacher competence. Burlingame, California: California Teachers Association.
- Hunter, M. C. (1993, February). Appraising teacher performance: One approach. National Elementary Principal.
- Jacobsen, J. (1993, May). "Should students evaluate teachers? Today's Education, 62.
- Jencks, C., et al. (1982). Inequality: A reassessment of family and schooling in america. New York: Basic Books.
- Kennedy, J. J. and Beesh, A. J. (1996). Overcoming some impediments to the study of teacher effectiveness. Journal of Teacher Education, 27: 1, 15.
- Kolesnick, W. B. (1990). Educational psychology. (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Lessinger, L. M. (1990). Every kid a winner: Accountability in education. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Madan, M. (1994). Specifying behavioral components of some higher-order concepts of teaching" Teacher Effectiveness. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications.
- Marshall, M. S. (1991, March). "Reverse grading. Educational Leadership, 28, 663-5.
- McAfee, D. T. (1995, May). Evaluation of the teacher: Do teachers and supervisors agree? The High School Journal, 58, 336-42.
- McKay, D. O. (1977). Pathways to happiness. comp. Llewelyn R. McKay. Salt Lake City, Utah: Bookcraft, Inc.

Medley, D. M. (1997). Teacher competence and teacher effectiveness: A review of process-product research. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Mosteller, F. and Moynihon, D. P. (1992). On equality of educational opportunity. New York: Vintage Books.

Natriello, G., et al. (1997). A summary of the recent literature on the evaluation of principals, teachers and students. Occasional Paper #18. Stanford, California: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, April.

Nelson, K. G., Bicknell, J. E., and Hedlund, P. E. (1976). Measures of teaching effectiveness. Albany, New York: State Education Department.

Orlosky, D. E. (1993). Teacher competence: To do what? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, February.

Page, C. F. (1994). Student evaluation of teaching. London, England: Society for Research in Higher Education.

Popham, W. J. (1991). Performance tests of teaching proficiency: Nationals, development and validation. American Educational Research Journal, 8, 105-8.

Reddin, W. J. (1991). Effective management by objectives. New York: McGraw-Hill Company.

Redfern, G. G. (1998). Evaluating teachers and administrators: Putting the pieces together. Westerville, Ohio: School Management Institute.

Redfern, G. B. (1993, March). Client-centered evaluation. The School Administrator, 7-10.

Richins, J. A. (1993). The reliability and validity of an instrument for evaluating teacher effectiveness in the seminaries of the church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University.

Rogers, V. M. (1980). Do we want "merit" salary schedules? Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press.

Rosenshine, B. and Furst, N. (1993). The use of direct observation to study teaching. Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. ed. R. M. W. Traverso. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Rushton, J. L. (1999). "The relationship between student ratings and selected characteristics of religion instructors and courses of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints education system. Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation. Los Angeles, California: University of Southern California: University of Southern California.

Smith, B. O. (1991). (Ed.) Research in teacher education: A symposium. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Printice Hall.

Sudweeks, R. R. (1999). An evaluation of the SES: An instrument used to collect student ratings of seminary teachers. A Report of a Study made for the LDS Church Educational System, Salt Lake City, Utah, January.

Teilhit, R. (1994). The employee organization role in teacher evaluation. Teacher Evaluation Today. ed. Robert Olds. Worthington, Ohio: School Management Institute.

Thompson, J. E., et al. (1995). Failures of communication in the evaluation of teachers by principals. Technical Report #43. Stanford California: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching.

- Thorndike, R. L. and Hazen, E. (1995). Measurement of teaching efficiency. Kappa Delta Pi Research Publication, New York: The MacMillan Company.
- Thonock, A. L. (1989). A comparative study of 'master' rated and productive rated seminary teachers in the snake river district. Master's Field Project. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University.
- Tuckman, B. W. (1990). A technique for the assessment of teacher directiveness. The Journal of Educational Research, 63, 395-400.
- Zelnak, M. J. and Snider, B. C. (1994, May). Teacher perceptions of the teacher evaluation process. California Journal of Educational Research, 117.

Appendix A

Minutes of the SES Planning Meeting October 13, 2000

ATTENDANCE

Greg Johnson

Frank Bradshaw

David Bowden

Boyd Beagley

John Nielson

Alan Petersen

Spencer Nordfelt

RE: Discussion and Planning for the Future Development of the SES Instrument

Frank Bradshaw and David Bowden presented a brief history of the SES development to date including the involvement of Wendell Johnson, Alden Richins and Richard Sudweeks. Frank Bradshaw reported that since the last meeting at which time Richard Sudweeks presented his evaluation of the instrument and those things that it did and did not do, a group had met to consider its further use. It was decided at that time that Spencer Nordfelt would be involved in his master's thesis/project with further development of the instrument.

In preparing his proposal, Spencer and those with whom he worked, including Frank Bradshaw of our office, felt that the original emphasis of his these in dealing specifically with the SES document needed to be changed and the resulting goals and objectives of his thesis are now as follows:

1. Define and clarify the stewardship of a released-time seminary teacher as it relates to his/her letter of appointment.
2. Identify from the standpoint of seminary administrators which areas within the teacher's stewardship the SES has been and should be to make assessment.
3. Determine within those areas what types of information students would want to give, teachers would want to receive and administrators would want to obtain.

The following points were discussed and agreed upon:

1. We would accept Spencer's thesis as a project which would develop information which would be used as a preliminary and preparatory base for the development of a revised SES instrument.
2. Spencer would begin immediately and would have the thesis/project finished by July of 2001.
3. During the summer of 2001, Spencer or some other interested teacher would use the thesis criteria in the development of a new SES instrument.
4. Throughout the entire thesis preparation and during the summer, constant contact and involvement of the Central Office Staff would be involved in monitoring the progress and direction of the research preparation. It was suggested that Richard Sudweeks could be involved in the summer document instrument preparation and testing procedure.
5. The 2001-2002 school year will be used for testing and modification of the document with final revisions to be made during the summer of 2002. At

that time, the finalized instrument with appropriate usage recommendations will be announced.

6. It was agreed upon that Mack Bowen would be the contact person with whom Spencer Nordfelt will work with on normal day-to-day communications and planning.
7. Spencer and Mack will develop a letter to be sent out from the Central Office requesting input from brethren who are conducting and administrating similar type documents in the various areas of the program.

I will keep everyone apprised of the progress of this project through the Administrative Council as time progresses.

Boyd D. Beagley

BDB:lr

Appendix B

Sources and References Documenting the Research

to Establish the Expectations of a

Released-time Seminary Teacher

1. The Successful Seminary and Institute Teacher
by Dr. Henry Eyring
2. Four Imperatives for Religious Educators
by Elder Gordon B. Hinckley
3. The Teacher's Divine Commission According to the Lord
by Elder Bruce R. McConkie
4. "Basic Doctrine and General Objective"
approved by the Church Board of Education, March 5, 1997
5. "Overall Goals and Objective for the Department of Seminaries and Institutes of Religion" part of a compilation on a Seminary Teacher's Stewardship
by J. Alden Richins
6. The Curricular Stewardship of Seminaries and Institutes
by Joe J. Christensen
7. To Be Effective Teachers We Must Involve Students in the Scriptures
by Arnold Stringham
8. Principles of Learning and Teaching
by Joe J. Christensen
9. Personnel Matters From Coordinator's Convention
by Joe J. Christensen

10. A Reaffirmation of What Every Religious Educator Within the Church Educational System Should Know
by Joe J. Christensen
11. Religious Education: A Latter-day Saint Point of View
by Joe J. Christensen
12. The Charter Course of the Church in Education
by President J. Reuben Clark, Jr.
13. Circles of Exaltation
by President Spencer W. Kimball
14. Objectives of Church Education
by President Harold B. Lee
15. Education: Moving Toward and Under the Law of Consecration
by President Alvin R. Dyer
16. Equally Yoked Together
by Elder Boyd K. Packer
17. Good Teachers Matter
by Elder Marion D. Hanks
18. Loyalty
by Elder Harold B. Lee
19. The Ideal Teacher
by Elder Boyd K. Packer
20. To Those Who Teach In Troubled Times
by Elder Boyd K. Packer

21. Ten Commandments for Seminary and Institute Teachers
by President N. Eldon Tanner
22. True Shepherds After the Way of the Lord
by Elder Thomas S. Monson
23. Men With A Message
by Elder A. Theodore Tuttle
24. What I Hope You Will Teach My Grandchildren
by Elder Spencer W. Kimball
25. The Value of Preparation
by President Hugh B. Brown
26. The Gospel Gives Answers To Life's Problems
by Elder Neal A. Maxwell
27. Teaching By The Spirit
by President William E. Barrett
28. Self-Reliance
by Elder Boyd K. Packer
29. The Place of the Living Prophet, Seer, and Revelator
by Elder Harold B. Lee
30. Avoiding Sectarianism
by Elder Mark E. Peterson
31. The Seminary Teacher's Stewardship As I See It
by J. Alden Richins

Appendix C

Coordinator Instruction Sheet

to Distribute Forms SAIS and TS-AIS

GENERAL INFORMATION**Who is to participate?**

Each teacher in the seminary district who teaches at least two classes at the high school seminary with twenty or more students per class will be used for this study. The *coordinator will assign each teacher a three digit identification number. The starting number for this district is _____. The ending number is _____.

Procedures for Part I

In each high school seminary with at least three teachers:

1. Randomly (see note on page 3 for instructions) select two periods from the daily teaching schedule.
2. Identify all teachers who teach a class of twenty students or more during both of the periods which are randomly selected.
3. Randomly select three teachers from that group and fill in their three-digit ID number on the form provided. (see note on page 3).
4. At the beginning of the class in which the SAIS is to be given, each teacher should randomly divide his students into three test groups in the following manner.
 - a. Have students count off 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, etc. assigning each student one number.
 - b. Each group has already been formed by a random process. Use the following information to assign students to their respective groups. Disregard any numbers in each group that were not assigned to any student. Each group will be within one student of being equal in size.

GROUP 1

3, 4, 8, 11, 14, 18,
19, 24, 25, 29, 33,
36, 37, 40, 43

GROUP 2

1, 5, 7, 12, 13,
16, 21, 22, 26,
30, 31, 35, 39,
42,44

GROUP 3

2, 6, 9, 10, 15,
17, 20, 23, 27,
28, 32, 34, 38,
41, 45

- c. Each teacher will then divide his class and send groups 2 and 3 into their separate and designated rooms.

5. All students in:
- GROUP 1** - should remain in their own classroom and have their own teacher administer to them the SAIS form.
- GROUP 2** - from all three teachers' classes should be directed into one room together and have the SAIS form administered to them by a peer-teacher that is available during that period.
- GROUP 3** - from all three teachers' classes should be directed into one room together and have the SAIS form administered to them by an administrative supervisor.
6. Give students as long as they need to read the instructions on the SAIS form, write in the computer ID numbers from the blackboard (see following information to determine correct ID numbers) and fill in their responses to each statement.

Procedures for Part II

What is to be administered?

The SAIS is to be given to students and filled out.
The TS-AIS is to be given to teachers and filled out.

Who is to administer the SAIS and TS-AIS forms to the participating individuals?

Someone in district supervision that would be viewed by the students as an authority figure.

Which teachers are to be involved in this aspect of the study?

All other teachers (high school and grade nine) who were not used in Part I and who teach two or more classes of regular seminary with twenty or more students per class.

How many classes per teacher should the SAIS be given to?

Two classes with twenty or more students per class.

When should these forms be administered in each seminary?

Preferably all the same day and two weeks before the exam break.

The coordinator should confirm a day in each seminary and have the SAIS administered to students and the TS-AIS given to teachers.

- Note:
- a. Make sure the teachers fill out a TS-AIS form on each of his two classes used in this study.
 - b. Make sure the students put the same computer identification number of their form (SAIS) as the teacher puts on his form (TS-AIS) for each class.
 - c. Refer to the instructions on the TS-AIS form to determine these computer numbers.

Collect all SAIS and TS-AIS forms and return them to the designated receiving point.

*For ease with administrative titles, the term “coordinator” will be used representing the position of Associate Area Director.

Addendum

* METHOD TO DETERMINE A RANDOM SELECTION OF TEACHERS AND PERIODS

1. Cut several small pieces of paper about one inch by one inch.
2. Number these pieces from one to about ten so that no identifying marks seep through to the other side.
3. Turn the pieces over.
4. When making random selections for either teachers or periods, determine the total number of the group.
5. Eliminate the numbered pieces of paper that are higher than the total.
6. Mix up the remaining pieces and draw the number of random selections needed.
7. Return each piece back into the selection pool after drawing.

* HOW TO DETERMINE TEST GROUP COMPUTER NUMBER

Part I's test group computer number is composed of FIVE digits:

Example:

Three-digit	Class	Test Group Code Number
Teacher	Period	Group 1
Identification		Group 2
Number		Group 3

PLEASE INSURE THE ACCURACY OF THESE NUMBERS
FOR EACH TEST GROUP AND SITUATION

Appendix D

Teacher Instruction Sheet

Implementing Standardized Administrative Procedures

INSTRUCTIONS TO TEACHERS

1. You are one of three teachers who have been randomly selected for this study.
2. At the beginning of the class which the student assessment form (SAIS) is to be given, randomly divide your class into three groups in the following manner:
 1. Have students count off 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, etc. until each student has been assigned a number.
 2. Read off from the chart the numbers which have been previously chosen at random to form test group #1, #2, and #3.
 3. Disregard any numbers in each group that were not assigned to any student. Each group will be within one student of being equal in size.

<u>GROUP 1</u>	<u>GROUP 2</u>	<u>GROUP 3</u>
3, 4, 8, 11, 14, 18, 19, 24, 25, 29, 33, 36, 37, 40, 43	1, 5, 7, 12, 13, 16, 21, 22, 26, 30, 31, 35, 39, 42, 44	2, 6, 9, 10, 15, 17, 20, 23, 27, 28, 32, 34, 38, 41, 45

3. Each teacher will then divide his class and send each group to their appropriate room at the appropriate time.
4. **Group 1** will have their own teacher administer to them the SAIS.

Group 2 will be a combined group from all three teachers and they will have a peer- teacher that is available during that period administer the SAIS to them.

Group 3 will be a combined group from all three teachers and they will have an administrative supervisor administer the SAIS to them.

Instructions To Verbalize To Students

1. "I would like to give you an opportunity to assess the classroom experience you have had thus far this year in my class."
2. "Read the instructions on the top of the form that is now being passed out to you."
3. (Referring to the blackboard) "These are the numbers you are to write - starting on top and going down putting one number in each space."
4. "Fill in the numbered circle which corresponds to each number you have written in. Fill in means to blacken."
5. "You will have sufficient time to read each statement and give your response. You may now begin."

STUDENT ASSESSMENT IN SEMINARY

Directions:

- Copy the number written on the blackboard in the boxes to the right.
- Read each statement. Use the numbered scale to assess your feelings about each statement.
- **FOUR** is the highest assessment you can give.
- Note that in Part I, II and III all the statements are preceded by an introductory phrase. Please read each statement with that in mind. Thank You.

PART I

In this seminary class:

1. we have a feeling of friendship among class members (1) 4 3 2 1
2. we feel comfortable in expressing personal feelings (2) 4 3 2 1
3. we are encouraged to set and work toward worthwhile goals (3) 4 3 2 1
4. our devotionals leave us with good feelings (4) 4 3 2 1
5. learning activities keep us involved and hold our interest (5) 4 3 2 1
6. students have some choice in how they earn their grade (6) 4 3 2 1
7. our student leaders help us enjoy seminary (7) 4 3 2 1
8. our time is spent in studying the scriptures (8) 4 3 2 1
9. our tests are used to help us learn (9) 4 3 2 1
10. we are expected to attend and be on time (10) 4 3 2 1
11. we have enjoyable and stimulating classroom experiences (11) 4 3 2 1

PART II

Our teacher:

12. takes into consideration the needs and feelings of the students . . . (12) 4 3 2 1
13. recognizes me as an important individual and values my ideas (13) 4 3 2 1
14. helps us feel responsible for our behavior and classroom exper . . . (14) 4 3 2 1
15. goes the second-mile to help students have success experiences . . (15) 4 3 2 1
16. reaches out to those who are not positive toward their experience (16) 4 3 2 1
17. explains things so we can clearly understand him (17) 4 3 2 1
18. helps create a spiritual feeling in class (18) 4 3 2 1
19. handles classroom conflicts without creating negative feelings . . . (19) 4 3 2 1
20. enjoys his teaching experience with us (20) 4 3 2 1
21. has a way of teaching that I enjoy (21) 4 3 2 1

PART III

Because of experiences in this class:

22. I am developing better feelings about myself (22) 4 3 2 1
23. I am receiving help with personal problems I may have (23) 4 3 2 1
24. I am reading, marking, and studying the scriptures (24) 4 3 2 1
25. I am gaining greater faith and love for the Savior (25) 4 3 2 1
26. I am learning how to apply the scriptures in my personal life (26) 4 3 2 1
27. I am recognizing the warm feelings of the Spirit (27) 4 3 2 1

PART IV

28. I enjoy my classroom experience at the high school (28) 4 3 2 1
 29. My feelings about sem. before enrolling in this class were good . . (29) 4 3 2 1
 30. I attend my church meetings (30) 4 3 2 1
 31. I want religion to be an important part of my life (31) 4 3 2 1
 32. I have put forth an honest effort to have a good seminary exper . . (32) 4 3 2 1
 33. My year in school (33) 9 10 11 12
 34. My sex (34) M F

PART V

We are desirous of making seminary the best experience possible. On the rest of this page, please write down what you have especially liked about seminary. If you have not enjoyed seminary, tell us what you feel could be done to make it better. Thank You.

Teacher Self-Assessment In Seminary

Instructions:

- This form is to be used by the teacher. It can be an aid in his own analysis of each classroom situation.
- Read each statement. Use the numbered scale to assess your feelings about each statement.
- **FOUR** is the highest assessment you can give.
- Use the TS-AIS SUMMARY FORM to compare teacher's assessment with student responses.

PART I - LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

In this class:

1. there is a feeling of friendship among class members 4 3 2 1
2. students feel comfortable in expressing personal feelings 4 3 2 1
3. I encourage students to set and work toward worthwhile goals 4 3 2 1
4. our devotionals leave us with good feelings 4 3 2 1
5. I use learning activities which involve students and hold their interest . . . 4 3 2 1
6. I give students some choice in how they earn their grade 4 3 2 1
7. our classroom leaders help students enjoy seminary 4 3 2 1
8. our time is focused on studying the scriptures 4 3 2 1
9. our tests are used to help students in the learning process 4 3 2 1
10. I expect my students to attend and be on time 4 3 2 1
11. we have enjoyable and stimulating classroom experiences 4 3 2 1

PART II - TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS

"I":

12. take into consideration my students' needs and feelings 4 3 2 1
13. recognize each student as an important individual and value their ideas 4 3 2 1
14. make students feel responsible for their behavior and classroom exper 4 3 2 1
15. go the second-mile to help students have success experiences in sem . 4 3 2 1
16. reach out to those who are not positive toward their sem. experience . 4 3 2 1
17. explain things so students can clearly understand me 4 3 2 1
18. help create a spiritual feeling in class 4 3 2 1
19. handle classroom conflicts without creating negative feelings 4 3 2 1
20. enjoy my teaching experiences with this class 4 3 2 1
21. have a way of teaching that students enjoy 4 3 2 1

PART III - STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

Because of experiences in this class:

22. students are developing better feelings about themselves 4 3 2 1
23. students are receiving help with their personal problems 4 3 2 1
24. students are reading, marking and studying the scriptures 4 3 2 1
25. students are gaining greater faith and love for the Savior 4 3 2 1
26. students are learning how to apply the scriptures in their personal life . 4 3 2 1
27. students are recognizing the warm feelings of the spirit 4 3 2 1

PART IV - STUDENT STATUS

28. These students enjoy their classroom experiences at the high school . . 4 3 2 1
29. These students had good feelings about seminary before this class . . . 4 3 2 1
30. This class attends their church meetings 4 3 2 1
31. This class wants religion to be an important part of their life 4 3 2 1
32. This class has put forth an honest effort to have good sem. experiences 4 3 2 1

Appendix G

TS-AIS Summary Form

TS-AIS SUMMARY

TEACHER _____ PERIOD _____ GRADE LEVEL _____
 NUMBER OF STUDENTS _____ DATE _____

Part I - Learning Environment	Student Assessment				Average Student Assessment	Teacher Assessment	Diagnosis & Recommendations
	0	1	2	3			
1. Feeling Of Friendship							
2. Can Share Personal Feelings							
3. Setting & Working Toward Goals							
4. Devotionals Leave Good Feelings							
5. Learning Activities Hold Interest							
6. Students Have Choices In Earning Grade							
7. Leaders Help Us Enjoy Seminar							
8. Time Is Spent Studying Scriptures							
9. Tests Help Us Learn							
10. Expected To Attend & Be On Time							
11. Classroom Is Enjoyable & Stimulating							

Part II - Teacher Characteristics

12. Considers Students Needs & Feelings							
13. Recognizes Students & Values Ideas							
14. Makes Students Accountable							
15. Goes Second-Mile To Help Students							
16. Reaches Out To Those Not Positive							
17. Explains Things Clearly							
18. Helps Create Spiritual Feelings							

19. Handles Classroom Conflicts Well								
20. Enjoys His Teaching Experience								
21. Has Way of Teaching That I Enjoy								

Part III - Student Development

22. Developing Better Feelings About Self								
23. Receiving Help With Personal Problems								
24. Reading, Marking, Studying Scriptures								
25. Developing Faith & Love For Savior								
26. Learning How To Apply Scriptures								
27. Recognizing Warm Spiritual Feelings								

Part IV - Student Status

28. I Enjoy School								
29. My Feelings About Sem. Were Good								
30. I Attend My Church Meetings								
31. I Want Religion To Be Important								
32. I Have Put Forth An Honest Effort								

Note: To obtain the average student assessment - times the number of responses in each column by 0, 1, 2, or 3 and then add them together and divide by the number of students.

Appendix H

Parent Consent Letter

Dear Parent/Guardian:

I am conducting a study of Teacher Evaluation in the LDS seminaries. The purpose of the study is to construct an assessment questionnaire allowing students and teachers to evaluate the classroom experience. I anticipate that your son or daughter and others will benefit from participation in this study by expressing their view of their overall seminary experience. I would like your permission for your son or daughter to participate in this study.

As part of this research your son or daughter will be asked to give feedback regarding: the classroom learning environment, teacher characteristics, student development, and his/her status on factors outside of classroom. Please note that all information will be handled in a confidential and professional manner. When responses are released, they will be reported in summary form only. Further, all names, locations and any other identifying information will *not* be included in any discussion of the results. You also have the right to withdraw your son or daughter from the study without prejudice at any time.

If you choose to do so, please indicate your willingness to allow your son or daughter to participate by signing this letter in the space provided below, and return the letter to the seminary with your son or daughter.

I very much appreciate your assistance in this study. If you have any questions please feel free to call me at 327-0926/ spencer.nordfelt@uleth.ca. Also feel free to contact the supervisor of my study, Dr. David Townsend, 329-2731/ david.townsend@uleth.ca, and/or the chair of the Faculty of Education Human Subject Research Committee if you wish additional information. The chairperson of the committee is Keith Roscoe, 329-2446/ keith.roscoe@uleth.ca.

Sincerely,

Spencer Nordfelt
Principal
Lethbridge Seminary
327-0926/ spencer.nordfelt@uleth.ca

I agree to allow my son or daughter, _____, to participate in this study.

Name of Parent/Guardian _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix I

Teacher Consent Letter

Dear Teacher:

I am conducting a study of Teacher Evaluation in the LDS seminaries. The purpose of the study is to construct an assessment questionnaire allowing students and teachers to evaluate the classroom experience. I anticipate that you and others will benefit from participation in this study by expressing your view of your overall seminary experience. I would like to request your assistance to participate in this study.

As part of this research you will be asked to give feedback regarding: the classroom learning environment, teacher characteristics, and student development. Please note that all information will be handled in a confidential and professional manner. When responses are released, they will be reported in summary form only. Further, all names, locations and any other identifying information will *not* be included in any discussion of the results. You also have the right to withdraw from the study without prejudice at any time.

If you choose to do so, please indicate your willingness to participate by signing this letter in the space provided below, and return the letter to me at our next faculty meeting.

I very much appreciate your assistance in this study. If you have any questions please feel free to call me at 327-0926/ spencer.nordfelt@uleth.ca. Also feel free to contact the supervisor of my study, Dr. David Townsend, 329-2731/ david.townsend@uleth.ca, and/or the chair of the Faculty of Education Human Subject Research Committee if you wish additional information. The chairperson of the committee is Keith Roscoe, 329-2446/ keith.roscoe@uleth.ca.

Sincerely,

Spencer Nordfelt
Principal
Lethbridge Seminary
327-0926/ spencer.nordfelt@uleth.ca

I, _____, agree to participate in this study.

Signature: _____

Date: _____