TEACHER EVALUATION PRACTICES AND TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

A Dissertation
presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

---

by
VICTORIA M. HUGHES

Dr. Sandy Hutchinson, Dissertation Supervisor

DECEMBER 2006

The undersigned, appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled

TEACHER EVALUATION PRACTICES
AND
TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

Presented by Victoria M. Hughes

A candidate for the degree of Doctor of Education

And hereby certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

_____

Dr. Sandy Hutchinson
Educational Leadership and Human Development

_____

Dr. Robert L. Bowman
Educational Leadership and Human Development

_____

Dr. Clifford E. Mohn
Educational Leadership and Human Development

_____

Dr. Douglas D. Thomas
Educational Leadership and Human Development

_____

Dr. Wayne W. Williams
Curriculum and Instruction

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A dissertation is a culmination of extensive study, but not a solitary effort. There are numerous individuals who have provided me with support and encouragement.

I must first offer my sincere appreciation and gratitude to my family for their patience and understanding during this monumental process. Their encouragement and support guided me toward completion of the project.

I would like to extend a very special thank you to my advisor, Sandy Hutchinson, who joined me in the middle of my dissertation experience. Without her patience, guidance, and personal interest I would not have been successful. I wish to thank the other members of my dissertation committee: Dr. Wayne Williams, Dr. Doug Thomas, Dr. Robert Bowman, and Dr. Cliff Mohn for their valuable advice, suggestions and motivation.

Kudos are also extended to the dedicated administrators and teachers of the participating school district. Their effort and willingness to share their experiences enabled me to complete my project. They are the true champions of education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

TEACHER EVALUATION PRACTICES AND TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

Victoria M. Hughes

Dr. Sandy Hutchinson, Dissertation Supervisor

ABSTRACT

Determining teacher quality has become a critical focus for public school administrators due to the codification of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Recruitment and retention of quality teachers is not only beneficial for continual student achievement but cost effective for school districts.

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction as measured by the Teacher Evaluation Profile and one subscale of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire. The quantitative study was conducted administering the Teacher Evaluation Profile and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire to all certificated teachers in a rural, mid-size school district located in the mid-west. The data from both instruments were analyzed using the Pearson product-moment. Demographic data pertaining to gender, years of teaching experience, and teaching assignment grade level were collected and were used as predictors for multiple regression analyses.

A significant relationship was found to exist between the Teacher Evaluation Profile subscale Evaluator Perceptions and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire subscale Work Itself. No significant difference resulted from the multiple regression analyses using the predictors of gender, years of teaching experience, and teaching assignment grade level. Recommendations for future studies are to replicate the study using different subscales of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Inquiry into whether or not a well supervised teacher was a satisfied teacher undergirded Robinson's (1998) study that examined the elements of teacher supervision and components of teacher job satisfaction that could be affected by administrators. Danielson (2001) suggested that educators have discovered that a well-designed evaluation system improves practices and ensures the quality of teaching. Sustaining a school culture in which effective evaluation is encouraged focused teachers on their own professional growth (Beall, 1999). In schools where teachers collaboratively learn and solve problems, with a sense of being part of a professional community, is both a powerful motivator and a significant source of job satisfaction (Protheroe, Lewis & Paik, 2002).

Teacher job satisfaction relates positively to participative decision-making, higher autonomy at work, work environment conditions, and ultimately leads to improved student achievement (Ferguson, 2000; Jacobson, 2005; Mertler, 2002; Pearson & Moomaw, 2005; Singer, 1994). Goodlad (1990) found that teachers who chose an occupation in public education because of inherent professional values expressed higher levels of satisfaction and greater commitment than did their counterparts who went in to teaching for economic reasons. Reyes and Shin (1995) found that teacher job satisfaction is a determinant of teacher commitment and related to teacher retention.

Latham (1998) and Mertler (2002) suggested the best ways to strengthen the teaching profession would be to: (a) make teaching a more satisfying career,

(b) encourage young prospects to become teachers, and (c) motivate experienced teachers to stay in the profession. Harris (1995) surveyed a national sample of over 1000 American teachers and found only seven percent very satisfied with the profession, compared to 38% who were somewhat satisfied or very dissatisfied and indicated they would change careers in the near future. Colgan (2004) reported 14% of the teachers new to the profession leave after one year, and the cumulative rate of teachers leaving the profession after five years is 46% (National Education Association, 2004). Wutke's (2004) study assessed the reasons Missouri teachers left the profession in their first five years of teaching. The study affirmed previous research regarding why teachers leave the profession related to teacher education programs, gender, and salary. School district related variables were also examined in Wutke's study including: per pupil expenditure, percentage of minority students, teacher to pupil and administrator to pupil ratios, average years of experience of teachers, percentage of teachers with graduate degrees, discipline incidence rate, and accreditation status.

Job satisfaction is a term that is difficult to describe as a single construct, and the definition of job satisfaction varies between studies (Morice & Murray, 2003; Protheroe, Lewis & Paik, 2002; Singer, 1995). Bogler (2001) noted job satisfaction is important in terms of teacher retention, but is also related to teacher empowerment, school culture, quality work environment, and student achievement. Greater job satisfaction is also a critical factor to consider in terms of recruitment of new teachers into the profession. It is not surprising that researchers suggest schools must give more attention to increasing teacher job satisfaction to recruit and retain quality personnel (Bogler). As the importance

of retaining quality teachers steadily continues to increase, numerous studies have determined factors contributing to teacher satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Colgan, 2004; Houchins, Shippen & Cattret, 2004; Kleinhenz & Ingvarson, 2000; Reyes & Hoyle, 1992).

Identifying and employing quality teachers are key components to the most current national school reform initiative, the No Child Left Behind Act (2002). Documenting that quality instruction is being implemented in classrooms suggests that teacher evaluation processes will soon shift to a higher priority. As accountability for student learning becomes a determining factor for the evaluations teachers receive and the accreditation school districts are awarded, teacher evaluation practices will move to the forefront of school administrators' agendas. Studies are needed to ascertain the state of teacher evaluation practices in schools. Furthermore, data are needed to determine which components of current teacher evaluation practices are perceived as effective in increasing teacher job satisfaction.

The push for teacher quality has developed from recent school reform movements that emphasize increasing student achievement (Danielson, 2002). Two national studies, *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) and the 1996 study by the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, propelled the concepts of teacher quality and student achievement to the forefront of many school districts' policy agenda. The No Child Left Behind Act (2002) legislative initiative specifically identified teacher quality as one of the components that determine the accreditation of school districts. Practitioners and policy makers recognized that teacher

quality matters and discovered that a long neglected requirement--teacher evaluation--could enhance and support teacher quality, leading to an increase in student achievement.

According to Holland and Adams (2002), evaluation has traditionally been an activity that placed teachers in a relatively passive role. Even though evaluations emphasized teachers' abilities to individualize instruction, promote engaged learning, and effectively link standards to instruction, many teacher evaluation systems continued to rely on annual observations and used outdated checklists with no alignment to the teaching standards expected to be used in the classroom. Administrators conducted an observation, wrote a review of the observation, and conducted pre- and post- observation conferences to provide feedback based on their own perception of the observation, with teachers documenting non-observable aspects of their practice. Marshall (2005) suggested the observations were conducted too seldom to provide suggestions that could be tried and then reevaluated by both teacher and supervisor.

Iwaniki (2001) suggested as teaching and learning evolved and became more complex, new models of teacher evaluation placed teachers in a more active, participative role. New approaches to teacher evaluation integrated classroom observation and teacher professional development. Teacher evaluation methods also encouraged teachers to engage in self-directed professional activities by submitting portfolios and documents that illustrated collaborative events or inquiry-based approaches directly impacting student achievement. Brandt (1996) posed that the principal served as a partner, guiding the teacher toward continuous development and improvement. Administrators began to realize that they could not expect teachers to develop alternative, innovative strategies for

teaching and assessing students and then continue to evaluate teachers as they were 50 years ago.

Determining teacher satisfaction is a convoluted endeavor. Teacher job satisfaction has been positively related to school reform issues such as teacher professionalism, participative decision-making, teacher growth, teacher empowerment, perceptions of school climate, collegiality, and workplace conditions (Fullan & Hargreaves, 2002; Ma & McMillan, 1999; Quaglia & Marion, 1991; Rindler, 1994; Singer, 1995; Stockard & Lehman, 2004; Wu & Short, 1996). Models of teacher evaluation incorporate similar internal conditions (e.g., observation of classroom performance, pre- and post- evaluation conferences, and improvement provisions if necessary). Studies continue to search for a connection between the internal construct of teacher job satisfaction, for example, sense of success, commitment to the profession, motivation for coming to work, or self-perception of worth, and the external conditions of teacher evaluation such as work place conditions, collaborative processes, autonomy, professional development, or administrative support (Butt & Lance, 2005; Davis & Wilson, 2000; Woods & Weasmer, 2002; Zembylas & Papanastasiou, 2005).

Ma and MacMillan (1999) found that workplace conditions positively affect teacher satisfaction. In school settings, educators evaluate their work roles by determining how they feel about coming to work each day and the sense of success they have for their performance. Certain background variables, such as teacher's age, ethnicity, and gender, are related to teacher satisfaction (Moore, 1987). Jacobson (2005) and Pearson and Moomaw (2005) suggested that additional variables, such as workplace

conditions, autonomy in the classroom, administrative support, and opportunities for leadership, have significance in explaining the different levels of teacher satisfaction.

Darling-Hammond (1992) emphasized that traditionally the rigid, bureaucratically administered schools have not succeeded in implementing changes in school reform. Schools using collective and collaborative problem-solving strategies, valuing the input from all people affected by decisions made in the school organization, have been successful in restructuring staff focus on teacher competence and commitment. One aspect of teacher commitment appears to be teacher satisfaction (Ma & MacMillan, 1999).

Current trends in teacher evaluation suggest a shift in the primary purpose of teacher evaluation from addressing only school district needs to including more collaborative processes focused on professional development (Danielson, 2001; Glatthorn, 1997; Machell, 1995; Weiss & Weiss, 1998). Robinson (1998) posed a question related to teacher job satisfaction and teacher evaluation systems, "Is a well-supervised teacher a satisfied teacher?" (p. 1) and suggested that diverse evaluation models maximize teacher growth and teacher satisfaction. Robinson further suggested that increased teacher job satisfaction would motivate teachers to continue to improve their instructional practices, generating improved learning environments and increased student achievement.

Most supervisors and teachers recognize the value of evaluations (Beall, 1999). "No professional educator in his or her right mind would advocate that there should be no teacher assessment" (Van der Linde, 1998, p. 329). The quality of the school is determined by teacher performance in the classroom more than by any other factor.

Mechanisms that exist to ensure that teacher quality remains high are evaluation practices (Beall). It is therefore imperative that teacher evaluation be conducted correctly, efficiently, and fairly to determine the areas where further development and improvement of skills are needed. If done correctly, teacher evaluations could provide a vital step toward providing quality instruction for students and job satisfaction for teachers (Beall).

Theoretical Underpinnings of the Study

The fundamental component of organizational culture is a shared belief or vision. Schein (1992) offered a definition of culture that includes facets of organizations reflecting the underlying assumptions, guiding decisions, behaviors, and beliefs of an organization. Organizations have a common purpose and collective commitment that translate to an identifiable entity called organizational culture. Culture is the way a group or organization determines what has worth or value. School culture is unique in an organizational view because schools are complex, mature organizations with multiple purposes. Scribner, Cockrell, Cockrell, and Valentine (1999) stated:

> Schools as formal organizations experience the tension between a professional community ethic of caring for students, critical reflection, and collaboration on the one hand, and the bureaucratic necessities of hierarchy, accountability, rationality, and control on the other. (p. 154)

Organizations should exist to provide an opportunity for organizational members to improve (Senge, 1990). As organizational members improve so does the organization. This adaptation of the concept of double-loop learning is one process that allows effective schools to remain effective. Organizations can improve their functional ability by dispersing some of the decision-making rights of the leaders to previously un-empowered groups (Kanter, 1977). McCombs (1993) stated:

> Learning settings that allow for and respect diversity encourage flexible thinking as well as social competence and moral development. In such settings, individuals have an opportunity for perspective talking and reflective thinking, thereby leading to insights and breakthroughs to new knowledge. (p. 8)

By allowing organizational members to develop and grow professionally, and by creating opportunities for interaction, interdependence, collaboration, and implementation of best practices, an organization maximizes its assets, which in turn maximizes organizational outputs. In the case of a school, the output maximized is quality instruction (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Plecki, 2000).

Richardson (2001) stated that school principals are the primary shapers of school culture because they connect on a daily basis with other teachers, their students, and with parents. The diverse perspectives on instructional practices gained from students and parents provide teachers with rich, ongoing feedback (Marshall & Hatcher, 1996). No school can improve unless it has a culture that supports improvement, collaboration, and a shared vision for what it wants to achieve. An evaluation system that focuses on collaboration among teachers and principals, reflective practices among teachers, and students' learning will have a positive effect upon a school's culture. According to Novick (1996), to ensure successful teaching, a school's culture should be one that requires and allows time for observation, reading, reflection, dialogue with colleagues, and provides support for these practices at the district, state, and federal levels.

Yukl's (1998) strategic contingency theory suggested that teachers, as subunits within the school, gain or lose power depending upon their ability to apply expertise to a unique situation. Morgan's (1977) theory centered on three postulates: (a) the subunit has an expertise in coping with important problems, (b) there is a centrality of the subunit

within the work flow, and (c) there is uniqueness to the extent the subunit's expertise is not substitutable. Teachers have expertise in instruction; they share the centrality of the organization with the students, and their expertise is unique (Woods & Weasmer, 2002). Woods and Weasmer suggested that by restructuring the historically top-down hierarchical evaluation systems to a more web-like evaluation system that embraces shared expertise and collaboration, teacher expertise could be used as part of the evaluation process.

While all organizations learn certain things, some organizations learn better than other organizations. Yukl (1998) cited several educational reviews (Fiol & Lyles, 1985; Huber, 1991; Levitt & March, 1988) in defining learning organizations as those that "…learn rapidly and use the knowledge to become more effective" (p. 97). All organizations, not just educational organizations, require creative thinking from every member, not just a chosen few. Current global complexities and the speed in which information is received suggests that organizations can no longer rely on individual leaders and "lone rangers" to solve problems. Rather, members within organizations must learn to work together to identify their own mission and to form decision-making groups (Bennis, 1997).

As the world becomes more interconnected and business becomes more complex and dynamic, work must become more "learningful." It is no longer sufficient to have one person learning for the organization (Senge, 1990). In successful organizations it is no longer possible to solve problems at upper levels and have everyone else follow the orders. Organizations that excel are the organizations that discover how to tap people's commitment and capacity to learn at all levels in the organization. A school district can

overcome problems in evaluation reform, such as time constraints, training, and teacher resistance, and rely on empowerment, best practices, current research and learning from within its own organization. One of the greatest learning moments is when a collaborative, responsible solution is found to a problem about which the organization cares deeply (Maher, 2000).

Shared decision-making and increased collaboration encourages organizational members to ask questions. The asking of questions is in line with the concept of learning communities, as studied by DuFour (1998) and Scribner et al. (1999). To be as knowledgeable as possible, those empowered must continually participate in academic and professional growth. "As individuals engage in problem solving, coaching and conversation, multiple perspectives are expressed, dissonance created and reduced, discrepancies perceived and resolved, alternatives weighed, options selected and consequences considered and evaluated" (Costa, Garmston & Lambert, 1988, p. 156). The opportunity to grow and develop professionally is a mandated component of a Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation (PBTE). So, too, is the concept of professional communication with a colleague, as well as personal reflection.

Peers would not only review other peers' portfolios, they would collaborate on ideas and solutions to specific internal education concerns. Teaching practices would be evaluated and reviewed internally as part of an ongoing process. External concerns expressed by students, parents, and other outside influences would be addressed through the internal requisite variety. Time constraints would become a non-factor as evaluations occurred at many levels as part of a continually evolving process within an efficient learning organization (Andrejko, 2000).

Three key components of professional growth are reflection on practice, collaboration, and self-assessment (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Hawley & Valli, 1999; Shulman**,** 1997). The proper training necessary to produce an effective and proper evaluation involves both the evaluator as well as the person being evaluated. Both the evaluator and the evaluated are continual learners. Danielson and McGreal (2000) stated the only way teachers will improve their practices is to have professional dialogue about the art of teaching in a safe environment and to have that dialogue led by teachers.

Rationale for the Study

There is no single predominant theory of worker satisfaction. The awareness that teacher retention is a growing problem for public education indicates a need for better understanding of the difficulties teachers face in deriving satisfaction from teaching (Quaglia & Marion, 1991). Research has not adequately addressed how satisfaction levels may influence teachers to remain in the profession or how satisfaction levels influence the quality of instruction in schools. Researchers have determined that the factors of empowerment (Wu & Short, 1996; Pearson & Moomaw, 2005), professional development (Beall, 1999; Danielson & McGreal, 2000;) and positive organizational culture (Duffy, 1997; Jacobson, 2005) do impact teacher job satisfaction as well as influence the type of teacher evaluation provided in school districts.

Teacher evaluation practices are located on a continuum between two types: task-focused and dialogue-focused (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 2000). Reflection and dialogue without purposeful tasks are no better than tasks without purposeful reflection and dialogue. The type of reflection and dialogue is not as important as the amount of reflection and dialogue. In the school

environment, as collaboration, reflection, discourse and dialogue pertaining to evaluation increases, so does the effectiveness of the school (Southwest Educational Development Laboratory).

The primary intent of teacher evaluation practices should not be a shortsighted attempt to wean a few weaker teachers from the organization; it should instead be that of making schools more effective organizations via enhanced instruction (Glatthorn & Fox, 1996; Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 1999; Plecki, 2000; Valentine, 1992). A sense of high expectations, a pursuit of excellence, and an acceptance of professional development as an embedded process are characteristics of the culture of effective schools (Valentine). A school culture that values the sharing of ideas, the sharing of responsibilities, and allows a caring, collaborative, and empowering attitude to permeate the organization enables the existence of a learner-centered community to exist (Scribner, 1999b).

Decision-making through empowerment and collaboration increases teachers' intrinsic motivation (Short, Greer, & Melvin, 1994) leading to an increase in teacher satisfaction (Singer, 1994). Dialogue and professional discourse between teachers and their evaluators during conferences held before and after evaluative observations is positive reinforcement. Professional interaction with peers is not only positive reinforcement, but intrinsically motivating. Rindler (1994) suggested the creation of a working environment with more emphasis on collaboration and professional discourse and less on a clinical checklist, shifts the focus to collegial practices. Commitments, shared beliefs, and values between organizational members are attributes more in line

with a professional learning environment and components aligned with job satisfaction (Rindler, 1994; Scribner et al., 1999; Sergiovanni, 2001).

The possibility exists that specific, predictive characteristics within performance-based teacher evaluation practices could be present in schools and relate to teacher job satisfaction. Additional research is suggested to identify attributes of teacher evaluation that lead to teacher job satisfaction (Ebmeier, 2003; Rindler, 1994; Singer, 1995; Stockard & Lehman, 2004). This study will help educators identify the relationship between current evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction. Findings from this study will provide guidance to school districts for improving policies and practices related to teacher evaluations.

Statement of the Problem

The Missouri Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation legislation has been in place since 1983, with one major revision in 1999. Effective schools have shifted away from the clinical evaluation model towards a dialogue-centered model (Valentine, 1992) and embedded professional development within their culture (Fullan, 1993). Scribner (1999b) stated that supervisory behavior along with workplace conditions, including teacher evaluation practices as a key component, are factors that influence professional educators' motivation. With teacher quality as a requirement of the No Child Left Behind legislation and the concern that an alarming number of teachers are leaving the profession in their first five years of teaching (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2003; Wutke, 2003), increasing teacher job satisfaction is necessary for school districts to keep quality teachers in the classrooms.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to advance the base necessary for understanding the relationship between teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction. A study by Darling-Hammond (2000) indicated that state departments of education, to improve teacher quality and student achievement, would be well advised to attend to the preparation and qualifications of the teachers school administrators hire and retain in the profession. Ebmeier (2003) and Stockard and Lehman (2004) support the Darling-Hammond findings regarding the value of teacher knowledge, training, and learning, all components of the revised teacher evaluation model in Missouri.

Constructs immersed in most teacher evaluation practices such as collaborative inquiry, a shared sense of responsibility and self-direction, and reflective practice create an atmosphere that enhances the knowledge of all teachers (Ebmeier, 2003; Novick, 1996). Evaluation practices that incorporate collaborative dialogue and reflective practices lead to a school environment where changes can be aligned with procedures that foster teacher and student growth, leading to teacher satisfaction.

Quaglia and Marion (1991) suggested more research is needed to determine if an internal construct such as teacher satisfaction can be improved by changing an external construct in the workplace such as the school's organizational culture. Teacher evaluation, with the inclusion of teacher empowerment and collaboration, is an integral part of the school's organizational culture. Using research conducted by Darling-Hammond (2000), Ebmeier (2003), Quaglia and Marion (1991), and Stockard and Lehman (2004) as the conceptual framework, this study identified the degree of the relationship between current teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction

operationalized as scores generated from the Teacher Evaluation Profile (Stiggins & Duke, 1990) survey and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (Lester, 1982).

Research Questions

To address the purpose of the study, four research questions were developed to guide the study:

1. What is the relationship between teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction?
2. What is the relationship between gender and teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction?
3. What is the relationship between years of teaching experience and teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction?
4. What is the relationship between teaching assignment grade level and teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction?

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested during this study:

HO_1: There is no statistically significant relationship between current evaluation practices, as measured by a revised Teacher Evaluation Profile survey, and factors of teacher job satisfaction, as measured by the subscale Work Itself of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire.

HO_2: There is no statistically significant relationship between current evaluation practices, as measured by a revised Teacher Evaluation Profile survey, and factors of teacher job satisfaction, as measured by the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire subscale Work Itself, depending on gender.

HO_3: There is no statistically significant relationship between current evaluation practices, as measured by a revised Teacher Evaluation Profile survey, and factors of teacher job satisfaction, as measured by the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire subscale Work Itself, depending on years of teaching experience.

HO_4: There is no statistically significant relationship between current evaluation practices, as measured by a revised Teacher Evaluation Profile survey, and factors of teacher job satisfaction, as measured by the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire subscale Work Itself, depending on the teaching assignment grade level.

Significance of the Study

The performance-based teacher evaluation model currently mandated in Missouri has undergone major revisions. The national school reform No Child Left Behind directly addresses teacher quality (U.S. Department of Education, 2002), placing importance on effective and accurate teacher evaluation practices. Identifying predictors related to teacher evaluation systems that lead to teacher job satisfaction would assist school administrators in designing school programs and policies to retain quality teachers in the classroom.

Teacher attrition rates present a challenge to school districts to recruit and retain quality teachers (Colgan, 2004; Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2001; Rosser, 2004; Wutke, 2003). A positive school culture where teachers collaborate, have a voice in the design and development of programs, and share in making decisions leads to teacher commitment and retention. Forging a strong and clear link between teacher evaluation and teacher job satisfaction, through increased

empowerment and improved collaboration, would be a step forward in meeting the nationwide goal of placing quality teacher in every classroom.

This study addressed the factors related to teacher job satisfaction, including empowerment, collaboration, and self-direction, and will examine the relationship between these factors and teacher evaluation practices. The results of this study may be used to inform educators and administrators of factors that may predict teacher job satisfaction. The study will also help school officials in making ongoing decisions about teacher evaluation practices.

Limitations of the Study

This study had the following limitations:

1. This study included participants from one selected school district consisting of eight separate school buildings. The district was selected because of its collaboration with the state department of education in the development and implementation of a performance-based teacher evaluation system. Several components of the 1999 Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation model were included in the district's evaluation model.
2. The sensitive nature of the information and responses obtained from respondents may have an effect on participants' responses. Participants may have been unwilling to respond to questions related to their level of satisfaction of evaluation practices in their current position.
3. The researcher was an employee of the district prior to 1991.

4. This study includes only teachers who are currently teaching in the AP School District. The researcher did not include teachers who are no longer teaching. In the last five years, 22 teachers left the district for various reasons, excluding retirements and teachers who left because of their spouse's job relocation.

Definition of Key Terms

Artifact data: Tangible items of information related to teacher performance.

Clinical evaluation: Clinical evaluation models use a checklist of mutually preferred objectives. Teachers are observed, notes are taken, teacher actions are scripted by the observer, and discussion follows based upon what the observer saw or did not see (Carlson & Park, 1978).

Collaboration: Collaboration is a process by which assistance is both given and requested in the performance of professional responsibilities (Bruffee, 1993).

Criteria: The items used to evaluate the teacher's performance which describe the behavior of the students and teacher and the skill of the teacher related to effective performance (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 1999).

Empowerment: Empowerment is a process by which those who traditionally have power share the power of decision-making and policy making with others. In accepting the new responsibility, those empowered are also held accountable for the decisions (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Maher, 2000; Wu & Short, 1996).

Formative evaluation: Ongoing process of data collection, documentation, conferences, professional plans, and portfolios designed to promote professional development.

Job satisfaction: The extent of an employee's perception and value of the characteristics of the work situation including: Compensation, autonomy, co-workers, and productivity (Lester, 1982; Rice, Gentile, & McFarlin, 1991).

Job dissatisfaction: The negative emotional state that results from the appraisal of the job or job experiences (Locke & Schweiger, 1979).

Organizational culture: Shared assumptions and beliefs held by members of the organization about the world and their place in it (Schein, 1992; Yukl, 1998).

Participative decision-making: Measures the degree to which teachers perceive they are involved in making decisions about issues of critical concern. The involvement is coupled with the belief that their opinions are critical to the outcomes of the decisions.

Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation: A systematic method of making professional judgments about teacher performance for the purposes of improving teacher instruction and personnel decision-making.

Planned data: Information collected purposefully by the teacher and/or the teacher's supervisor.

Post-observation conference: A collaborative conference between the administrator/supervisor and the teacher about data collected during an observation and other data submitted by the teacher (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 1999).

Pre-observation conference: The interaction between administrator/supervisor and teacher during which the lesson is previewed, and the purpose, time, length, and location of the observation are confirmed. In some cases, a form will be completed by the

teacher prior to the conference (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 1999).

Professional development: Continuous endeavor by a professional to increase the knowledge of his/her craft through the processes of collaboration, reflection, teaching, and learning (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Scribner, 1999a; Sparks & Hirsch, 1997).

Professional portfolio: A teacher's collection of data reflecting student or personal performance, student or personal development, and involvement in professional activities that reflect criteria, school building goals, and the comprehensive school improvement plan (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 1999).

Summative evaluation: Review and analysis of formative evaluation data pertaining to the performance of the teacher with regard to continued employment.

Supervision: The process of evaluating, supporting and providing professional growth to teaching personnel (Rooney, 2005; Holland & Adams, 2002).

Teacher efficacy: An individual's belief that one can positively influence student learning (Quaglia & Marion, 1991).

Teacher evaluation: "The process of collecting data and making professional judgments about performance for the purpose of decision-making" (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 1999, p. 25).

Workplace conditions: The organizational culture and interpersonal relationships in a school that either positively or negatively affect a teacher's commitment to remain in teaching.

Summary

Teacher evaluation has existed in some form since the beginning of public schools

and most educators understand the need for teacher evaluation (Beall, 1999). Legislation mandating quality instruction elevates the necessity for effective teacher evaluation practices in school districts across the country. Increasing teacher job satisfaction would be one of the first steps in improving the teaching profession, leading to the recruitment and retention of quality teachers (Latham, 1998).

This study consists of five chapters. Chapter 1 introduced the background and conceptual underpinnings of the study. The rationale of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions and null hypotheses were also presented. The significance of the study and limitations of the study were cited and definitions of key terms were listed. Chapter 2 presents related literature for the study. Key concepts, research, and theories connected with the study are shared. Chapter 3 details the design of the study presenting the research questions and null hypotheses. Chapter 3 also provides information on the research site, population and sample, measurement instruments, and methodology for data collection and analysis. Chapter 4 provides a summary of the demographic information reported by the participants and an analysis of the data collected. Chapter 5 summarizes the study and significant findings. Conclusions and implications are presented, and recommendations for future research and practice are offered.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Federal legislation mandating the placement of quality teachers in all classrooms elevated the topic of teacher evaluation among public educators. Due to codification of the No Child Left Behind Act (2002) the United States Department of Education requires that "all teachers of core academic subjects hired after the first day of the 2002-2003 school year and teaching in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds must be highly qualified" and "all teachers teaching in CORE academic subjects must be highly qualified by 2005-2006" (U.S. Department of Education, 2003, ¶ 1).

The task of ensuring that instructors are highly qualified teachers has quickly become a priority for principals and superintendents. Teacher evaluation, subsequently, becomes not only a state and federal mandate, but also an opportunity for school districts to document that quality teachers are employed within their schools.

Recruiting and retaining creative and highly motivated teachers is a challenge when an estimated 50% of beginning teachers leave the profession within five years (Boles & Troen, 2000; Colbert & Wolff, 1992; Ferguson, 2000; Rosser, 2004). Dinham and Scott's (1998) study of teachers who resigned from the teaching profession indicated teachers' dissatisfaction centers on school systems and relates to school structure or administration policies. If school districts want quality teachers to consider the education profession as a lifelong career, the job of teaching must change in fundamental ways (Boles & Troen, 2000). School districts cannot continue to spend billions of dollars on

teacher recruitment and training to perpetuate an education system in which a large percentage of the best practitioners choose to leave early in their career.

Job satisfaction holds great import for teacher retention and is a pivotal link in the chain of school reform. Collegial support and interaction appear to influence teacher job satisfaction and retention among teachers. Woods and Weasmer (2002) suggested that when teachers are satisfied, the rate of attrition is reduced, collegiality is enhanced, and job performance improves. Teachers who find their work environment supporting and nurturing have self-perceptions of competence, worth, ownership, and satisfaction with their school and find it difficult to leave a responsive workplace (Wu & Short, 1996).

Educators are recognizing the role that effective teacher evaluations can play, not only in assessing teacher competency, but in strengthening collegiality and increasing teacher empowerment (Protheroe, 2002). Newer approaches to teacher evaluation need to be ongoing, tied to professional development, and based on multiple sources of data. Through a review of literature this chapter addresses two foundational topics of teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction. Historical reviews of both topics examine trends and purposes for teacher evaluation and present findings from studies concerning teacher satisfaction. A description of the alignment between teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction, including the constructs of empowerment, professional development, and organizational culture embedded within each, are included.

Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation (PBTE)

It is important to define what teacher evaluation truly is. The definition used in each school district is a direct result of the shared beliefs and common commitments of

the members of that district. According to Danielson and McGreal (2000), any attempt to develop a teacher evaluation system must answer two fundamental questions (a) what do we believe good teaching looks like, and (b) what are the processes and procedures that will best fit what the school district wants the educational system to accomplish?

While it may be imperative to answer these two questions, it is equally imperative to realize the answers are not fixed solutions to a static problem. Education as an entity is permanently fluid and, therefore, aspects of education should be viewed as evolutionary in nature. The two questions posed by Danielson and McGreal (2000) addressed descriptive issues, the look and feel, of teacher evaluations. Equally important questions need to be asked related to the purpose of teacher evaluations.

Danielson and McGreal (2000) stated the two primary purposes of teacher evaluation are quality assurance and professional development. These two purposes could also be categorized as summative and formative, respectively. Summative purposes are aligned more with accountability and competence, whereas formative purposes are aligned with enhancement and improvement. Haefele (1993) argued an evaluation system should: (a) screen out unqualified persons from certification and selection processes, (b) provide constructive feedback to individual educators, (c) recognize and help reinforce outstanding service, (d) provide direction for staff development practices, (e) provide evidence that will withstand professional and judicial scrutiny, (f) aid institutions in terminating incompetent or unproductive personnel, and (g) unify teachers and administrators in their collective efforts to educate students.

Scriven (1981) drew attention to the distinction between formative and summative evaluation. If a school system instituted a system of assessment to encourage the

professional growth and development of its teachers, it is engaged in formative evaluation. Formative assessment data may be used as feedback to shape performances, build new practices or alter existing practices (Peterson, 2000). If a school system established an accountability system of evaluation to license, hire, give tenure to, promote, demote, or dismiss teachers, it is engaged in summative evaluation.

According to Crew, Everitt, and Nunez (1984), two major philosophical problems exist for administrators in the evaluation process. First, they focus on past poor teacher performance and they want to use the evaluation process to continue to gather documentation on a teacher's weaknesses. Administrators must constantly remind themselves that the approach to evaluation should not be to get rid of teachers performing below district expectations, but rather to cause those teachers to improve.

The second problem cited by Crew, Everitt, and Nunez (1984) is evaluators' reluctance to candidly address weaknesses observed in teachers. Evaluators fail to face up to the responsibility of an honest assessment of a teacher's skills, abilities and performance. Evaluators can be prone to looking to the positive side of teachers' actions and write glowing reports when they should report weaknesses that they know are present. Evaluators gloss over situations because they do not have the documentation or simply procrastinate in completing a negative evaluation. Far too many administrators literally turn their backs on problem teacher performance (Crew, Everitt, & Nunez).

Teacher evaluation systems that focus on the professional development of teachers have the potential to improve the quality of instruction and contribute to continuous school improvement. According to Machell (1995), research exists that identifies specific elements found in effective teacher evaluation systems. The research

provides a theory base that guides efforts in the development of teacher evaluation systems that encourage teacher growth and instructional improvements. As a result of this research, a number of attributes have been found to be present in effective teacher evaluation systems. Systems that have a clear purpose of what they hope to achieve through teacher evaluation, with everyone understanding this purpose, as well as systems that match the procedures and processes of teacher evaluation to the selected purpose, have proven to be effective in facilitating teacher growth. Districts that have made teacher evaluation a priority by allocating sufficient resources, time and money, and providing training for evaluators have also been proven to be effective.

Additional attributes of evaluation systems that have been proven to facilitate teacher growth include: (a) effective feedback provided for teachers; (b) multiple sources of data; (c) clear, relevant, and meaningful performance criteria; (d) teachers actively involved in peer assistance and teacher goal setting; (e) mutual trust between the teacher and evaluator; and (f) teacher evaluation and staff development which are systematically linked (Machell, 1995; Marshall, 2005).

Historical Review of Teacher Evaluation

The evaluation of certified teachers has undergone numerous changes over the last 60 years. Hoskins (1987) suggested the process of teacher evaluation is multifaceted and affected by several complex and constantly changing variables. The evaluation of certificated teachers is a part of the continually evolving dynamics of the entire educational system. Numerous factors still enter into the equation concerning the way teachers teach and the way teaching is evaluated. Hoskins also found teachers did not have a strong preference for peer review, unscheduled observations, or evaluations from a

person outside the educational community. Subsequently, as preparation programs for educators continue to emphasize reflective, dialogue-oriented work and collaborative efforts, it is time to revisit the teacher evaluation process. This section of the literature review will examine historical aspects of teacher evaluation along with national and state perspectives of Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation.

In looking at the history of teacher evaluation, Danielson and McGreal (2000) stated that, in the 1940s and 1950s, educators and researchers emphasized what are often called presage variables. Presage variables took the form of traits teachers naturally possessed, such as voice, appearance, emotional stability, warmth, trustworthiness, and enthusiasm. Educators of this era believed that teachers who possessed these traits were more likely to perform effectively, so these traits became the centerpiece items in local teacher evaluation criteria. There is no real evidence available to link presage variables to good teaching or student learning (Danielson & McGreal, 2000).

During the 1960s and 1970s a torrent of energy centered on research in the field of teaching and prompted a dramatic shift in the focus of teacher evaluation. This time period coincided with significant advances in evaluation skills and classroom observation techniques. Researchers were developing clinical evaluation processes as a way of enhancing instruction, and others were designing observation and ratings instruments that allowed more accurate depiction of what was occurring in classrooms (Danielson & McGreal, 2000).

According to Peterson (2000), 70 years of research on principal ratings of teachers show that administrator ratings do not work well. Several studies on these types of evaluation models have been conducted (Ebmeir, 2003; Holland & Adams, 2002;

Marshall, 2005). Wood and Pohland (1979) studied teacher evaluation ratings forms and concluded:

> Teacher evaluation serves as organizational maintenance rather than a teaching improvement function. First, rather than focusing primarily on the teachers' classroom instructional behaviors, the items on which teachers are evaluated scan the entire work world. Only a minority of the items are teaching oriented. The items indicate an organizational preference for stability rather than for change. Second, the procedures suggest more concern for assessing minimal competency of neophytes than with instructional improvement. And finally, the formal expectations and conditions, which surround the principal/evaluator's role, serve to perpetuate the organizational maintenance function of teacher evaluation. (p. 81)

Donaldson (2000) described evaluation as a collaborative process, focusing on the teacher's selection of a course of professional growth designed to increase student success. There is agreement that collaboration is essential, and that coaching, guided professional dialogues, and sharing mutual learning will accelerate both professional growth and student learning (Donaldson). Donaldson studied the implementation of a teacher evaluation approach by the Pajaro Valley Unified School District in California. In this approach, teachers were encouraged to work together to self-assess and analyze their own teaching practices in relationship to student learning. Many structured collaborative opportunities were available throughout the evaluation system. Probationary teachers collaborated with the administrator and focused on developing and documenting the teaching skills described in the CSTP (California Standards and Teaching Profession) through classroom observations and a teacher-developed portfolio. In the Pajaro study tenured teachers chose to: (a) develop a coaching relationship with another teacher; (b) develop a coaching relationship with an administrator; or (c) develop a portfolio to share with other teachers and an administrator (Donaldson).

A National Perspective of Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation

In 1987 the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) promoted discussion of more meaningful standards for teachers and developed a performance-based assessment system to recognize advanced competence among experienced teachers (Weiss & Weiss, 1998). In 1989 the NBPTS developed the following teaching standards that became the cornerstone for teacher evaluation in 33 states:

1. Teachers are committed to students and their learning;
2. Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students;
3. Teachers are responsible for managing and mentoring student learning;
4. Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience;
5. Teachers are members of learning communities. (¶ 6)

A national study conducted by Wiederhold in 1991 (as cited in Argotsinger, 2002) provided a status report of the teacher performance evaluation components and procedures and described models in use at the time. The study found only nine states mandated a competency-driven, evaluation system with specific, pre-determined procedures, while the other 41 states allowed each school district to develop policies for evaluating teachers. Clearly there has been a trend in recent years not only to require that evaluation take place, but to require that specific procedures take place within the evaluation process. There has been a change in emphasis from the traditional and judgmental summative evaluation that substantiates employment decision-making to a formative developmental format that emphasizes personal growth.

In 1992 the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education collaborated with teachers, teacher educators, and state licensing officials to create a set of core standards that defined the knowledge, dispositions, and performances essential for all beginning teachers (Weiss & Weiss, 1998). Performance assessments, modeled from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards initiatives, evolved from the collaboration that included: videotapes and analyses of teaching, samples of lessons, teacher demonstrations showing how their teaching related to student learning and how their teaching fostered higher-level reasoning and problem-solving skills.

The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) developed assessments that evaluated how specific teaching behaviors contributed to student learning (as cited in Weiss & Weiss, 1998). Using the guidelines based on best practices at the time, the NCTAF recognized that evaluation becomes part of a reflective process in which teaching is studied on a regular basis with colleagues for purposes of continual growth, rather than static formalities determined outside the classroom.

In 1996, the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association initiated peer review and peer assistance programs in selected districts across the nation. The programs relied on teachers having increased opportunities for decision making and collaboration with colleagues as the evaluation process became part of everyday practice (Weiss & Weiss, 1998). Altering the process by which teachers are evaluated provided the impetus of deeper structural changes and increased autonomy. The move to a more collaborative evaluation process strengthened the standards for

obtaining tenure and remaining in teaching. The success of peer review and peer assistance programs were attributed to (1) "more useful measures of performance, (2) intensive assistance, and (3) expertise of consulting teachers who are matched by subject and grade level with the teacher being helped" (Weiss & Weiss, ¶ 14).

In 1999, Bickford (as cited in Argotsinger, 2002) worked with alternative teacher evaluation plans and studied evaluation methods used in one Pennsylvania school district to monitor teacher quality and enhance teaching and learning. The results of the study point to a need for more research in the field of evaluation. In particular, alternative teacher evaluation plans need to be closely scrutinized for their contributions that lead to enhanced student learning.

Sullivan and Glanz (2000) suggested that supervision is in crisis due to the wide range of perplexing problems such as conflicting definitions of supervision, ambiguities related to role and function of the supervisor, and low levels of teacher acceptance of supervision procedures. Sullivan and Glanz further proposed that supervision lacks focus, direction, and balance. During the investigation of the challenges of educational supervision, Sullivan and Glanz worked closely with schools in New York and New Jersey to help develop or examine alternative supervisory programs. The study examined five theory-based, alternative approaches to supervision that follow best practices in supervision, including peer coaching, the use of portfolios for differentiated supervision, mentoring, peer assessment, and action research.

During qualitative interviews with principals and assistant principals, patterns emerged linking leadership strategies to successful supervision approaches. The first crucial facet to surface emphasized a "democratic conception of supervision based on

collaboration, participative decision making and reflective practice--all with the goal of developing self-directed, autonomous professionals" (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000, p. 233). The second critical component emerging from the study indicated the need for visionary school leaders who enjoined their faculties to construct a supervisory program that improved teaching and learning rather than relying on inspectoral practices.

Duffy (2000) outlined a new paradigm for instructional supervision called Knowledge Work Supervision (KWS). Knowledge Work Supervision is structurally and substantively different from previous approaches to instructional supervision as it shifts the focus of supervision from the behavior of individual teachers to an examination and improvement of a school system's knowledge work processes, social culture, and environmental relationships. Duffy proposed that the problem of trying to improve instruction through previous approaches of supervision is an intricate and seemingly insoluble problem and one that needs to be approached with a different set of rules and boundaries. Knowledge Work Supervision is the paradigm for improving teaching and learning through an entire school system.

The Knowledge Work Supervision changed the underlying philosophy of a school system. The focus on improving individuals changed to improving the entire organization for the betterment of each individual (Duffy, 2000). The entire school system is assessed regarding environmental relationships, both internally and externally; organization design; teacher motivation; and job satisfaction. Key players change from principals and instructional supervisors to strategic leadership teams, improvement teams in each school or grade level, site improvement teams, and communities of practice. Within the KWS paradigm teachers are viewed as semiautonomous knowledge workers and stakeholders

in the organization improvement process, as opposed to employees needing to be evaluated as in previous supervision systems (Duffy).

Duffy (2000) noted that Knowledge Work Supervision required a high level of participation and replaced the traditional bureaucratic organization design of school systems with a participative organization design. High participation contributed to a sense of self-efficacy, the sense that one has some degree of influence or control of his/her situation. Duffy suggested teachers with a strong sense of self-efficacy are more likely to adopt new classroom techniques and are more likely to stay in the profession. A higher level of teacher collaboration and participation is needed to transform an entire school system into a high-performing organization of learners.

Obstacles to Effective Teacher Evaluation Practices

A study conducted by Coker, Medley, and Soar (1980), demonstrated the problems of using any individual observer-raters in teacher evaluation practices. This study addressed previous research that showed little evidence that any set of observational criteria could be related empirically to student learning. These findings challenge the assumptions that an observer can enter a classroom, use an observation framework of supposed desirable performances, rate the teacher, and draw conclusions about the quality of teaching that can be defended for purposes of teacher evaluation. Similar objections to the checklist format of teacher evaluation are challenged more in the current phase of school reform (Brandt, 1996).

Medley and Coker (1987) obtained ratings of 46 principals on 322 teachers in three roles: (a) facilitating pupil learning of fundamental knowledge; (b) fostering pupil development of citizenship, personal satisfaction, and self-understanding; and (c) being a

professional colleague of other educators. The study reported low statistical correlation between administrator ratings and teacher roles. An important finding of the study was the low accuracy of the principals' judgments regarding the performance of the teachers he or she supervised.

According to Peterson (1984), the particular quality of the evaluation model directly affects choices of actions taken, efficiency of activities associated with those actions, satisfaction level of the participants, and consequences or ultimate results of those actions. Therefore, evaluation models should possess differing characteristics aligned with those choices, efficiencies, satisfactions, and consequences.

Effective teacher evaluation systems are fair and just, meet demonstrated needs of clients, answer the questions of interested audiences, are cost-effective, and are free from unjustifiable side effects (Peterson, 2000). Effective teacher evaluation systems should be technically sophisticated enough to encompass the full range of teaching styles, duties and responsibilities. They should be sociologically and politically complex. Defensible systems should be research based and involved in ongoing studies of validity and reliability. Effective teacher evaluation systems should be evaluated and empirical data should be gathered on levels of participant satisfaction, teacher performance norms, and system performance in terms of its claims. Evaluation systems should be compared with those of others for outcomes, long-term effects, expenses, and problems. Finally, effective teacher evaluation systems are credentialed by outside experts and knowledgeable educators (Peterson).

To produce a better evaluation system, a school district needs to do more than change the model used by educators. The environment surrounding the system must be

changed as well. Valentine (1992) stated that effective teacher evaluation practices should be focused on personnel development as opposed to personnel employment decisions. Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation models must emphasize conferences between the teacher and the evaluator, as well as personal reflections by the teacher. Before the conferences can be of maximum value there needs to be an atmosphere of trust prevalent in the school culture. Before a teacher can accurately reflect and conduct personal critique, he or she needs to be aware of current research and best practices. The mechanism for that trust and awareness is an opportunity for professional growth (Plecki, 2000; Short, Greer, & Melvin, 1994; Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 2000).

Stodolsky (1984) studied the stability of classroom observations and found that teacher evaluations based on observation by classroom visits depends very heavily upon what the teacher is observed doing at the time of the visit. Because most administrators have limited time to evaluate each teacher, the small number of observations results in unreliable data for evaluation. Scriven (1981) also criticized classroom visits as a single method of evaluating teachers. Scriven suggested the number of classroom visits is too small to be representative and that observers almost always bring personal prejudices with them. The dominant influence of styles observed in the classroom that are used for judgment cannot be linked to student learning.

Summative evaluation has the primary purpose of enabling management to make decisions regarding the retention or dismissal of personnel. Scriven (1981) designated summative evaluations as a primary evaluation activity due to the need for personnel decisions involving careers. Additionally, Scriven determined that without the

judgmental power of summative evaluation, there could be no determination of whether the activity was good or bad; therefore, there could be no determination as to whether improvement was needed. Recent educational research (Ebmeir, 2003; Kimball, White, Milanowski, & Borman, 2004; Marshall, 2005) has made it clear that we need new approaches to teaching and to the description and evaluation of teaching. The development of evaluation practices was often driven by evaluation criteria generated from lists of behaviors taken from Hunter's (1982) steps in lesson design. Evaluation instruments developed during this time often provided rating scales and checklists that accompanied evaluation criteria. The rating scales and checklists encouraged a single view of teaching and have prompted a simplistic, summative orientation toward evaluation that persisted into the 1990s (Danielson & McGreal, 2000).

Kauchak, Peterson, and Driscoll (1985) surveyed Utah and Florida teachers. They found evaluations based on principal visits to have little or no effect on actual teaching practice. The first problem in evaluation practices identified by the teachers was that evaluation visits were too brief and non-rigorous in their content. Second, teachers complained that the principal was not knowledgeable in current teaching practices. Overall, the study suggested that teachers did not regard evaluations, based on two or three observations and using a checklist to determine observed strategies, instrumental in improving teaching.

Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Berstein (1984) conducted extensive surveys and case studies of school districts on teacher evaluation for the National Institute of Education. These studies became known as the RAND Studies. The most serious problem they found in evaluation practices was that principals were in a

significant role conflict position as principals serve the dual role of providing supervisory support to assist teachers in improving instruction while simultaneously evaluating teachers' competency. Many of the RAND respondents believed that principal evaluations were upwardly biased, assigning a rating higher than deserved, and their disinclination to be tough made the early identification of problem teachers difficult and masked important variations in teacher performance. The study additionally found that principals considered teacher evaluation a necessary evil or a time consuming chore. Three other major problems of teacher evaluation were identified in the study. First, teachers resisted evaluations and were apathetic toward the process. Second, uniformity and consistency within the evaluations were found to be lacking within school districts, and third, evaluators conducted the evaluations without adequate training in the assessment instrument.

Scriven (1981) provided a thorough analysis of problems with the teacher evaluation practices of the era. The analysis identified four components of evaluation practices that should have been provided by educational systems, but rarely were in practice. The components included: (a) administrators being evaluated, (b) evaluation of other expectations of a teacher's position, (c) distinguishing between worth and merit in the evaluation of teachers, and (d) providing an independent support system for teachers. This generation of evaluation systems is grounded in the concept of teaching that prevailed in the 1970s, and continued to evolve based on the research done by Hunter (1982). Weiss and Weiss's (1998) study supported Scriven in advocating multiple components within teacher evaluations and found that evaluations based on competency would soon be meaningless and obsolete as a majority of teachers typically performed

above a minimal level. Duke (1993) summarized conventional evaluation systems characterized by a set of performance standards and a series of categories by which those standards are checked, "If there is a less meaningful ritual for the vast majority of experienced teachers, it would be hard to find" (p. 703).

Glatthorn (1997) cautioned that using any evaluation alone in an unreceptive environment thwarted the professional growth of teachers. Professional growth is so complex that it requires a systemic approach in a supportive environment. Regardless of its form, cooperative professional development can effectively foster growth only when certain steps are taken to ensure success. These steps include: (a) providing a supportive culture; (b) ensuring bottom-up involvement and top-down support; (c) keeping the process simple; (d) providing the needed training; (e) arranging for the time needed; and (f) rewarding participants.

One option for improving evaluation is to diversify those doing the evaluation. The opportunity for professional interaction and the ability to share beliefs allows for a more knowledgeable evaluator as well as a more knowledgeable person being evaluated (Manatt, 1997). According to Maher (2000), another obstruction to implementing a dialogue-oriented evaluation process is teacher resistance. Teacher resistance may be a by-product of years of working in isolation, a lack of knowledge of best practices, a reluctance to accept increased responsibility, simply a fear of things done differently, or a lack of permeation of empowerment ideals throughout the school culture.

Trends in Teacher Evaluation

Johnson (1994) investigated the teacher evaluation practices in Utah to determine whether current procedures and practices were conducive to positive and helpful teacher

development. The study recommended more resources at the district level for in-service, at the university level for pre-service, and more staff time and involvement in conducting evaluations at the school level. The study also recommended an increased focus on improving the relationship between principals and teachers in the evaluation process and greater sharing of resources and information about evaluation systems among districts throughout the state (Johnson).

According to Sawyer (2001), one school district in Nevada created a new performance-based teacher evaluation model that contained alternative teacher evaluation practices. This model consisted of four domains of teaching: 1) planning and preparation, 2) classroom environment, 3) instruction, and 4) professional responsibilities. Each domain identifies components and more specific elements of teacher behaviors, and has a scoring guide that describes teaching behavior as unsatisfactory, target for growth, proficient, or area of strength.

There were several keys to the success of this evaluation model. First, there were annual goal setting sessions between teachers and their principals. The participation by teachers taught them self-reflective practices, encouraging adjustments to teaching strategies when necessary. Second, novice and veteran teachers received different numbers of evaluations and third, expanded data collection processes to include parent conferences, IEP meetings, artifacts such as letters to parents, and activities in which teachers participated were included (Sawyer, 2001).

According to Mayo (1997), nine evaluation procedures were in general use. These included: (a) classroom observations, (b) peer partnership,(c) teacher mentoring, (d) peer coaching, (e) portfolios, (f) self-evaluation, (g) student/parent evaluation, (h) artifact

collection, and (i) action research. These trends in evaluation depicted teaching as a non-routine activity that draws on a reliable body of technical knowledge and is conducted in collaboration with other professional colleagues. Teacher evaluation, in this view, is a collaborative professional enterprise meeting the needs of the organization and all members.

Mayo (1997) and Sawyer (2001) suggested an evaluation model that emphasized teacher autonomy would support self-monitoring and self-modification. The Missouri Council of School Administrators (MSCA) supported the modification of the evaluation model to reflect multiple Likert (1932) scale categories instead of the "meets expectation, does not meet expectation" format (MCSA, 2004). Multiple Likert scale choices allow differentiation by the evaluator and are more motivational and relevant to teachers of multiple experience and performance levels.

Peterson (2000) offered other new directions in evaluation to improve results for teachers, administrators, students, and the public. These included:

1. Emphasizing the function of teacher evaluation to seek out, document and acknowledge the good teaching that already exists.
2. Using good reasons to evaluate.
3. Placing the teacher at the center of evaluation activity.
4. Using more than one person to judge teacher quality and performance.
5. Limiting administrator judgment role in teacher evaluation.
6. Using multiple data sources to inform judgments about teacher quality.
7. When possible, including actual pupil achievement data.
8. Using variable data sources to inform judgments.

9. Spending the time and other resources needed to recognize good teaching.
10. Using research on teacher evaluation correctly.
11. Attending to the sociology of teacher evaluation.
12. Using the results of teacher evaluation to encourage personal professional dossiers, publicize aggregated results, and support teacher promotion systems. (p. 4-12)

Marshall (1998) suggested redesigning approaches to teacher evaluation so that the evaluation process is more effective as a "front end" assessment for teacher development. Such an evaluation should be based on criteria or goals that the principal and teacher agree are relevant to teacher development. The evaluation system should give teachers useful dialogue on students' needs, the opportunity to learn new teaching techniques, and counsel from principals and other teachers about how to make changes in the classroom. Further, the standards used by the administrator should: (a) relate to best practices in teaching skills, (b) be as objective as possible, (c) be clearly communicated to the teacher before the evaluation, (d) be reviewed after the evaluation, and (e) be linked to the teacher's professional development (Marshall, 1998).

Ebersold's (2004) study compared teachers' and administrators' perspectives of teacher evaluation related to: the purpose of the evaluation process, the role of professional growth within the evaluation process, data sources, and the effect of the evaluation process on teacher growth and student learning. Thirty-eight percent of the teachers surveyed (n=252) indicated the performance-based teacher evaluation was used for improvement of instruction, while 25% indicated that the performance-based teacher evaluation was not intended to be used for improvement of instruction. Ebersold's

respondents provided a mixed response regarding the performance-based teacher evaluation's impact on professional growth. Forty percent of the respondents indicated the performance-based teacher evaluation was used to promote professional growth and 28% indicated very little use of the performance-based teacher evaluation in promoting professional growth.

Ebersold (2004) additionally indicated that teachers' perspectives were mixed regarding the use of various data sources during the performance-based evaluation process. Sixty percent of the teachers surveyed indicated very little connection between portfolio creation and professional growth, but indicated that reflective practice was connected to professional growth. Respondents were divided in responding to the impact of the evaluation process on overall professional growth, with 35% indicating a high degree of impact and 30% indicating a low degree of impact.

Professional Development

The success of evaluation model reform initiatives depends on the quality and accessibility of professional development for teachers (Corcoran, 1995). The processes of professional development are not peculiar just to educators. In an educational organization, articulated processes of professional development and the idea of empowerment are the keys to improving instructional skill and expertise, which directly leads to the fundamental purpose of the Missouri PBTE, the enhancement of instruction (Duke, 1993; Jacobson, 2005; Kimball, White, Milanowski, & Borman, 2004; Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 2000; Short & Greer, 1997; Short, Greer, & Melvin, 1994; Valentine, 1992;).

The increased emphasis on professional development for the evaluator and

person being evaluated is vital with regard to the connection between current research and best practices. New ideas are the lifeblood of change. By exposing itself to newer ideas both internally and externally, a school grows in its instructional capacities and capabilities. The individual members become partners in an increasingly mature profession committed to the fundamental pursuit of enhancing the instructional processes of teaching through collaboration, empowerment, shared decision-making, and continuous professional growth (Short & Rinehart, 1992; Zymbylas & Pananastasiou, 2005).

Iwanicki (2000) described the integrated approach to teacher evaluation. Teacher evaluation starts with the school improvement plan, supporting the school improvement plan with quality staff development, and reinforcing staff development through teacher evaluation. When this occurs, meaningful improvement in teaching and student learning results. According to Iwanicki, the first component of this integrated approach to evaluation is to have teachers work in teams to prioritize improvement strategies by addressing the school's priority improvement goals. The second component of this approach is to have principals conduct classroom observations that support the continuing professional growth and development needs of individual teachers. Iwanicki described a two-year study of the integrated approach. The study found that teachers developed more ownership for student learning and improved the quality of their reflective judgment. Students' scores also improved on statewide assessments.

Sawyer (2001) posed that early systems of teacher evaluation were time intensive for administrators, did not include collaboration with teachers or opportunities for professional growth, and did not result in a valuable end product. Information about

the evaluation was returned to teachers too late to be useful, or it was imprecise and vague. Teacher evaluation systems should provide more teacher autonomy, by incorporating collaboration with colleagues, intrinsic motivation, and self-monitoring opportunities.

Personal reflection, another evaluation format, allows a person to grow from within. It is this internal acceptance of accountability that is a fundamental basis for empowerment. Organizational members learn a great deal initially from their experiences, but more from their reflections upon those experiences (Schon, 1987).

Self-evaluation is a component of an evaluation model used in a learning organization. Teachers regularly evaluate their teaching strategies and techniques through personal reflections about their work. Andrejko (2000) found teacher portfolios to be an appropriate option of evaluation approved by administrators. The portfolio allows for teacher reflection, peer collaboration and a partnership approach with the evaluator. The portfolios are best used in a growth-oriented teacher evaluation system because they allow for the collection of data over a period of time (Andrejko).

Additionally, the idea of personal reflection allows a single staff member to evaluate him or herself. The individual staff member is simultaneously the evaluator and the evaluated. Personal reflection should be both internal and external. Internally, the teacher reflects on his or her values and beliefs, effort, preparation, level of skill, and professional status. External reflections are also important tools for a teacher in that they illustrate how students performed against the backdrop of teacher expectations. Assessing test questions and reflecting on adjustments made in lesson plans allows a teacher to

enhance the teaching and learning that took place as compared to the teaching and learning that was expected to take place (Guskey, 2000).

Multiple Data Sources

Studies have found leadership a crucial variable in changing the paradigm of teacher evaluation. A major part of this paradigm shift in evaluation is toward the integration of supervision, evaluation and staff development. Glatthorn (1997) stated that alternative teacher evaluation practices operate on the belief that teaching is a profession. As members of that profession, teachers should have more control over their professional development. As skilled professionals, teachers need both support and feedback, not only from administrators or supervisors, but from colleagues, students, and parents. Glatthorn, Van Maanen and Barley (1997) observed a commitment to high standards of performance is more easily promoted through shared professional norms than by bureaucratic controls. One of the best ways to foster collegiality is with a differentiated evaluation system that strongly emphasizes cooperation and mutual assistance.

Sergiovanni (2001) suggested that a key component in effective schools is shared leadership. The amount of leadership present is similar to energy in the universe and is neither created nor destroyed, but simply changes forms. By allowing others to be involved in the leadership duties, including peer evaluation as related to the development of professional development plans, the principal does not relinquish authority. The principal simply shares the responsibility of evaluation with others who have previously not been asked to participate. The essential factor of differentiated evaluation enables teachers to work together, helping each other grow professionally. The systemic

permeation of collaboration throughout the culture must be an identifiable characteristic if the process of collaboration is to be effective (Peterson, 2000).

Glatthorn's (1997) theory of differentiated supervision is a form of collaboration that allows teachers certain options with regard to the way they are evaluated. Glatthorn stated three supporting elements: (a) schools effectively implementing alternative teacher evaluation practices have a unique global climate referred to as collaboration; (b) competent teachers can get the feedback needed by informal observations and peer coaching, thus allowing more time for teachers needing help; and (c) teachers can learn from experienced colleagues.

Glatthorn (1997) warned, however, that not all collaboration is effective, "when collaborative systems are imposed on teachers in a culture that fosters isolation…a culture that rewards isolation and competition provides an inhospitable environment for the differentiated model" (p. 5-7). Peer coaching and peer review, when used in a collaborative environment, should also provide motivation for continuous improvement, specific feedback, and assistance that results in real progress and builds understanding while fostering the environment of a learning community.

Marshall (1998) outlined a process of evaluation entitled Wants, Activities and Plan. The process's first phase included the supervisor asking what the teacher wants or envisions in a quality teaching and learning situation and the teacher describing the classroom strategies in terms of teacher instruction and student learning. The second phase included the supervisor asking the teacher how the activities guide students toward the lesson's objective and, finally, the teacher initiating a plan. The plan can be designed by the teacher, in collaboration with the evaluator, or in collaboration with others.

Teacher-initiated suggestions promote ownership in the evaluation process. The difficult step of acceptance is eliminated. Traditional teacher evaluation approaches are not putting educators on track to enhanced relationships. Telling people what to do communicates control and criticism. Growth comes from creating an environment in which people want to change. For this to occur, the evaluation procedure must be viewed as a positive process rather than as a negative one. The strategy should lead to intrinsic motivation resulting in desire, rather than extrinsic motivation by compliance (Marshall, 1998).

Mannatt (1997) focused upon another recent trend that has impacted models of teacher evaluation, the use of 360-degree feedback. This practice, well established in the areas of business and industry, incorporated the team evaluation approach. All who have contact with the employee evaluates the employee: supervisors, peers, clients, and the public. The overarching purpose of performance evaluation is to improve performance year after year. Done correctly, 360-degree feedback can be the keystone to school transformation efforts. Multiple sources of data and different approaches are needed for different classes of employees. Data sources include principals, peers, parents, students, self-reflection, and student achievement gains. After examining data each year, teachers and principals can then determine professional growth goals. The data analysis and planning that precedes setting improvement goals is the most important link in the team evaluation process (Manatt).

Dyer (2001) stated that the fundamental premise of 360-degree feedback is that data gathered from multiple perspectives are more comprehensive and objective than data gathered from only one source. The role of 360-degree feedback is to allow educators to

compare their own views of themselves with the views of others. This comparison has the potential for leading teachers through an unfreezing process where they move from a rigid, unchanging process of evaluation to a fluid process with varying evaluation approaches (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Schein, 1992). Feedback is developmental and not evaluative for hiring or dismissal purposes, and a coaching or mentoring session must accompany the feedback. The development of professional goals or action plan follows the feedback and the feedback belongs to the receiver. This process must be confidential, and Dyer (2001) warned it can be harmful if not used correctly.

If teachers view evaluation as a mandate from the administration, neither teacher quality nor school culture will rise to optimum levels. However, if the evaluation is perceived as a tool in achieving mutual goals and conducted in a non-threatening environment, the process is on track toward success.

Missouri Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation

In 1984 the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) provided the school districts with a Missouri Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation model. Schools revised teacher evaluation systems to reflect the mandate from the Missouri legislature. Not only did school district personnel rewrite their evaluation systems, they redefined the focus of the teacher evaluation process. The new focus was to move the evaluation system away from a clinical supervisory system and toward a developmental system.

The teacher evaluation systems used prior to the legislation identified what a teacher did in the classroom, focusing on accountability and competency. The focus has

since shifted to concentrating on the process of how a teacher teaches, emphasizing learning styles, teaching strategies and research-based best practices.

Brown (1987) found the more contact a teacher had with the principal, the more positive the teacher felt about the PBTE. Such contact promoted trust and assists in enhancing the professional growth of teachers. Valentine and Harting (1988), in a three-year report of PBTE work in Missouri, indicated a shift in the focus of evaluation toward a developmental model and away from the clinical evaluation model. With the major shift, evaluations, formerly used only to measure teacher competence, were also expected to foster a teacher's development and growth.

A 1988 study conducted by Davis (as cited in Argotsinger, 2002) found a significant relationship between principals who requested that teachers supply artifact data as a component of the PBTE process and principals reporting a positive perception of PBTE contributions to instructional improvement and student achievement. This study also found the presence of growth plans for teachers as a PBTE component related significantly to principals' perception of performance evaluation, which impacted instructional improvement.

Perspectives of Missouri teachers and the impact of PBTE were studied by Schweitzer (1990). More specifically, Schweitzer's study looked at the impact of the Missouri's PBTE process on the improvement of instruction and student achievement. Results indicated that more than 90% of the school districts in the state of Missouri used the state PBTE model, but more than 50% of the teachers said they had never received growth plans as part of their evaluation process. Schweitzer also noted that 50% of the teachers surveyed reported that their districts did not require a growth plan for teachers

rated as performing below expectations. This study also found that most teachers expect the PBTE process to be moderately effective in improving teacher performance and student achievement and they also favored the PBTE system over the evaluation programs in the past.

In 1997, a statewide Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation committee was created by the DESE to revise the 1984 model and align it with current research and best practices of teaching, learning, and evaluation. The Commissioner of Education, Robert Bartman, stated that the intent of the second PBTE model was to move away from the competency driven models of the 1970s toward professional development and continued professional improvement of the teachers' effective instructional processes (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 1999). As teacher evaluations shifted toward promoting continual teacher growth, it was postulated that there would be an increase in the academic successes of current and future students and schools.

Counts, Shepards and Farmer (1998) conducted a study of the 1984 Missouri PBTE model. The authors recommended: (a) a peer assistance model for the principal in the formative aspect of evaluation, (b) reduction of principal time on evaluation of teachers, and (c) changing the culture to more of a learning community where knowledge is created internally.

Corkery (1999) conducted a study that analyzed differences among Missouri teachers' perceptions of their effectiveness when using mandatory enrichment plans against voluntary enrichment plans. The districts that utilized voluntary plans asked teachers to take some personal responsibility for their professional development over a

three-year period. This study found that the teachers' perceptions about performance plans were significantly different depending upon the type of professional growth plan used by their district. Plans that allowed teachers to take some responsibility in their development were perceived to be more effective.

The 1999 Missouri PBTE model focused on both student and teacher behaviors and is based on revised Missouri standards along with effective teaching research, quite different from the previous model documenting individual teacher behaviors. The 1999 model provided opportunities for the teacher and supervisor to work cooperatively in documenting student learning, while documentation under the old model was collected only during classroom observations. Professional growth was integrated into the 1999 model, since professional growth and development were not formally assessed in the first model. The1999 Missouri PBTE model also provided tenured teachers with choices in their annual professional development process, not available in the previous model.

The 1999 Missouri PBTE model emphasized:

1. Evaluative and professional development processes.
2. Self-directed professional development for teachers.
3. Clear criteria and standards, supporting the Show-Me Standards, student performance, and student assessment.
4. Clear procedures for the evaluation of performance.
5. An emphasis on training for both teachers and administrators.
6. A professional collaborative process that is necessary for the development of a learning community (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 1999).

Another fundamental difference between the 1999 Missouri PBTE model and the models used in earlier years related to the inherent differences between the evaluation of the tenured versus non-tenured teacher. Under the 1999 model, tenured teachers experiencing difficulties in the classroom were provided more direct assistance than those not experiencing difficulties.

Effective teacher evaluation practices focus on professional development and personal growth as opposed to personnel employment decisions (Valentine, 1992). The 1999 Missouri PBTE model emphasized conferences between the teacher and the evaluator as well as personal reflections by the teacher. Before the conferences can be of maximum value, an atmosphere of trust must be prevalent in the school culture where the evaluation process occurs. Before a teacher can accurately reflect and personally critique his or her professional teaching skills, he or she needs to be aware of current research and best practices. The mechanism for instilling trust between teacher and supervisor and awareness of research-based teaching practices is the opportunity for professional growth (Plecki, 2000; Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 2000; Short, Greer & Melvin, 1994).

The opportunity to grow and develop professionally is a mandated component of Missouri's PBTE. So, too, is the concept of professional communication, both with colleagues and through personal reflection. As the purpose of evaluation shifts from the summative driven task-oriented process to the formative driven dialogue-oriented process (Scribner et al., 1999; Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 2000; Short & Greer, 1997), emphasis is placed on individual teacher input in terms of personal reflection, personal assessment, and peer review. The shift in the focus of teacher

evaluation, supported by Missouri's PBTE, was to promote better instruction that in turn could lead to improvements in student learning, benefits identified by Rinehart and Short (1993). Increases in student achievement should occur as a result of organizational changes, implementation, and facilitation of the evaluation model (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Rinehart & Short, 1993; Valentine, 1992) and be the end of the process that begins with effective teacher evaluation.

Belcher and Machell's (1999) study examined the perceptions of administrators and teachers concerning the efficacy, quality, and impact of the piloted 1999 Missouri Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation model. The piloted model required more informal interaction between administrator and teacher, incorporated multiple data sources to make evaluative decisions, emphasized professional growth for administrators and teachers, and provided a differentiated evaluation approach for new and experienced teachers. The study indicated that teachers had positive perceptions of evaluations when the 1999 Missouri Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation model was used in areas related to the attributes of the evaluator, data sources used for evaluation, attributes of the feedback received, and elements of the evaluation context.

Some schools with a progressive cultural vision incorporate other options available within the Missouri PBTE framework. One option is to diversify those doing the evaluation. Differentiated supervision (Glatthorn, 1997) and the 360-degree feedback evaluation (Manatt, 1997), terms used to describe the use of a variety of resources to evaluate educators, suggest multiple evaluators would be a positive aspect of evaluation. However, the availability of multiple evaluators reduces the authority of a single evaluator and poses a risk to teachers who may not be comfortable having a variety of

evaluators. The transfer of authority from a central evaluator to peers poses a potential problem when the effect of the total evaluation is a binding agreement such as incentive or merit pay or simply the issuance or continuance of a contract (Glatthorn, 1997). Because the purpose of Missouri's PBTE is to enhance instruction through professional growth, strategies to minimize this conflict need to be designed and implemented.

Teacher Evaluation Models in the AP School District

In 1984 a state model of performance-based teacher evaluation was developed. The instrument was developed by the state department of education and served as a model for consistency in evaluation of teachers. The model served as the AP School District's teacher evaluation instrument from 1985-1999. This method focused more on the summative side of evaluation than the formative aspect of evaluation, and embedded within the model was the professional development of teachers.

In 1997, prior to the state initiative, the AP School District administration perceived that the 1984 PBTE model was not consistent with current trends and best practices of teacher evaluation. The district created a task force of school administrators and teachers and charged them with developing a new performance-based teacher evaluation model. Teachers and administrators from each building within the district were included in the task force. State level public school administrators took notice of the innovative ideas generated from the AP School District task force. In collaboration with educators from the state department of education, the AP School District's task force met throughout the school terms from 1997-1999 to evaluate the current statewide teacher evaluation model and develop a revised model for future implementation.

By the spring of 1999, the task force had developed a draft copy of a new PBTE district model that reflected many current and best practices of effective evaluation. The task force presented the draft model to the entire AP School District staff in April of 1999 and subsequently made minor changes before presenting the model to the Board of Education in September, 1999. The AP School District Board of Education approved the draft copy of the district PBTE model and implemented the model throughout the district during the 1999-2000 school year. During the implementation phase, the task force met periodically to review teacher evaluation practices and to assess the newly-adopted PBTE model.

The 1999 performance-based teacher evaluation system in the AP School District was crafted through a process that empowered teachers to create optimal learning opportunities for each student. A task force developed a model that could be used to effectively evaluate teacher performance while encouraging professional development (AP School District, 1999). The process fostered growth in both teaching and learning.

Some similarities existed between the AP School District PBTE and the 1999 state model. Similarities included: (a) differentiated cycles for tenured and probationary teachers; (b) creation of professional development plans for all teachers; (c) professional development options for teachers; (d) self-reflection of instructional lessons by teachers; and (e) inclusion of various forms of performance documentation, for example, action research, portfolios, and peer evaluations.

Probationary and Tenured Teacher Cycles

The AP School District PBTE process differs for probationary teachers and tenured teachers. Probationary teachers are observed and evaluated by the administrator

on a yearly basis. Observations include a minimum of four in the first year to two in the fifth year. Each teacher must have a professional development plan developed jointly with his or her administrator. First and second year teachers are required, by law, to have a mentor teacher (160.720 RSMo, 2002, 161.092 RSMo, 1983, amended 1973, 2002).

Tenured teachers are provided greater latitude in observations and development of professional development plans. Tenured teachers are required to be observed twice in a four-year time frame. A summative evaluation is completed at the end of the four years. The tenured teacher is required to have a professional development plan in place each year. The professional development plan can be selected from one of several plan options or developed jointly with the administrator. Progress of the professional development plan is reviewed with the administrator on a yearly basis.

Professional Development Plans

One element of the AP School District PBTE is the requirement of a professional development plan for each teacher. Three types of professional development plans were developed: enrichment, noted for development, and improvement necessary. The *enrichment plan* is used for teachers who perform at the proficient or distinguished level and is developed in cooperation with the administrator. The *noted for development* plan is used for teachers with an area of performance in the basic level of evaluation. The plan is assigned by the evaluator or mutually agreed upon between the evaluator and teacher. The final plan, designated as *improvement necessary* is identified and developed by the evaluator and could carry a recommendation for dismissal if improvement is not demonstrated.

Professional Development Options

Several professional development activities are available from which teachers could choose. Options include mentoring a new teacher, action research, study group participation, individualized professional activity, peer coaching, school-wide or district-wide action research, and participation in an industrial experience. Professional development plans are approved by the administrator in the fall and reviewed annually in the spring. Plans may span a multi-year time frame.

Self Reflection

The AP School District encourages teachers to incorporate a reflective component in their professional development plans. Specific strategies exist for teachers unfamiliar with the practice of reflection to assist and engage them in the process. The strategies integrate an examination of beliefs and teachers experienced opportunities to align teaching practices with espoused values. Administrators model reflective practices by providing and requesting feedback.

Documentation

The AP School District PBTE included one final component in alignment with the 1999 state model of teacher evaluation. A required component in the 1999 state model was the development of a comprehensive portfolio for first and second year teachers. All first and second year teachers in the AP School District were required to assimilate a portfolio addressing each of the 20 criteria, listed in the PBTE, on which they were evaluated. Teachers were required to include in the portfolio documents that corroborated activity of each criterion and to include comments by the teacher reflecting on each activity. The purpose of the portfolio was to improve performance by encouraging reflection and communication with the administrator.

Empowerment and Teacher Evaluation

Empowerment is a broad topic with differing definitions. An essential characteristic of empowerment is the sharing of the decision-making processes. Empowerment in many schools has expanded the role and involvement of teachers in planning and decision-making with regard to school goals and policies (Davis & Wilson, 2000). Teachers perform better when involved in the planning and implementation process (Short, Greer, & Melvin, 1994).

Short, Greer, and Melvin (1994) posited that a central theme among empowered schools is the improvement of the instructional processes. Short and Rinehart (1992) cautioned that empowerment can have negative outcomes, sometimes in the form of demotivation and additional job stress, as the opportunities for conflict increase. In specific incidents where teachers are involved in critical decisions and when disclosures of ideologies and perceptions are made known that are not typically disclosed, shared power may have a negative influence on the lives of teachers. Vogt and Murrell (1990) posed that negative outcomes associated with shared decision-making can be minimized by nurturing intrinsic empowerment. Encouraging and establishing positive, collaborative relationships and facilitating decision-making enhances personal and organizational growth.

An important aspect of empowerment that merits consideration is the additional responsibility those empowered undertake. One school defined empowerment as "people closest to the problem solving the problem" (Short, Greer, & Melvin, 1994, p. 44) and Maeroff (1988) defined empowerment as "the power to exercise one's craft with confidence and to help shape the way the job is to be done" (p.473). As previously stated,

for the purpose of this study teacher empowerment is a personal endeavor involving trust that increases the authority of both parties by sharing both accountability and responsibility (Maher, 2000).

Empowerment has been defined as the overall philosophy of teamwork and collegiality that allows collaboration and the sharing of ideas to permeate the school culture and thus enhance the instructional efforts of teachers (Short, Greer, & Melvin, 1994). Empowerment is not as simple as joining committees or sharing common duty periods, it is the processes involved in empowerment that are the greater assets to a school's primary function. "In essence, empowerment expresses an overall school philosophy of teamwork, collegiality, participation in decision-making and problem solving without constraints of a bureaucratic organization" (Short, Greer, & Melvin, p. 41).

In a professional learning community, empowered teachers identify problems and seek solutions to issues in the context of shared decision-making. Teacher evaluation is an example of empowerment as the importance of conferencing, dialogue, and discourse between the evaluated and the evaluator is emphasized (Valentine, 1992).

According to Peterson and Chenoweth (1992), current evaluation practices have been criticized because teachers have little control and involvement in their own evaluation. Peterson and Chenoweth's research described limitations that have hampered teacher participation. First, innovative options related to teacher evaluation, such as peer review, have not been widely adopted. Second, preparations to assist teachers in changing from passive recipients of evaluation into active participants have not been carefully

planned. Finally, educators who design teacher evaluation systems continue to place teachers into receiver roles, rather than to tap the more powerful role of teachers as collaborators, indicating that policy makers lack a vision of teacher participation.

Valentine (1992) emphasized the importance of teacher participation in conferencing, dialogue, and discourse with the evaluator. The fulcrum of empowerment allows teachers to move in both directions, the giver of power and the receiver of that power. Adequate attention to the effects of power distribution in work redesign can result in satisfaction among the people in the organization (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Davis & Wilson, 2000; Kanter, 1977). Empowering teachers allowed principals to be instructional leaders who focus on issues such as learning opportunities for students and enhancing instruction, rather than supervisors or managers who focused on administrative duties (DESE, 1998; Sergiovanni, 2001; Short & Greer, 1997), leading to shared leadership and collaborative decision-making.

Empowering strategies of the 1980s continued to impact the educational work force and are very similar to the concepts of collaboration suggested in the Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation. However, the 1999 PBTE took the issue a step further by expecting the collaboration to be not only between upper and lower levels of the organization, but within the same level as well. Part of the growth process, as outlined in the 1999 Missouri PBTE, is the articulated action plan for improvement or enrichment. To be most effective, the action plan for the teacher should be done in collaboration with the administrator or person evaluating the teacher. The empowered teacher accepts the responsibility and accountability embedded within the action plan as the power to decide which criteria need be addressed is shared by the teacher and the evaluator.

Ronnie (1993) suggested that the instructional leaders of the school are the teachers, not the principals. By involving the teachers in the evaluation process, teachers accept the responsibility for their behavior both individually and as part of a group. Bunting (1999) agreed, stating there are three elements to a self-reliant teacher: (a) collegiality, (b) reflection, and (c) life experience.

Bunting (1999) indicated collegiality facilitated collaboration, consensus, proactive discussions, and professional interaction. Reflection, as part of the PBTE system, allowed a teacher to constantly evaluate his or her own work, either individually or in a collegial manner. Life experiences provided a diverse and varied backdrop for professional discourse. The professional discourse, conducted in a collegial setting, allowed new ideas to develop. New ideas bring the energy to an organization to sustain systemic change. Whether it is via double-loop learning cycles, mutual learning and improvement of an organizational and its members, cross-role grouping, or conferencing, all provided the impetus to sustain empowerment at the individual and the organizational level (Bunting). Schools that work to become learning communities addressed the issue of culture. The natural outgrowth of telling teachers what to do resulted in an "us versus them" syndrome, a common characteristic within school cultures. This adversarial approach of teachers versus administrators worked against the process of building positive and productive relationships or enhancing an organization dedicated to growth and learning.

Measuring Teacher Evaluation Practices

The Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) questionnaire, using approved revisions (Rindler, 1994), was designed to collect data related to the components of the evaluation

model used in the schools being studied. The TEP is a 46-item questionnaire developed by Stiggins and Duke (1990) at the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. The TEP allowed researchers and participants to document the nature of the teacher evaluation environment in a particular school or school district.

The TEP presents items with a Likert response set at a scale from one to five. Participants respond by determining to what degree they agree or disagree with a phrase. Each item was worded so that the response set matched the phrase. A phrase within the category where a participant describes the person who conducted his or her most recent evaluation was "Working relationship with you". The response set was Adversary or Helper with a scale from one to five. A rating of one indicated the respondent perceived the evaluator to be an Adversary and a rating of five indicated the respondent perceived the evaluator to be a Helper. A complete TEP is included in Appendix B.

The revised instrument, developed by Rindler (1994), included elements related to teacher evaluation, such as artifacts, student performance, self-evaluation, and evaluations from students and peers, present in the school district being studied. The revised TEP, as the original, asked teachers to rate their most recent evaluation experience for its overall quality. The TEP included five subscales: Attributes of the teacher, perceptions of the evaluator, procedures of the evaluation system used, feedback received, and the evaluation context. Stiggins and Duke (1990) merged the five subscales into three areas of interest: people (attributes of the teacher and perceptions of the evaluator), procedures (attributes of the system and feedback), and the environment (attributes of the evaluation context).

The TEP was found to be an instrument of high reliability. Dependability of TEP results was established by demonstrating that the combined set of 46 items provides an internally consistent portrait of a teacher evaluation environment. The internal consistency reliability of the instrument as a whole is .94 (Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1989). No validity information was provided.

The greater contextual changes in Rindler's (1994) revised TEP were made in the section of questions related to the sources of performance information considered as part of the evaluation. The section asks the participant, "To what extent were the following sources of performance information considered as part of the evaluation?" The original TEP allowed the participant to rate the degree that the following performance information sources were used:

1. Observation of your classroom performance.
2. Examination of classroom or school records.
3. Examination of student achievement.
4. Completion of professional development or growth plans.

Rindler (1994) kept the first performance information source "Observation of your classroom performance" and did not use performance information sources two through four. Rindler added six other performance information sources that align with suggested teacher evaluation practices, including pre- and post-conferences, the use of artifacts or teacher portfolios, using student and peer evaluations, and self-reflection. As selections for the question "To what extent were the following sources of performance information considered as part of the evaluation?" Rindler (1994) included the following performance information sources in the revised TEP:

1. Observation of your classroom performance,
2. Meetings with your evaluator,
3. Examination of artifacts (lesson plans, materials),
4. Examination of students performance,
5. Examination of student evaluations,
6. Peer evaluations,
7. Self-evaluations.

The revised TEP was tested in a pilot study. Three Intensive English Programs with characteristics similar to the sample used in the original study by Duke and Stiggins (1990) were chosen to complete the revised TEP. In total, 30 teachers from the piloted Intensive English Programs received questionnaires. Twelve teachers completed and returned their surveys. The purpose of the pilot study was to determine if teachers in Intensive English Programs would fill out the questionnaire and to identify items that needed editing. The 40% initial return rate from the piloted surveys, without the aid of a follow-up letter indicated that the study could expect a sufficient response. The comment that the teachers made in the pilot study led to two formatting changes, but did not suggest the need for further revision of the content.

Rindler's (1994) process of modification and testing indicated that the revised TEP was valid for use with Intensive English Programs faculty. With the exception of the section on the teachers' attributes, which reflected little correlation with teacher growth due to teachers rating themselves high in most teacher categories, the revised TEP has been shown to be a valid tool for collecting data on the attributes of teacher evaluation systems.

The revised TEP was tested using data from the original study and resulted in an internal consistency reliability of .93. As the reliability measurement was virtually the same as for the revised TEP as for the original TEP, it was shown that the modifications made for the survey's use with Intensive English Programs did not compromise the instrument's reliability. The reliability test was undertaken to verify that the revised TEP was still a reliable instrument after its modifications. Cronbach's Alpha was chosen as the procedure to follow to remain consistent with the measure used by Stiggins and Duke (1990) with the original instrument (Rindler, 1994). No validity information was provided.

Teacher Job Satisfaction

The degree to which a teacher is satisfied with his or her job has been shown to be a predictor of teacher retention (Houchins, Shippen & Cattret, 2004; Protheroe, Lewis & Paik, 2002; Shann, 1991; Stockard & Lehman, 2004). Teacher attrition rates are a continuing concern for public education as recruiting, hiring and retaining good teachers continues to be a difficult challenge. Salaries of the certificated staff form the single largest expenditure of any school district. Common sense would indicate that school districts do something to protect their investments (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Plecki, 2000).

Ellis and Bernhardt (1992) warned that the problem of attracting and retaining quality teachers is exacerbated, not only because the proportion of young people wanting to be teachers has sharply declined, but that nearly 25% of the current teaching force will likely leave in the near future. Teachers are not leaving the profession for negative

reasons, but because they want new challenges and more intellectual stimulation (Colgan, 2004; Ellis & Bernhardt, 1992).

Latham (1998) and Mertler (2002) suggested increasing teacher job satisfaction as one of the best ways to strengthen the teaching profession. This would encourage the best and brightest prospects to enter the field of teaching and increase the retention of experienced teachers. "For teachers, motivation is as important as cognitive and professional skills. Attracting the best and the brightest into teaching is not enough. These individuals must not be thwarted in their efforts to teach and to improve" (Ellis & Bernhardt, 1992, p. 181). Educators need a better understanding of the difficulties teachers face in deriving satisfaction from teaching and how teachers' levels of overall satisfaction influence the quality of instruction in schools (Houchins, Shippen & Cattret, 2004; Protheroe, Lewis & Paik, 2002; Quaglia & Marion, 1991). The challenge is to identify the factors that schools can control leading to teacher career satisfaction. Job satisfaction can do more than help retain quality teachers, it can improve their teaching (Latham, 1998).

The demand for school restructuring to improve the quality of teaching and to improve student learning is loud, clear and pervasive across the nation. All social domains, including educators, scholars, researchers, and politicians, recognize the importance of developing successful, productive citizens (Wu & Short, 1996). The attempt to improve the quality of education has placed the focus on teachers and other organizational factors that influence teacher work conditions. The basis of the focus is the belief that factors affecting teacher quality, i.e., teacher evaluations and teacher job satisfaction, could lead to more effective schools.

Historical Review of Job Satisfaction

The existing theories of worker satisfaction are complementary to and interrelated with psychological theories of needs and values. Intrinsic sources of satisfaction are explained by need theories, defined by Maslow (1954), whose study suggested general groups of human needs were arranged in the following hierarchical order beginning with the most basic human needs: physical, security, love, self-esteem and self-actualization. Maslow's premise is that the needs served as motivators until they were satisfied. Herzberg (1972) continued to refine the needs theory by investigating the deficiencies in specific work environments resulting in a Hygiene Motivation Theory.

The Hygiene Motivation Theory postulated that people have two sets of needs: one for psychological growth (a motivational component) and another to avoid unpleasantness (a state of non-dissatisfaction). Herzberg (1972) identified criteria for meaningful work, including (a) opportunities for growth and achievement, (b) recognition for achievements, (c) increased responsibility for one's job, and (d) opportunities to advance to higher task levels. A job enrichment model for classroom teachers that would meet the intrinsic sources defined by Maslow and the four criteria recognized by Herzberg is needed in the school workplace environment (Ellis & Bernhardt, 1992).

The motivational component of Herzberg's (1972) theory corresponds with the need for humans to achieve psychological growth. Hackman's (as cited in Ellis & Bernhardt, 1992) Job Characteristics Model identified three critical psychological states which, when present within the workplace, lead to greater internal work motivation. The first psychological state of experienced meaningfulness is evident when workers see their roles as being significant and can identify visible outcomes from their work, such as

improvement in student achievement. The second psychological state is experienced responsibility and is created by the job characteristic of autonomy inherent in a collaborative workplace. Knowledge of results of completed work is the third psychological state defined by Hackman and takes place when a teacher receives feedback from the job itself, from peers or from the overall quality of evaluation used within the operational constructs of the school.

In a workplace environment, motivational needs align with Hackman's Job Characteristics Model and include achievement, recognition, advancement, and responsibility. The hygiene component of Herzberg's theory is consistent with the physical and security needs described by Maslow and Hackman's psychological states including, in a work environment, policies, evaluation, salary, and working conditions (Bess, 1981; Ellis & Bernhardt, 1992).

Research studies specifically related to teacher job satisfaction have yielded inconsistent findings, perhaps due to the different aspects of the teaching role and myriad differences in environments surrounding school communities (Davis & Wilson, 2000; Pearson & Moomaw, 2005; Quaglia & Marion, 1991; Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 2000; Tye & O'Brien, 2002). Moore (1987) suggested the differences in teacher satisfaction, while related to individual differences in education, gender, age, socio-economic status, and ethnicity, are further complicated by the dedication teachers have for their profession. Teachers often speak of their work being a calling or a mission and attach little importance to advancement or extrinsic rewards. Teachers emphasize internal rewards and measure their satisfaction in the involvement with their students, experiencing a degree of autonomy in their classroom activities and

collaborating with other teachers, further supporting Herzberg's premise that motivation is related to an individual need for psychological growth (Latham, 1998).

Bandura (1977) noted the variable of teacher efficacy, both personal and general, as one of the satisfiers in the teaching profession. Personal teacher efficacy, the teacher's belief that he or she can positively influence student learning, and general teacher efficacy, the teacher's belief in the ability of the profession as a whole to positively influence educational outcomes, create higher levels of teacher satisfaction. Teachers who resign from the profession often report job dissatisfaction with external factors associated with the workplace: lesson preparation time, discipline, and hours spent on non-teaching duties, consistent with the hygiene component of Herzberg's theory (Bess, 1981).

Latham (1998) posed that teacher satisfaction can be influenced through school policy and that it is essential to determine the components of the working environment that lead to teacher satisfaction. "An understanding of differences between satisfied and dissatisfied teachers' perceptions of their professional lives is critical to developing an understanding of the complex problems surrounding the recruitment and retention of teachers" (Quaglia & Marion, 1991, p. 208). Teacher satisfaction has been shown to be higher in schools in which teachers work together to learn and solve problems. "The sense of being a part of a professional community is both a powerful motivator and a significant source of job satisfaction" (Protheroe, Lewis & Paik, 2002, p. 46).

Empowerment and Teacher Job Satisfaction

The construct of empowerment, embedded in teacher job satisfaction, emphasizes

teacher involvement in decision-making and includes complex dimensions such as teacher perceptions of status, self-efficacy, autonomy, impact, and opportunities for growth in the organization (Short & Rinehart, 1992). Among teachers, the belief is widely held that the more teachers share in decision-making the greater their job satisfaction (Shreeve, et al., 1997). Melenyzer's (1990) qualitative study suggested a definition of empowerment for teachers: "The opportunity and confidence to act upon one's ideas and to influence the way one performs in one's profession" (p.4).

Creating a culture of learning and involving teachers in strategic decision-making is crucial to teacher empowerment (Martin & Kragler, 1999). According to Anderman, Smith, and Belzer (1991), a school culture that emphasizes accomplishment, recognition, and affiliation relates to teacher satisfaction. Teachers find their job satisfaction improves when workplace collegiality is strong and opportunities exist for new learning through new experiences. Moving into leadership roles establishes the teacher as an active participant in the school culture. The shared decision-making enhances teachers' investments in the organization and teacher authority is recognized. Such strategies not only increase job satisfaction, but reduce teacher attrition and improve school climate (Woods & Weasmer, 2002).

Organizational Culture and Teacher Job Satisfaction

Maehr (1989) and Rosenholz (1989) suggested that the personal investment of employees is necessary for any effective organization. They specifically emphasize the importance of personal investment and commitment of teachers. McCormack-Larkin (1986) and Rosenholz (1989) indicated that if teachers are dissatisfied with their work lives and lack commitment to their schools, not only will teachers suffer, but their

students will suffer as well. Further studies have concluded that commitment to an organization and job satisfaction are key factors to individual performance (Davis & Wilson, 2000; Ebmeir, 2003; Jacobson, 2005). The researchers also posed a linkage between commitment to an organization and a strong belief in, and acceptance of, the organization's goals and objectives. Teacher satisfaction influenced job performance, and, ultimately, student performance.

It is essential for teachers to know that they have contributed to shaping their work environment (Woods & Weasmer, 2002). As stakeholders, they need to know that their contributions in designing and developing programs and curricula are recognized as valuable and meaningful. Lortie (1975) stated that a teacher's sense of his or her contributions to the culture of the school influences job satisfaction. Collegial support and interaction appear to influence satisfaction and are consistent with results found by Bogler (2001), Ebmeir (2003), and Popkewitz and Myrdal (1991) who suggested that teacher collaboration leads to increased belief in teacher effectiveness.

Another means of collegial investment is sharing school leadership roles. Graham and Messner (1998) asserted that to succeed in a collaborative school environment it is important for teachers to actively influence the school culture rather than passively allow decisions to be made for them. When teachers assert their roles as experts on the school culture and voice opinions toward meeting organizational goals, they increase their commitment to the organization and enhance their job satisfaction. Such collaboration unifies purpose and strengthens commitment to the organization (Schein, 1992).

The cultural characteristics of the school dictate the cultural ability, willingness, and capacity for a school to assimilate new information, data or knowledge into the processes

and policies of the school. Scribner, et al.'s (1999) research of a professional learning community paralleled Glickman, Allen, and Lunsford's (1992) concept of a "professional school" and aligned with concepts of professional development, empowerment, and utilizing multiple data sources in teacher evaluation systems. Glickman et al. assigned three core premises to a professional school: shared governance, school-wide instructional focus, and action research. Schools with high implementation of Glickman et al.'s three premises demonstrated the following:

1. A tendency to be inclusive and involve all faculty.
2. An ability to work with or around the district in making school based decisions.
3. The use of time for planning, developing, and revising as validation of important work.
4. An ability to ask for help and assistance to call others, to ask help of each other, to visit others, to ask others to come to the school. (pg. 19-21)

Each of the preceding indicators supports the concepts of empowerment and professional development through collaboration and reflects fundamental tenets of reform models of teacher evaluation systems and constructs of teacher job satisfaction (Davis & Wilson, 2000; Ma & McMillan, 1999; Pearson & Moomaw, 2005; Woods &Weasmer, 2002; Zembyles & Papanastasiou, 2005).

Measuring Teacher Job Satisfaction

Teacher job satisfaction, as defined by Lester (1982), is the extent to which a teacher perceives and values various factors such as evaluation, collegiality, responsibility, and recognition. Lester developed the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) specifically for use in various educational settings. The TJSQ

incorporated 66 items in 9 subscales. The subscales are defined as: Supervision, colleagues, working conditions, pay, responsibility, work itself, advancement, security, and recognition. After selection of the questionnaire format and content, the items were edited into a form specifically geared to teachers in the educational setting. Language that was familiar and appropriate to the population was used. Only one piece of information was requested in each statement. Vaguely defined words, words with double meanings, emotionally loaded words, double negatives, and unclear words were eliminated, resulting in clear, concise, and direct statement of no more than 20 words. Approximately 50% of the items were written in a positive form and 50% in a negative form to avoid response set bias.

The TJSQ presented items with Likert response set in a scale from one to five. Participants indicated the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each item. A rating of one indicated that the respondent strongly disagreed with the statement presented. A rating of five indicated that the participant strongly agree with the statement. A complete TJSQ is included in Appendix B.

Maslow (1954) and Herzberg's (1972) theories were explored as sources of job satisfaction to generate a taxonomy for the development of the TJSQ instrument. The theories contain specific concepts that correspond to the factors found in an educational setting, and were identified in the development of the TJSQ. The theories also provided a system of classification supporting the conceptual foundation of this study.

The population from which the sample was drawn to develop the TJSQ included teachers from four geographic locations in New York. Within each of these four locations, a sample of two school districts was randomly selected by using a table of

random numbers. Within each of the eight school districts an elementary, junior high school and a senior high school were randomly selected. Instruments and personal data forms totaling 1600 were distributed to the teachers in the selected schools, with 620 usable returns received.

Tests of reliability were run for the total and for each of the nine factors or subscales. The internal consistency of the TJSQ was determined through computation of an Alpha coefficient. The total scale Alpha for the sample was .93. The scale coefficients range from .71 for the factor of security, to .92 for the factor of supervision. Data were cross-validated using a split-sample technique.

To insure content validity, a representative sample of items was generated from the literature on job satisfaction. The plan and procedures for the construction of the instrument were evaluated in terms of instructions, ordering of items and selection of items. Content validation was accomplished through a modified Q sort by faculty and graduate students. Statements with less than 80% agreement were either rewritten or rejected. The items were evaluated on the basis of length, intelligibility, and redundancy, as well as their content specificity to an educational setting. A representative sample of items was developed, generating an initial item pool of 120 items.

Criterion validity for this instrument was not obtained. One method of establishing criterion validity is through correlating a newly created instrument with another instrument measuring the same concepts. As no other instrument existed with the primary purpose of measuring teacher job satisfaction, establishing criterion validity through this method was not feasible. Another technique for establishing criterion validity is the known-groups technique (Lester, 1982). The known-groups technique

includes identifying a group of satisfied teachers and a group of dissatisfied teachers, administering the instrument and performing a t test to analyze how well the instrument discriminates between the groups. No such groups were identified, and thus, no attempt was made in this study to establish criterion validity.

Factor analysis was undertaken as an exploratory technique to discover underlying factors and patterns among variables and also as a psychometric procedure for the development and refinement of the TJSQ (Lester, 1982). The SPSS statistical procedure used in the factor analysis and reliability determined the treatment for missing data on incomplete returns resulting in 526 returns. This sample size was adequate to obtain a stable factor solution for the 66 questionnaire items. The TJSQ is commercially available and distributed by the author.

Summary

This chapter reviewed the literature related to teacher evaluation systems through several areas. An explanation of Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation (PBTE) coupled with a historical perspective and national viewpoint of teacher evaluation were first outlined. Obstacles for effective teacher evaluations were given and trends in teacher evaluation were summarized. The nexus between teacher evaluation, teacher empowerment, and professional development was presented and types of data sources used in teacher evaluations were described. This chapter offered the history of the formation of teacher evaluations in the state of Missouri and a detailed description of the history of teacher evaluations in the participating school district.

This chapter reviewed the literature related to teacher job satisfaction through a historical review of job satisfaction and theoretical aspects related specifically to teacher

job satisfaction. Studies of teacher job satisfaction associated to teacher empowerment and organizational culture were presented. An overview of the instruments used in this study, the Teacher Evaluation Profile and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire, was given. Chapter three will provide information regarding the design and methodology employed in this study.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation (PBTE) in Missouri has been the subject of various studies since its development and implementation in 1984. Earlier studies focused on the 1984 model, but more recent studies have examined models similar to the 1999 Missouri PBTE model (Kimball, White, Milanowski & Borman, 2004; Marshall, 2005).

Conventional evaluation practices are not beneficial to teachers or their supervisors (Brandt, 1996). Teacher evaluation practices must mesh with school district procedures, goals, and working environments, which may include teacher collaboration, teacher empowerment, shared decision-making, and ultimately place quality teachers in classrooms and increase student learning (Butt & Lance, 2005; Ma & McMillan, Stempien & Loeb, 2002). In schools where teachers collaboratively learn and solve problems with a sense of being part of a professional community is both a powerful motivator and a significant source of job satisfaction (Protheroe, Lewis & Paik, 2002).

Research Questions

This study focused on one selected school district's performance-based teacher evaluation practices and its impact on teacher job satisfaction. This study focused on two variables, teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction. More specifically, this study addressed the following questions:

1. What is the relationship between teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction?

2. What is the relationship between gender and teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction?
3. What is the relationship between years of teaching experience and teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction?
4. What is the relationship between teaching assignment grade level and teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction?

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses will be tested during this study:

HO_1: There is no statistically significant relationship between current evaluation practices, as measured by a revised Teacher Evaluation Profile survey, and factors of teacher job satisfaction, as measured by the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire subscale Work Itself.

HO_2: There is no statistically significant relationship between current evaluation practices, as measured by a revised Teacher Evaluation Profile survey, and factors of teacher job satisfaction, as measured by the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire subscale Work Itself, depending on gender.

HO_3: There is no statistically significant relationship between current evaluation practices, as measured by a revised Teacher Evaluation Profile survey, and factors of teacher job satisfaction, as measured by the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire subscale Work Itself, depending on years of teaching experience.

HO_4: There is no statistically significant difference in the relationship between current evaluation practices, as measured by a revised Teacher Evaluation Profile survey, and factors of teacher job satisfaction, as measured by the Teacher Job

Satisfaction Questionnaire subscale Work Itself, depending on teaching assignment grade level.

Research Site

The research site selected for the study was chosen because of its sustained commitment to implementing in-depth changes in its teacher evaluation model consistent with the 1999 Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education recommended practices. For the purpose of the study, a pseudonym, AP School District, was used in place of the actual name of the study site. The AP School District is located in a rural Midwestern setting approximately 40 miles from a large metropolitan area. The AP School District is located in a city that has a population of 16,340 and houses a state university accredited in its teacher preparation and development program.

A breakdown of the student population in the AP School District indicates that 88.8% are Caucasian, 5.3% are African American, 2.3% are Asian, 2.3% are Hispanic, and .6% are Native American. The AP School District consists of eight schools, including a high school (grades 9-12), a middle school (grades 6-8), an intermediate school (grades 4-5), two elementary schools (grades 1-3), a kindergarten center, a vocational school, and an alternative education center. The district enrollment is 3,178 in grades K-12 and employs 263 certificated staff.

Population and Sample

The population for this study was composed of all certificated teachers (n = 221) in the AP School District who had taught in the district for at least one year. Teachers who met the criteria for participation were asked to complete the Teacher Evaluation Profile and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire. Names of certificated teachers

who had taught in the AP School District for at least one year were provided by the superintendent's office. Surveys were distributed to all eight schools in the AP School District, with 221 teachers receiving copies of the surveys. A total of 84 certificated teachers responded to the study.

Instruments

Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP)

The Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) questionnaire, using approved revisions (Rindler, 1994), was used to collect data related to the components of the evaluation model used in the schools being studied. A copy of the permission letter granting the use of the TEP for this study can be found in Appendix A. The TEP is a 46-item questionnaire developed by Stiggins and Duke (1990) at the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. The TEP allows researchers and participants to document the nature of the teacher evaluation environment in a particular school or school district.

The TEP presents items with a Likert response set at a scale from one to five. Participants respond by determining to what degree they agree or disagree with a phrase. Each item was worded so that the response set matched the phrase. A phrase within the category where a participant describes the person who conducted his or her most recent evaluation was "Working relationship with you". The response set was Adversary or Helper with a scale from one to five. A rating of one indicated the respondent perceived the evaluator to be an Adversary and a rating of five indicated the respondent perceived the evaluator to be a Helper. A complete TEP is included in Appendix B.

The revised instrument, developed by Rindler (1994), was chosen for this study because it includes elements related to teacher evaluation, such as artifacts, student performance, self-evaluation, and evaluations from students and peers, present in the school district being studied. The revised TEP, as the original, asked teachers to rate their most recent evaluation experience for its overall quality. For this study the TEP is operationally defined using five subscales: Attributes of the teacher, perceptions of the evaluator, procedures of the evaluation system used, feedback received, and evaluation context. Stiggins and Duke (1990) merged the five subscales into three areas of interest: people (attributes of the teacher and perceptions of the evaluator), procedures (attributes of the system and feedback), and the environment (attributes of the evaluation context).

The TEP has been found to be an instrument of high reliability. Dependability of TEP results was established by demonstrating that the combined set of 46 items provides an internally consistent portrait of a teacher evaluation environment. The internal consistency reliability of the instrument as a whole is .94 (Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1989).

Rindler's (1994) process of modification and testing indicated that the revised TEP was valid for use with Intensive English Programs faculty. With the exception of the section on the teachers' attributes, which reflected little correlation with teacher growth due to teachers rating themselves high in most teacher categories, the revised TEP has been shown to be a valid tool for collecting data on the attributes of teacher evaluation systems. No validity information was provided.

An internal consistency reliability of .93 was found when findings from the revised TEP, at its completion, was tested with the data from the original study. As the

reliability measurement was virtually the same as for the revised TEP as for the original TEP, it was shown that the modifications made for the survey's use with Intensive English Programs did not compromise the instrument's reliability. The reliability test was undertaken to verify that the revised TEP was still a reliable instrument after its modifications. Cronbach's Alpha was chosen as the procedure to follow to remain consistent with the measure used by Stiggins and Duke (1990) with the original instrument (Rindler, 1994).

For the purpose of this study, the following selections for the question "To what extent were the following sources of performance information considered as part of the evaluation?" were asked of each participant:

1. Observation of your classroom performance.
2. Meetings with your evaluator.
3. Examination of artifacts (lesson plans, materials).
4. Examination of students' performance.
5. Examination of student evaluations.
6. Peer evaluations.
7. Self-evaluations.
8. Completion of professional development or growth plans.

Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ)

Lester (1982) developed the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) specifically for use in various educational settings. A copy of the permission letter granting the use of the TJSQ for this study can be found in Appendix A. The TJSQ incorporates 66 items in 9 subscales. The subscales are defined as: supervision,

colleagues, working conditions, pay, responsibility, work itself, advancement, security, and recognition.

The TJSQ presented items with Likert response set in a scale from one to five. Participants indicated the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each item. A rating of one indicated that the respondent strongly disagreed with the statement presented. A rating of five indicated that the participant strongly agree with the statement. A complete TJSQ is included in Appendix B.

Maslow (1954) and Herzberg's (1972) theories were explored as sources of job satisfaction to generate a taxonomy for the development of the TJSQ instrument and provided a system of classification supporting the conceptual foundation of this study. Maslow's research on the hierarchy of personal needs and Herzberg's focus on worker's quest for a pleasant work environment and meaningful tasks was a nexus to the TJSQ subscale Work Itself. Components of Ellis and Bernhardt (1992) and Colgan's (2004) research, such as work autonomy and intellectual stimulation, were embedded in the TJSQ subscale Work Itself. The subscale asked participants to rate their perceptions of the work they performed. More specifically, items on the subscale were linked to: (a) the use of a variety of skills, (b) a variety of activities, (c) the freedom to make decisions, (d) interesting tasks, (e) encouraging originality, (f) developing new methods, (g) encouraging creativity, (h) enjoying the profession, and (i) pleasant work environment.

The TJSQ subscale Supervision was not chosen as a measurement of teacher job satisfaction for this study. Components of supervision were extensively measured in the other instrument used in this study, the Teacher Evaluation Profile. Determining a

relationship between two instruments' measures of supervision was not the focus of this study.

Three of the remaining subscales of the TJSQ, Responsibility, Advancement, and Recognition, had a fundamental basis in Herzberg's (1972) Hygiene Motivation Theory. The TJSQ subscale Colleagues was supported by research of Protheroe, Lewis, and Paik (2002) who considered collegiality and collaboration to be a basis for job satisfaction. The TJSQ subscale Security was a key component in Maslow's (1954) hierarchy of personal needs. Although considered to be a part of the foundational underpinnings of job satisfaction, the subscales were outside the focus of the study. The TJSQ subscale Work Conditions concentrated on the physical surroundings of the work environment and was not a focus of this study. The TJSQ subscales of Pay also did not fit into the realm of focus for this study.

Data Collection

Permission was granted from the superintendent of the AP School District to distribute copies of both instruments to certificated teachers in the district who had taught at least one year in the district. Personnel at the central administration building assisted in identifying 221 certificated teachers who had taught at least one year in the district in each of the eight buildings in the district. A total of 84 certificated teachers responded to the study.

Copies of the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) were sent to all certificated teachers in the AP School District who had taught at least one year in the AP School District. A cover letter consisting of a description of the study, informed consent information, and a stamped, return envelope

were included in the packet delivered to each participant. A copy of the cover letter is included in Appendix B. Administrators in each building were contacted by the researcher and asked to distribute the materials to all participants. Extra copies of the two surveys, the cover letter, and return envelopes were left at each building in the event a teacher, whose name had not been included on the list, wanted to participate in the study. Participants were asked to complete and return the TEP and TJSQ within 10 days. A follow-up reminder was sent five days after the distribution of the two instruments to participants, requesting the return of the completed instruments and thanking them for their participation. A copy of the reminder is included in Appendix B.

Data Analysis

The study is quantitative in design. Demographic data related to gender, years of teaching in the AP School District, total years of teaching and current teaching assignment grade level were collected. The self-reported data collected from the TEP survey and the TJSQ were summarized and analyzed. Inferential statistical analyses were conducted from the collected survey data.

The statistical analyses were performed using the SPSS (1999) statistical analysis program to compute results from the data gathered from the TEP and the TJSQ. An alpha level of 0.05 was used to determine statistical significance. Frequencies and percentages were generated from the demographic data for the variables of gender, years of teaching experience, and teaching assignment grade level.

Means, standard deviations, and number of responses were calculated for the total score of the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP); subscales of the TEP, Personal Attributes, Evaluator Perceptions, Evaluation Procedures, Feedback Received, and Evaluation

Context; and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) subscale Work Itself. The number of items and the range of possible scores were given for both the TEP and TJSQ and all subscales of the TEP.

The Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation was used to gauge the relationship between teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction. Total scores for both instruments were calculated and analyzed to examine the relationship. Total scores from items in each of the five subscales of the TEP and the TJSQ subscale Work Itself were calculated and analyzed separately to determine the degree of the relationship between specific components of teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction (Minium, King, & Bear, 1993).

Research questions two through four guided the examination of the differences in the relationship between the TEP and the TJSQ depending on three predictors: gender, years of teaching experience, and teacher assignment grade level. A multiple regression was calculated and analyzed for each predictor generating unstandardized and standardized coefficients, t-scores, and significance values.

Summary

This chapter presented a review of the research questions and hypotheses developed for the study. The research site, population and sample, and the instruments used were described. Procedures and methods used for completion of the study regarding data collection and data analysis were outlined. Elements of validity and reliability were also addressed.

In this chapter, a detailed description of the study was provided so the processes could be replicated in possible future studies. Data that served as a basis for the findings were collected and are described and analyzed in Chapter Four.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study investigated the relationship between current teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction in one school district in a Midwestern state. The researcher investigated the perceptions of all certificated teachers (n=221) who had taught at least one year in the school district regarding their most recent evaluation experience and the degree to which they were satisfied with teaching as a profession. This chapter presents those data relevant to teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction within the participating school district.

The data collected on the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) survey and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) were summarized and analyzed using a frequency distribution summary, a profile of means and standard deviations, a correlational analysis, and multiple regression analyses. The results were used to address the research questions and hypotheses developed for the study.

Descriptive data of the participants' gender, years of teaching experience, and current teaching assignment grade level are included. Descriptions of the research site and the population and sample are included in this chapter. Statistical analysis of each research question is reviewed, and results of data analyses are presented in tables to illustrate statistical significance. Tables were also used to delineate correlations between teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction. Statistical analyses of the hypotheses are also presented.

Descriptive and Statistical Analyses

Research Site

One rural school district in the mid-west was selected for this quantitative study. The participating school district was comprised of eight schools: One high school, grades 9-12; one middle school, grades 6-8; one intermediate elementary school, grades 4-5; two primary elementary schools, grades 1-3; one school for all kindergarten classrooms; one vocational technology school; and one alternative education center.

Population and Sample

The target population for this study consisted of 221 full-time and part-time certificated K-12 teachers employed in the school district who worked in the eight buildings. Only certificated teachers who had taught in the district at least one year were asked to participate. To ensure full geographic, ethnic, gender, age level and current teaching assignment grade level representation, all certificated teachers were asked to participate in the study (Cui, 2003; Kaplowitz, Hadlock, & Levine, 2004). All participants received packets consisting of a cover letter, informed consent information, contact information for the researcher, the Teacher Evaluation Profile survey (TEP), the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ), and a stamped return envelope. Of the 221 teachers sampled, completed instruments were obtained from 84 participants, for a response rate of 38%.

Demographic data were collected in the areas of gender, years of teaching experience, and teaching assignment grade level. Table 1 provides an overview of demographic data related to the gender of the respondents to the instruments. Of the 84

respondents, one participant did not disclose gender, 68 females (81%) returned instruments, and 15 males (17.9%) returned instruments.

The sample consisted of a large percentage (81%) of female respondents. The percentage is consistent with the population. The population consisted of 176 female teachers (79.6%) and 45 male teachers (20.3%).

Table 1

Participants' Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Female	68	81.0
Male	15	17.9
NR	1	1.2

NR = No Response

The majority of the teachers who responded to questions related to years of experience had been teaching for more than 16 years. Only teachers who had taught at least one year in the district participated in the study, thus the initial interval for teaching experience was set at one year. However, no participant indicated teaching experience at one year. Six (7.1%) participants indicated they had been teaching from two to five years, 12 (14.3%) participants indicated they had 6 to 10 years of experience, 15 (17.9%) participants indicated teaching experience of 11 to 15 years, and 37 (44%) participants responded that they had 16 or more years of teaching experience. Fourteen participants did not respond to the item regarding years of teaching experience. Table 2 presents

frequency and percentage data received from participants regarding years of teaching experience.

Table 2

Participants' Years of Teaching Experience

Years of Teaching	Frequency	Percentage
1 year	0	0.0
2 to 5 years	6	7.1
6 to 10 years	12	14.3
11 to 15 years	15	17.9
16 or more years	37	44.0
NR	14	16.7

NR = No Response

Data regarding the teaching assignment grade level of the participants were also collected. Table 3 indicates the demographic representation of participants related to their teaching assignment in the following grade levels: pre-kindergarten through kindergarten, grades 1 through 4, grades 5 through 8, grades 9 through 12, and kindergarten through 12.

Table 3 illustrates that over one third (36.9%) of the participants who returned completed TEP and TJSQ instruments taught in the elementary school setting. Of the 84 respondents, 8 were teachers of students in pre-kindergarten through kindergarten; 23 were teachers of students in grades 1 through four; 24 were teachers of students in grades 5 through 8; 21 were teachers of students in grades 9 through 12; and 3 were teachers

who taught all grades or in multiple assignments. Five respondents chose not to report their current teaching assignment grade level.

Table 3

Participants' Teaching Assignment Grade Level

Teaching assignment grade level	Frequency	Percentage
Pre-kindergarten - kindergarten	8	9.5
Grades 1 - 4	23	27.4
Grades 5 - 8	24	28.6
Grades 9 - 12	21	25.0
K - 12	2	2.4
Pre-K – 8	1	1.2
NR	5	6.0

NR = No response

The percentages of the participants related to their current teaching assignment grade level are consistent with the population. The population consisted of 81 (36.5%) teachers in the primary elementary grades, grades Pre-K through 4. Teachers in the intermediate elementary grades and middle school grades, grades 5 through 8, who returned surveys totaled 24 (28.6%). The population consisted of 76 (34.3%) teachers in the intermediate and middle school grades. Completed data were received from 21 (25.0%) teachers who taught in high school. The number of teachers in the population at the high school level totals 56 (25.3%). Three (3.6%) teachers who teach across all grade

levels completed surveys. Eight (3.6%) teachers in the population teach at all grade levels, matching the response rate for teachers in that subgroup.

Research Questions

This study addressed the following research questions:

1. What is the relationship between teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction?
2. Does the relationship between teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction differ depending on gender?
3. Does the relationship between teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction differ depending on years of teaching experience?
4. Does the relationship between teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction differ depending on teaching assignment grade level?

To address the first research question, the Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation was used to identify the degree of association between current teacher evaluation practices, as measured by the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) survey, and teacher job satisfaction, as measured by the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) subscale Work Itself, in the AP School District. A total score from all 46 items of the TEP was collected and the total of the nine items of the TJSQ subscale Work Itself was collected. To further identify components of current teacher evaluation practices that may lead to teacher job satisfaction in the participating school district, a Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation was also calculated between the totals of each of the five subscales of the TEP and the TJSQ subscale of Work Itself.

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations of Total Scores of the Teacher Evaluation Profile, Subscales, and Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire Subscale Work Itself

	Raw Scores		
Instrument or Subscale (Item scale 1 – 5)	Mean	SD	Range
Teacher Evaluation Profile			
Items N = 46 Responses N = 84	161.42	30.11	157
TEP Subscale Personal Attributes			
Items N = 8 Responses N = 83	31.22	3.31	18
TEP Subscale Evaluator Perceptions			
Items N = 11 Responses N = 84	40.99	11.73	50
TEP Subscale Evaluation Procedures			
Items N = 13 Responses N = 84	40.13	8.55	50
TEP Subscale Feedback Received			
Items N = 9 Responses N = 84	31.26	8.28	33
TEP Subscale Evaluation Context			
Items N = 5 Responses N = 83	18.41	3.42	18
TJSQ Subscale Work Itself			
Items N = 9 Responses N = 84	36.62	4.25	20

TEP=Teacher Evaluation Profile

TJSQ=Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire

Table 4 provides the means and standard deviations from the total score of the TEP, consisting of 46 items; TEP subscale Personal Attributes, consisting of 8 items; TEP subscale Evaluator Perceptions, 11 items; TEP subscale Evaluation Procedures, 13 items; TEP subscale Feedback Received, 9 items; TEP subscale Evaluation Context, 5 items; and the TJSQ subscale Work Itself, 9 items. Each item has a scale of one through five and the range is indicated for each instrument and subscale. The number of participants is also provided.

Table 5 reports the data from the correlations of the total score of the TEP; the totals of scores from the TEP subscales, including Personal Attributes, Evaluator Perceptions, Evaluation Procedures, Feedback Received, and Evaluation Context; and the total score from the TJSQ subscale Work Itself. The data generated from this study indicated a significant correlation at the 0.01 level between the TEP total score and each of the TEP five subscales, ranging in significance levels from .317 to .903. The findings are consistent with the initial pilot study for the TEP conducted by Lester (1982) and the pilot study on a revised TEP conducted by Rindler (1994).

Additional statistically significant correlations at the 0.01 level were found between the various subscales of the TEP. The TEP subscales Evaluation Procedures and Evaluation Context each had significant correlations with all of the other four subscales. The TEP subscale Evaluation Procedures had correlations to the other four subscales that ranged from .308 to .733. The range of correlations for the TEP subscale Evaluation Context was .355 to .533.

The TEP subscale Evaluator Perceptions had significant correlations with three of the other TEP subscales: Evaluation Procedures (.687), Feedback Received (.790), and

Evaluation Context (.533). The subscale Evaluator Perceptions had the highest correlation to the TEP entire instrument at .903.

Table 5

Intercorrelations Between the Teacher Evaluation Profile Subscales, and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire

Instrument or Subscale	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
1. TEP Subscale						
Personal Attributes	—	.093	.308**	.120	.355**	.123
2. TEP Subscale						
Evaluator Perceptions	.093	—	.687**	.790**	.533**	.235*
3. TEP Subscale						
Evaluation Procedures	.308**	.687**	—	.733**	.478**	.100
4. TEP Subscale						
Feedback Received	.120	.790**	.733**	—	.520**	.155
5. TEP Subscale						
Evaluation Context	.355**	.533**	.478**	.520**	—	.160
6. TJSQ	.123	.235*	.100	.155	.160	—

TEP = Teacher Evaluation Profile

TJSQ = Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

The TEP subscale Feedback Received also had significant correlations to three other TEP subscales. The TEP subscale Feedback Received had significant correlations with the subscales of Evaluator Perceptions (.790), Evaluation Procedures (.733), and Evaluation Context (.520). The TEP subscale Personal Attributes had a significant correlation with one TEP subscale, Evaluation Context.

There was no statistically significant correlation found between the total TEP and the TJSQ subscale Work Itself. Of the five TEP subscales, one subscale had a statistically significant relationship at the 0.05 level with the TJSQ subscale Work Itself. The TEP subscale Evaluator Perceptions had a .235 correlation to the TJSQ subscale Work Itself. Four of the TEP subscales: Personal Attributes, Evaluation Procedures, Feedback Received, and Evaluation Context did not have statistically significant correlations with the TJSQ subscale Work Itself.

In this study, research questions two through four examined the relationship between three variables; gender, years of teaching experience, and teaching assignment grade level, and current evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction in the AP School District. A significant relationship first had to exist between the scores of the two instruments used to address any existing differences in the relationship depending on the specified variables. There was no statistically significant correlation found between the total TEP and the TEP subscales of Personal Attributes, Evaluation Procedures, Feedback Received, or Evaluation Context to the TJSQ subscale Work Itself. One subscale of the Teacher Evaluation Profile survey, Evaluator Perceptions, resulted in a statistically significant correlation to the TJSQ subscale Work Itself at the 0.05 level. The TEP subscale Evaluator Perceptions was used to determine the relationship between the

variables of gender, years of teaching experience, and teaching assignment grade level and teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction.

Due to the interval level data collected for research questions two through four, a multiple regression was conducted for each of the three research questions. Addressing the second research question, Table 6 reports the unstandardized and standardized coefficients, t-scores, and significance values generated from the multiple regression using gender as the variable. Although there was a statistically significant relationship between teacher job satisfaction and teacher evaluation practices using the TEP subscale Evaluator Perceptions (.020), the data did not show a statistically significant relationship (.096) between the variable of gender and teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction.

Table 6

Summary of Regression Analyses of Teacher Job Satisfaction Using Gender as a Variable (N = 84)

Variable	B	SE B	β	t	Sig.
TEP Subscale Evaluator Perceptions	.092	.039	.255	2.377	.020
Gender	-1.991	1.182	-.181	-1.684	.096

TEP = Teacher Evaluation Profile

$p < .05$

Unstandardized and standardized coefficients, t-scores, and significance values generated from the multiple regression using years of teaching experience as the variable are shown in Table 7. There was no statistically significant relationship between teacher

job satisfaction and teacher evaluation practices using the TEP subscale Evaluator Perceptions (.089). The data did not show a statistically significant relationship (.711) between the variable of years of teaching experience and teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction.

Table 7

Summary of Regression Analyses of Teacher Job Satisfaction Using Years of Teaching Experience as a Variable (N = 84)

Variable	B	SE B	β	t	Sig.
TEP Subscale Evaluator Perceptions	.080	.047	.207	1.724	.089
Years of Teaching Experience	-.196	.528	-.045	-.371	.711

TEP = Teacher Evaluation Profile

$p < .05$

Table 8 provides unstandardized and standardized coefficients, t-scores, and significance values generated from the multiple regression using the current teaching assignment grade level as the variable. Although there was a statistically significant relationship between teacher job satisfaction and teacher evaluation practices using the TEP subscale Evaluator Perceptions (.014), the data did not show a statistically significant relationship (.385) between the variable of teaching assignment grade level and teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction. The results of this study are consistent with Pearson and Moomaw's (2005) research that indicated gender or teaching assignment grade level had no statistically significant relationship to teacher job satisfaction.

Table 8

Summary of Regression Analyses of Teacher Job Satisfaction Using Teaching Assignment Grade Level as a Variable (N = 84)

Variable	B	SE B	β	t	Sig.
TEP Subscale Evaluator Perceptions	.103	.041	.282	2.525	.014
Teaching Assignment Grade Level	-.430	.493	-.098	-.874	.385

TEP = Teacher Evaluation Profile

$p < .05$

Hypotheses

This study addressed the following hypotheses:

HO_1: There is no statistically significant relationship between current evaluation practices, as measured by a revised Teacher Evaluation Profile survey, and factors of teacher job satisfaction, as measured by the subscale Work Itself of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire.

HO_2: There is no statistically significant relationship between gender and current teacher evaluation practices, as measured by a revised Teacher Evaluation Profile survey, and factors of teacher job satisfaction, as measured by the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire subscale Work Itself.

HO_3: There is no statistically significant relationship between years of teaching experience and current teacher evaluation practices, as measured by a revised Teacher Evaluation Profile survey, and factors of teacher job satisfaction, as measured by the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire subscale Work Itself.

HO_4: There is no statistically significant relationship between teaching assignment grade level and current teacher evaluation practices, as measured by a revised Teacher Evaluation Profile survey, and factors of teacher job satisfaction, as measured by the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire subscale Work Itself.

Although no statistically significant relationship was found between current evaluation practices, as measured by the Teacher Evaluation Profile survey in its entirety, and teacher job satisfaction, as measured by the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire subscale Work Itself, a significant relationship was found to exist between one of the subscales of the TEP and the TJSQ subscale Work Itself. The TEP subscale Evaluator Perceptions and the TJSQ subscale Work Itself did have a significant relationship at the 0.05 level. The null hypothesis for HO_1 was rejected.

HO_2 addressed the relationship between gender and current teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction. There was no statistically significant relationship as supported by the calculations generated by the multiple regression conducted. The study failed to reject HO_2.

This study examined years of teaching experience as the variable for HO_3. No statistically significant relationship was found between years of teaching experience and current teaching evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction. The study failed to reject HO_3.

The variable examined for HO_4 was the teaching assignment grade level. No statistically significant relationship was found between the teaching assignment grade level and current teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction. The study failed to reject HO_4.

Summary

This chapter presented the results centered on four research questions. Descriptive and survey data provided information helpful in determining the degree of the relationship between teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction. Additional inferential statistics provided insight to gauge the degree of differences in the relationship between teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction dependent on three predictors. Chapter 5 presents an overview of the study and a summary of findings. Conclusions and recommendations for future studies are also discussed in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Evaluation of teachers in the majority of school districts across the country is often inconsistent with best practices (Peterson, 2000). Most schools use supervision and evaluation in an attempt to increase teacher effectiveness in the classroom, which should enhance student learning. School districts across the state of Missouri have begun to develop more differentiated and student focused evaluation models in an attempt to foster teacher growth through the evaluation process.

Performance-based teacher evaluation (PBTE) in the state of Missouri has evolved from a one size fits all, competency-based checklist, to a diversified evaluation model. The PBTE model has been implemented by a majority of school districts throughout the state in an attempt to reform and personalize the district's evaluation system.

Ingersoll (2001) identified job dissatisfaction as a major reason teachers give for leaving the profession. School administrators are in positions to enhance the job satisfaction of teachers (Rinehart & Short, 1994) leading to an increase in performance and organizational effectiveness. Increased job satisfaction leads to teacher retention, keeping quality teachers in the classroom (Protheroe, Lewis, & Paik, 2002).

The purpose of this study was to conduct an in-depth examination of the relationship between teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction. The findings of this study were based on data collected in the form of two instruments: the Teacher Evaluation Profile and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire.

Summary of Findings

A total of 84 certificated teachers who had taught in a Midwestern school district for at least one year participated in the study, resulting in a 38% response rate. The Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) were used to gather descriptive and quantitative self-reported data from 221 certificated teachers. Over 80 % of the respondents were female. The highest percentage (44%) of the teachers participating in the study had teaching experience totaling more than 16 years and over half (61.9%) of the participants had more than ten years of teaching experience. Teachers in grades pre-kindergarten through fourth grade had the largest number of participants totaling 31 (36.9%).

The first research question examined the relationship between teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction. A Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation was calculated to determine the degree of the relationship.

The data suggested a strong relationship between the total score of the TEP and the five subscales, which was consistent with the results generated on the TEP during validity and reliability tests conducted when the instrument was developed. There was no statistically significant relationship between the total score of the TEP and the TJSQ subscale of Work Itself. Although four out of the five subscales of the TEP did not result in a statistically significant relationship with the TJSQ subscale Work Itself, the subscale Evaluator Perceptions did have a significant relationship to the subscale Work Itself at the .05 level. Because the TEP subscale Evaluator Perceptions was the only subscale that resulted in a statistically significant correlation, it was the sole subscale used to address the remaining research questions. Using the other subscales of the TEP without a

statistically significant correlation would not have generated usable data aligned with the focus of the study.

To examine research questions two through four, a multiple regression was calculated for each question. Differences in the relationship between current teacher practices and teacher job satisfaction were measured by data generated from the TEP subscale Evaluator Perceptions and the TJSQ subscale Work Itself. The TJSQ subscale Work Itself was the dependent variable in the study and the three predictors studied were gender, years of teaching experience, and teaching assignment grade level. There were no statistically significant differences in the relationship between the Evaluator Perceptions subscale of the TEP and the Work Itself subscale of the TJSQ dependent on gender, years of teaching experience, or teacher assignment grade level. The analyses of the data generated for this study indicated that the relationship between teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction does not depend on gender, years of teaching experience, or teaching assignment grade level.

Conclusions

Overall findings of this study offer many implications for professional educational practice. Based on specific findings the following conclusions were warranted:

1. Components of teacher evaluation practices have varied correlations to teacher job satisfaction. This study addressed five components of teacher evaluation practices as specified by subscales on the Teacher Evaluation Profile: Personal Attributes, Evaluator Perceptions, Evaluation Procedures, Feedback Received, and Evaluation Context. In this study, the subscale Evaluator Perceptions had a significant correlation to teacher job satisfaction.

2. Gender was not a factor in the relationship between evaluator perceptions in the teacher evaluation experience and teacher job satisfaction.
3. Years of teaching experience was not a factor in the relationship between evaluator perceptions in the teacher evaluation experience and teacher job satisfaction. The large proportion (61.9%) of the participants having more than ten years of teaching experience may indicate a level of satisfaction that existed prior to the implementation of the current teacher evaluation procedures.
4. Teaching assignment grade level was not a factor in the relationship between evaluator perceptions in the teacher evaluation experience and teacher job satisfaction.

Richardson (2001) indicated that school principals are the primary shapers of school culture because of their daily connection with teachers, parents, students, and other administrators. Marshall and Hatcher (1996) suggested that an evaluation system that focuses on collaboration among teachers and principals will have a positive effect upon a school's culture.

Belcher and Machell's (1999) study examined the perceptions of administrators and teachers concerning the efficacy, quality, and impact of a piloted Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation model in a Midwestern state. The piloted model required more informal interaction between administrator and teacher and resulted in positive teacher perceptions of evaluations.

The data from this study indicated that evaluator's perceptions of the evaluation process had a statistically significant relationship between teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction. The data from this study supported Ebmeier (2003) and

Novick's (1996) conclusions regarding evaluation processes that incorporate collaborative dialogue and reflective practices. The Ebmeir and Novick studies advocated school environments where changes are aligned with procedures that foster teacher and student growth, leading to teacher satisfaction.

School principals can use the results from this study to promote positive dialogue with teachers about evaluation practices. The data indicated a statistically significant relationship between evaluator's perceptions about the evaluation process and teacher's job satisfaction with the job of teaching. The way a principal perceives the evaluation process matters to teachers and has a statistically significant relationship to the satisfaction they have in their job.

Before evaluations can be of maximum value, and atmosphere of trust must be prevalent in the school culture where the evaluation process takes place (Plecki, 2000). Teachers can accurately reflect and personally critique their professional teaching skills when they are aware of current research and best practices. The mechanism for instilling trust and promoting research-based teaching practices is the creation of an organizational culture that advances the professional development of all stakeholders (Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 2000). A principal who conveys the importance of the evaluation process to teachers and establishes a credible, collaborative working environment may improve the job satisfaction of the teachers in the school.

Recommendations for Future Studies

The conclusions of this study offer several recommendations for future research. Based on previous research and findings from this study the following recommendations are proposed for further study:

1. The Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) contains nine subscales. Further research using other subscales of the TJSQ and the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) would provide data that may determine specific components of teacher job satisfaction that have a significant relationship to teacher evaluation practices.
2. The TEP is comprised of five subscales. One or more of the subscales of the TEP may have a relationship to the other TJSQ subscales. Designing a study using one or more of the TEP subscales to all of the nine subscales would provide data that may identify a relationship between specific components of the teacher evaluation experience and the total TJSQ.
3. Evaluator perceptions of the teacher evaluation process had a significant relationship to the TJSQ subscale Work Itself. Conducting a study using the TEP subscale Evaluator Perceptions to other TJSQ subscales would identify the degree of the relationship to other components of teacher job satisfaction.
4. An examination of the relationship in the responses specific to gender, years of teaching experience, and teaching assignment grade level would add to the knowledge base of the relationship between teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction.
5. The study could be replicated in larger or smaller school districts to determine if the size of the school district had an effect on the results.
6. Application of the same research design to a district in a suburban or urban school district to determine whether the location of the school district had an effect on the results.

7. A longitudinal study could be conducted in a district implementing new teacher evaluation procedures. A pre-test prior to implementation and a follow up study after implementation to determine if the new evaluation procedures improved teacher job satisfaction would add to the knowledge base of factors that lead to teacher job satisfaction.

Summary

Recruiting and retaining qualified teachers has become a focus for school district administrators since the codification of the No Child Left Behind Act (2002). The federal mandate requires school districts to place qualified teachers in every classroom. With the expense of recruitment, it is in the district's best interest to determine the factors that lead to increased teacher retention.

Research suggested that collaborative teacher evaluation practices, embedded with professional development, improve teacher retention (Butt & Lance, 2005; Woods & Weasmer, 2002). Consideration of the myriad variables that shape teacher job satisfaction may restructure the focus in school reform toward teacher competence and commitment. Darling-Hammond's (1992) study suggested that one aspect of teacher commitment appears to be teacher satisfaction. Vital attention on teacher competence, commitment, and retention begs the question, "Are there factors of teacher evaluation practices that lead to teacher job satisfaction?"

This study enhances the knowledge base that addresses the question of how to keep teachers satisfied with the profession and to keep them from leaving. Assisting school administrators in identifying specific components of teacher evaluation practices

that lead to teacher job satisfaction would help resolve the complex problem of keeping qualified teachers in the classrooms.

REFERENCES

Anderman, E., Smith, J. & Belzer, S. (1991). *Teacher commitment and job satisfaction: The role of school culture and principal leadership.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Andrejko, L. (1998). The case for the teacher portfolio. *Journal of Staff Development, 19* (4), 45-48.

Argotsinger, J. (2002). *Components of P.B.T.E: A case study.* Unpublished dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84,* 191-215.

Beall, J. (1999). On evaluation and professional development. *Independent School 59,* (1), 72-79.

Belcher, D. C., & Machell, J.R. (1999, July). Performance-based teacher evaluation: The Missouri model. Paper presented at the Consortium for Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Evaluation, Eighth Annual National Evaluation Institute, Traverse City: MI.

Bennis, W. (1997). *Organizing genius.* Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Bess, J. (1981). *Intrinsic satisfactions from academic versus other professional work: A comparative analysis.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED203805)

Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 37*(5) 662-674.

Boles, K. C., & Troen, V. (2000). Why new teachers quit. *Teacher magazine, 11*(7), 59-60.

Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1997). *Reframing organizations.* Artistry, choice, and leaderhip. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Brandt. R. (1996). On a new direction for teacher evaluation: A conversation with Tom McGreal. *Educational Leadership, 53*(6), 30-33.

Brown, C. A. (1987). Teacher perception of the process, purpose, and impact of performance-based teacher evaluation in Missouri. (Doctoral dissertation,

University of Missouri-Columbia, 1987). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 1630.*

Bruffee, K. (1993). *Collaborative learning.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bunting, C. (1999). Teacher, improve thyself. A call for self-reliant, reflective practitioners. *Classroom Leadership, 2* (9).

Butt, G., & Lance, A. (2005). Secondary teacher workload and job satisfaction: Do successful strategies for change exist? *Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 33*(4), 401-422.

Carlson, R., & Park, R. (1978). *A meta evaluation of a pilot study of a clinical teacher evaluation model.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED157869)

Colgan, C. (2004). Is there a teacher retention crisis? *American School Board Journal, 8*, 22-25.

Coker, H., Medley, D. M., & Soar, R. S. (1980). How valid are expert opinions about effective teaching? *Phi Delta Kappan, 62*(2), 131-134.

Colbert, J., & Wolff, D. (1992). Surviving in urban schools. *Journal of Teacher Education, 43*, 193-199.

Corcoran, T. B. (1995). *Helping teachers teach well: Transforming professional development.* New Brunswick, NJ: Consortium for Policy Research in Education Policy Briefs.

Corkery, D. L. (1999). Developmental practices for effective teacher evaluation. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1999). *Dissertations Abstract International, 61, 434.*

Costa, A. L., Garmston, R. J., & Lambert, L. (1988). Evaluation of teaching: The cognitive development view. In S. J. Stanley and W. J. Popham (Eds.), *Teacher evaluation: Six prescriptions for success* (p. 145-170). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Counts, G., Shepards, I., & Farmer, R. (1998). *Evaluation and supervision of teachers in Missouri schools.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED427402)

Crew, L. A., Everitt, T. J., & Nunez, R. W. (1984). *Improving teacher performance through systematic teacher evaluation.* Virginia Beach, VA: American Association of School Personnel Administrators.

Cui, Wei Wei (2003). Reducing error in mail surveys. *Practical Assessment, Research &*

Evaluation, *8*(18). Retrieved October 22, 2006 from http: PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=8&n=18.

Danielson, C. (2001). New trends in teacher evaluation. *The Leadership Academy Developer, 1*(3), 1-3.

Danielson, C. (2002). *Enhancing student achievement a framework for school improvement.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. L. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional learning.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1992). *Building learner-centered schools: Developing professional capacity, policy, and political consensus.* NCREST, Columbia University, New York.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). *Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of State policy evidence.* Retrieved September 8, 2003 from www.epaa.asu.edu/eppaav8n1.

Davis, J. W. (1988). The relationship between selected performance evaluation procedures and principals' perceptions about performance evaluation. (Doctoral dissertaion, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1988). Dissertation Abstract International, 50, 0837.

Davis, J., & Wilson, S. M. (2000). Principals' effort to empower teachers: Effects on teacher motivation and job satisfaction and stress. *The Clearing House, 73*(6), 349-353.

Dinham, S. & Scott, C. (1998). A three domain model of teacher and school executive career satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Administration, 36*(4), 362-378.

Donaldson, C. (2000). Teacher evaluation. *Thrust for Educational Leadership, 29*(3), 30-34.

Duffy, F. M. (1997). Supervising schooling, not teachers. *Educational Leadership, 54*(8), 78-83.

Duffy, F. (2000). Reconceptualizing instructional supervision for 3rd millennium school systems. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 15*(2), 123-145.

DuFour, R. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work.* Reston, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Duke, D. L. (1993). Removing barriers to professional growth. *Phi Delta Kapan, 74*(9) 702-704.

Dyer, K. M. (2001). The power of 360-degree feedback. *Educational Leadership, 58*(5), 35-38.

Ebersold, M. D. (2004). A utilization-focused evaluation of the growth-oriented teacher evaluation model in a selected Missouri school district. Unpublished dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia.

Ebmeier, H. (2003). How supervision influences teacher efficacy and commitment: An investigation of a path model. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 18*(2), 110-41.

Ellis, N., & Bernhardt, R. (1992). Prescription for teacher satisfaction: Recognition and responsibility. *The Clearing House, 65*(1), 179-186.

Ferguson, D. (2000). NSTA teacher survey lists teachers' dissatisfactions. *Curriculum Advisor, 36*(7), 18.

Fiol, C., & Lyles, M. (1985). Organizational learning. *Academy of Management Review, 10*, 803-813.

Fullan, M. (1993*). Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform.* New York: The Flamer Press.

Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (1996). *What's worth fighting for in your school?* New York: Teachers College Press.

Glatthorn, A. (1997). *Differentiated supervision* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Glatthorn, A., & Fox, L. (1996). *Quality teaching through professional development.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Glatthorn, A., Van Maanen, H., & Barley, S. (1997). *Differentiated teacher evaluation.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED353826)

Glickman, C., Allen, L., & Lunsford, B. (1992). *Facilitation of internal change: The league of professional schools.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED347929)

Goodlad, J. (1990). *Teacher for our nation's schools.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Graham, M., & Messner, P. (1998). Principals and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Educational Management, 12*(5) 196-202.

Guskey, T. R. (2000). *Evaluating professional development.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Haefele, D. (1993). Evaluating teachers: A call for change. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 7*(1), 21-31.

Harris, L. (1995). *The American teacher, 1984-1995, metropolitan life survey: Old problems, new challenges.* New York: Metropolitan Life Insurance Company. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED392783)

Hawley, W., & Valli, L. (1999). *Teaching as a learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice.* San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Herzberg, F. (1972). The motivation-hygeine theory. In Uroum, V. & Deci, E. (eds.), *Management and motivation.* Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc.

Holland, P., & Adams, P. (2002). Through the horns of a dilemma between instructional supervision and the summative evaluation of teaching. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 5*(3), 227-247.

Hoskins, L. (1987). *The reactions of Missouri teachers to selected aspects of teacher evaluation*. Unpublished dissertation University of Missouri-Columbia 1987.

Houchins, D., Shippen, M. & Cattret, J. (2004). The retention and attrition of juvenile justice teachers. (2004). *Education and Treatment of Children, 27*(4), 374-393.

Huber, G. (1991). Organizational learning: The contributing processes and the literatures. *Organization Science, 2*, 88-115.

Hunter, M. (1982). *Mastery teaching.* El Segundo, CA: TIP Productions.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, *38*(3), 499-534.

Iwanicki, E. F. (2000). Focusing teacher evaluations on student learning. *Educational Leadership, 58*(5), 57-59.

Jacobson, L. (2005). States scrutinize teacher working conditions. *Education Week, 24*(29), 1-17.

Johnson, M. (1994). Teacher evaluation in utah school districts. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1994). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 55, 2230.*

Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation.* New York: BasicBooks.

Kaplowitz, M.D., Hadlock, T.D., & Levine, R. (2004). A comparison of web and mail survey response rates. *Public Opinion Quaterly, 68*(1), 94-101.

Kauchak, D., Peterson, K., & Driscoll, A. (1985). An interview of teachers' attitudes toward teacher evaluation practices. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 19*(1), 32-37.

Kimball, S., White, B., Milanowski, A., & Borman, T. (2004). Examining the relationship between teacher evaluation and student assessment results in washoe county. *Peabody Journal of Education, 79*(4), 54-78.

Kleinhenz, E., & Ingvarson, L. (2000). Teacher accountability in australia: Current policies and practices and their relation to the improvement of teaching and learning. *Research Papers in Education, 19*(1), 31-49.

Latham, A. (1998). Teacher satisfaction. *Educational Leadership, 55*(5), 82-83.

Lester, P.E. (1982). Teacher job satisfaction questionnaire. Long Island University. Brookville; New York.

Levitt B., & March J. (1988). Organizational learning. *Annual Review of Sociology, 14*, 319-340.

Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology, 140*, 5-53.

Locke, E., & Schweiger, D. (1979). Participation in decision-making: When should it be used? *Organizational Dynamics, 14,* 32-44.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ma X., & McMillan, R. B. (1999). Influences of workplace conditions on teachers' job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Research, 93*(1), 39-48.

Machell, J. (1995). The teacher evaluation instrument: An examination of attributes related to teacher growth. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 9*(3), 259-73.

Maehr, M. (1989). Thoughts about motivation. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education, Vol. 3: Goals and cognition* (299-315). New York: Academic Press.

Maeroff, G. (1988). A blueprint for empowering teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69*(7). 472-477.

Maher, M.C. (2000). *A model for understanding the influence of principal leadership upon teacher empowerment as mediated by school culture.* Unpublished dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia.

Manatt, R. (1997) Feedback from 360-degrees: Client driven evaluation of school personnel. *The School Administrator, March* 1997.

Marshall, K. (2005). It's time to rethink teacher supervision and evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan, 86*(10), 727-735.

Marshall, M. (1998). Using teacher evaluation to change school culture. *NASSP Bulletin, 82*(600), 117-119.

Marshall, S., & Hatcher, C. (March, 1996). Promoting career development through CADRE. *Educational Leadership, 53*(6). p. 42-46.

Martin, L. & Kragler, S. (1999). Creating a culture for teachers' professional growth. *Journal of School Leadership, 9*(4), 311-320.

Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality.* New York: Harper and Row.

Mayo, R. W. (1997). Trends in teacher evaluation. *Clearing House, 70*(5), 269-272.

McCombs, B. (1993). Learner-centered psychological principles: Guidelines for school redesign and reform. *MCREL*, *January* 1993.

McCormack-Larkin, M. (1986). Ingredients of a successful school effectiveness project. *Educational Leadership, 42*, 6, 31-37.

Medley, D. M., & Coker, H. (1987). The accuracy of principals' judgment of teacher performance. *Journal of Educational Research, 80*, 242-247.

Melenyzer, B. (1990). *Teacher empowerment: The discourse, meanings and social actions of teachers.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Council of States on In-service Education, Orlando, FL.

Mertler, C. (2002). Job satisfaction and perception of motivation among middle and high school teachers. *American Secondary Education, 31*(1), 43-53.

Minium, E.W., King, B.M., & Bear, G. (1993). *Statistical reasoning in psychology and education.* New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Missouri Council of School Administrators. (2004). Retrieved March 22, 2006 from www.mcsa.org

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (MODESE). (1999). *Guidelines for performance-based teacher evaluation.* Jefferson City, MO: Author.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (MODESE). (2003). Mentoring Programs Standards 5 CSR 80-850.045, Division 80-Teacher Quality and Urban Education, Chapter 850-Professional Development, 160.720 RSMo, 2002, 161.092 RSMo 1983, amended 1973, 2002.

Moore, B.M. (1987). *Individual difference and satisfaction with teaching.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Washington, D.C. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED282851)

Morgan, G. (1977). Images of organization. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Morice, L. & Murray, J. (2003). Compensation and teacher retention: A success story. *Educational Leadership, 60*(8), 40-43.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE). (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* Washington, D.C: US Department of Education.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's Future.* New York: Teacher's College, Columbia University.

National Education Association. (2004). Survival of the fittest. *NEA Today, 23*(2), 15.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002).

Nonaka, I. & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge creation company.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. (1989). *The teacher evaluation profile.* Portland, OR.

Novick, R. (1996). *Actual schools, possible practices: New directions in professional development.* Retreived July 13, 2001 from www.epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v4n14.html.

Pearson, L. & Moomaw, W. (2005). The relationship between teacher autonomy and

stress, work satisfaction, empowerment, and professionalism. *Education Research Quarterly, 29*(1), 37-53.

Peterson, K. (1984). Methodological problems in teacher evaluation. *Journal of Research and Development Education, 17(*4).

Peterson, K. (2000). *A comprehensive guide to new directions and practices.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED445087)

Peterson, K. & Chenoweth, T. (1992). School teachers' control and involvement in their own evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 6*, 177-189.

Plecki, M. (2000). *Economic perspectives on investments in teacher quality: Lessons learned from research on productivity and human resource development*. Retreived April 12, 2006 from www.epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n33.html

Popkewitz, T. & Myrdal, S. (1991). *Case studies of the urban mathematics collaborative project: A report to the Ford Foundation.* Madison: University of Wisconsin.

Protheroe, N. (2002). Improving instruction through teacher observation. *Principal, 82*(1), 48-51.

Protheroe, N., Lewis, A., & Paik, S. (2002). *Promoting teacher quality.* Retrieved January 18, 2003 from www.ers.org/spectrum/win02a/htm.

Quaglia, R. & Marion, S. (1991). The relationship of teacher satisfaction to perceptions of school organization, teacher empowerment, work conditions, and community status. *Education 112*(2), 206-222.

Reyes, P. & Hoyle, D. (1992). Teachers' satisfaction with principals' communication *Journal of Educational Research 85*(3), 163-168.

Reyes, P. & Shin, H. (1995). Teacher commitment and job satisfaction: A causal analysis. *Journal of School Leadership, 5*(1), 22-39.

Rice, R.W., Gentile, D.A., & McFarlin, D.B. (1991). Facet importance and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 31-39.

Richardson, J. (2001). *Shared culture: A consensus of individual values.* Retreived September 8, 2003 from www.nsdc.org/library/ results/res5-01rich.html.

Rindler, B. (1994). *The attributes of teacher evaluation systems that promote teacher growth as perceived by teachers of intensive English programs.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University.

Rinehart, J., & Short, P. (1993). Job satisfaction and empowerment among teacher leaders, reading recovery teachers and regular classroom teachers. *Education, 114*(4), 570-561.

Robinson, S. (1998). *Diversifying supervision for maximum professional growth: Is a well-supervised teacher a satisfied teacher?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Ronnie, J. (1993). Teacher evaluation: No more snuper-vision. *Educational Leadership, 51*(2), 43-44.

Rooney, J. (2005). Teacher Supervision: If it ain't working… *Educational Leadership, 63*(3), 88.

Rosenholz, S. (1989). *Teachers' workplace.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Rosser, V. (2004.) Faculty members intentions to leave: A national study on their worklife and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(3), 285-309.

Sawyer, R. (2001). *Teachers who grow as collaborative leaders: The rocky road to support.* Retreived September 8, 2003 from www.epaa.edu/epaa/v9n38.html.

Schein, E. H. (1992) *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Schon, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions.* San Francisco: Josey-Bass

Scribner, J. P. (1999a). Professional development: Untangling the influence of work context on teacher learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(2), 238-266.

Scribner, J. P. (1999b). Teacher efficacy and teacher professional learning: Implications for school leaders. *Journal of School Leadership, 9*, 209-234.

Scribner, J. P., Cockrell, K., Cockrell, D. & Valentine, J. (1999). Creating professional communities in schools through organizational learning: An evaluation of a school improvement process. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(1), 130-160.

Scriven, M. (1981). Summative teacher evaluation. In J. Millman (Ed.), *Handbook of teacher evaluation*. (p. 244-271). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Schweitzer, S. (1990). Performance-based teacher evaluation: Teachers' perspectives. (Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1990). *Dissertations Abstract International, 52, 2359.*

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

Sergiovanni, T. J. (2001). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Shann, M. (1991). Professional commitment and satisfaction among teachers in urban middle schools. *Journal of Educational Research, 92*(2), 67-75.

Short, P. & Greer, J. (1997). *Leadership in empowered schools.* Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Short, P., Greer, J., & Melvin, W. (1994). Creating empowered schools: Lessons in change. *Journal of Educational Administration, 32*(4), 38-52.

Short, P., & Rinehart, J. (1992). *Teacher empowerment and school climate.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED347678)

Shulman, L. (1997). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard *Educational Review, 57*(1), 1-22.

Shreeve, W., Norby, J., Goetter, W., Stueckle, A., Midgley, T., & Goetter, P. (1997). *Job satisfaction: An imperative for the coming teacher shortage.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED289818)

Singer, K. F. (1995). *Participatory decision making and teacher job satisfaction.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Widener University.

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. (2000). *Creating a context conducive to change.* Retreived September 8, 2003 from www.sedl.org/csrd/connections/april/2000/4.html.

Sparks, D., & Hirsch, S. (1997). *A new vision for staff development.* Oxford, Ohio: NSDC.

Stempien, L. & Loeb, R. (2002). Differences in job satisfaction between general education and special education teachers. *Remedial and Special Education, 23*(5), 258-268.

Stiggins, R. J. & Duke, D. L. (1990). *The case for commitment to teacher growth: Research on teacher evaluation.* Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Stockard, J. & Lehman, M. (2004). Influences on the satisfaction and retention of 1st-year

teachers: The importance of effective school management. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(5), 742-771.

Stodolsky, S. S. (1984). Teacher evaluation: The limits of looking. *Educational Researcher, 13*(9), 11-18.

Sullivan, S. & Glanz, J. (2000). Alternative approaches to supervision: Cases from the field. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 15*(3), 212-235.

Tye, B. & O'Brien, L. (2002). Why are experienced teachers leaving the profession? *Phi Delta Kappan, 84*(1), 24-33.

United States Department of Education. (2002). *Promoting educational excellence for all Americans.* Retrieved January 3, 2004 from www.ed.gov/admins/tchrqual/learn/hqs/edlite-slide2.html.

Valentine, J. (1992). *Principles and practices for effective teacher evaluation.* Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.

Valentine, J. & Harting, R. (1988). *Performance-Based teacher evaluation in Missouri: A three year report.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED311588)

Van der Linde, C. H. (1998). Clinical supervision in teacher evaluation: A pivotal factor in the quality management of education. *Education, 119*(2), 328-336.

Vogt, J. & Murrell, K. (1990). *Empowerment in organizations: How to spark exceptional performance.* San Deigo: Pfeiffer.

Weiss, E. M., & Weiss, G. (1998). *New directions in teacher evaluation.* Washington D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED429052)

Wise, A. E., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M. W., & Berstein, H. T. (1984). *Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Wood, C. J., & Pohland, P. A. (1979). Teacher evaluation: The myth and realities. In W. R. Duckett (Ed.), *Planning for the evaluation of teaching* (p. 73-82). Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Woods, A. & Weasmer, J. (2002). *Maintaining job satisfaction: Engaging professional as active participants*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED6519795)

Wu, V. & Short, P. M. (1996). The relationship of empowerment to teacher job

commitment and job satisfaction. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 23*(1), 85-90.

Wutke, M. (2003). *Missouri teacher attrition: Why are they leaving the profession?* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Missouri-Columbia.

Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations.* Upper Saddle River, New Jersey. Prentice Hall 4th ed.

Zembylas, M. & Papanastasiou, E. (2005). Modeling teacher empowerment: The role of job satisfaction. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 11*(5), 433-459.

Appendix A

Letter of Permission from Paula Lester

Long Island University
C.W. Post Campus
Department of Educational Administration and Leadership
720 Northern Boulevard
Brookville, NY 11548

September 2, 2004

Vici Hughes
PO Box 856
Warrensburg, MO 64093

Dear Vici:

Thank you very much for your interest in the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire that I developed and validated. Your research sounds very interesting and I think that it will make a real contribution to the field.

You have my written permission to use the TJSQ in your study and to make as many copies of the TJSQ as needed for your study. When you complete your research, please send me a copy of your results.

If I may be of any assistance to you, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Paula E. Lester

Paula E. Lester, Ph.D.
Professor

Appendix A

Letter of Permission from the Northwest Regional Laboratory

Message

Vici-
We are able to provide the permission your request in your email reproduced below, and hereby do so. This permission is limited to the material and use described; any other material or use will require separate permission.

Good luck on your dissertation project.

Dave Wilson
Director, Development & Communications
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
101 SW Main St., Suite 500
Portland, OR 97204
503-275-9517 (v)
503-275-0458 (f)
wilsond@nwrel.org
http://www.nwrel.org

-----Original Message-----

From: jerry hughes [mailto:jvhughes1226@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, July 27, 2006 1:48 PM
To: Dave Wilson
Subject: Permission to use TEP

Mr. Wilson,

Greetings from Warrensburg, Missouri. My name is Vici Hughes and I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Missouri- Columbia. I am interested in using the "Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP): A questionnaire reviewing your most recent teacher evaluation experience" as one of the instruments in my study.

In researching an 1994 unpublished dissertation by Bruce Rindler, Boston University, entitled The Attributes of Teacher Evaluation Systems that Promote Teacher Growth as Perceived by Teachers of Intensive English Programs, I discovered that he used a revised version of the original TEP developed by Richard Stiggins and Daniel Duke in 1988. In additional dissertations, I have noticed that permission to use the TEP has been given by Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. The only reference I can locate for the TEP is the copyright date of 1988 by NWREL.

Are you able to grant approval for the use of the revised version of the original TEP as used by Rindler?

Thank you, in advance, for help with this component of my study.

Vici Hughes
jvhughes1226@earthlink.net

Appendix B

Cover Letter to School Administrators

Victoria M. Hughes
PO Box 856
Warrensburg, MO 64093
660-429-1513
jvhughes1226@earthlink.net

Dear Administrator,

I am a doctoral student at the University of Missouri-Columbia and am completing a dissertation with the department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis. I am requesting your assistance in a study examining the relationship between teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction in your district.

I have discussed the constructs of my study with the superintendent of your district and have given her copies of the attached packet that I would like to distribute to each certificated teacher in your building who has taught at least one year in the district. I have received permission from the superintendent to proceed with the study.

The packet contains the Teacher Evaluation Profile and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Survey. An explanation of the purpose of the study, instructions for completion of the two instruments, contact information should any participant have questions or request clarification, and an addressed stamped envelope are included within the packet.

I am requesting that you distribute the packet to each certificated teacher in your school who has taught in the district at least one year. I received the list of names from the superintendent's office and have included additional copies of the packet in case I have overlooked a teacher in your building who would like to participate in the study.

I have asked that the participating teachers return the packet to me October 23, 2006. If you would distribute them as soon as possible, they will have approximately two weeks to complete the surveys.

Thank you, in advance, for your time and effort.

Sincerely,

Vici Hughes

Appendix B

Cover Letter/Informed Consent Form to Teachers

Victoria M. Hughes
PO Box 856
Warrensburg, MO 64093
660-429-1513
jvhughes1226@earthlink.net

Dear Participating Teacher,

I am a doctoral student at the University of Missouri-Columbia and am completing a dissertation with the department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis. I am requesting your assistance in a study examining the relationship between teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction in your district. Your responses will provide data that will enrich the knowledge base related to teacher evaluation practices.

Your participation is completely voluntary and anonymous, and you may stop at any time during the study. Completion and return of the survey signifies your informed consent. Every certificated teacher in your school who has taught a minimum of one year in the district will be asked to participate in the study. All data collected will be confidential and all individual rights and privacies will be protected. The findings of the study will be compiled in aggregate form and distributed as anonymous data in summary.

To participate in the study you are being asked to complete the two attached survey instruments. Completion of both surveys should not take more than 10 minutes.

If you are willing to participate, please complete the two surveys and return them in the provided stamped envelope by October 23, 2006. If you have specific questions or want additional information about the survey instruments, please contact me at the address, phone number or email listed above. If you have questions regarding the study please contact Dr. Sandy Hutchinson at 660-543-4341. Please contact the University of Missouri Campus Institutional Review Board at 573-882-9585 for questions regarding your rights as a participant in research.

Thank you, in advance, for your time and effort.

Sincerely,

Vici Hughes

Appendix B

CONSENT FORM

Identification of Researchers: This research is being done by Victoria Hughes, a graduate student and current employee in the University Advancement department at Central Missouri State University.

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study is to develop an understanding of the relationship between current teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction.

Request for Participation: You are invited to participate in this study on teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction. It is up to you whether you would like to participate. If you decide not to participate, you will not be penalized in any way. If you do not wish to answer any of the questions, you may simply skip them. There is no penalty if you decide not to return the surveys after completing them or if you decide to stop at any time. Please note that once you turn in the materials, I will not know which surveys are yours.

Exclusions: You must be at least 18 years of age to participate in this study, have teacher certification in the state of Missouri, and have taught at least one year in the school district where the data were gathered.

Description of Research Method: This study involves completion of two surveys, the Teacher Evaluation Profile and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire. You will be asked about your years of teaching experience, current teaching assignment, gender, and date of your last teaching evaluation. The two surveys should take no more than 10 minutes to complete.

Privacy: All of the information collected will be anonymous. Your name, years of teaching experience, current teaching assignment, or any information that could be used to identify you will not be recorded. All respondents were given stamped return envelopes addressed to the researcher so that no surveys were collected by school personnel.

Explanation of Risks: The risks associated with participating in this study are similar to the risks of everyday life.

Explanation of Benefits: The process of teacher evaluation may be improved as result of this study. The knowledge base regarding teacher job satisfaction may also be enhanced as result of this study.

Questions: If you have any questions about this study, please contact Dr. Sandy Hutchinson, 660-543-4341 or at hutchinson@cmsu.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact the University of Missouri Campus Institutional Review Board at 573-882-9585.

Appendix B

TEACHER EVALUATION PROFILE

The Definition of Teacher Evaluation

Teacher evaluation takes different forms in different programs. For the purpose of this study, teacher evaluation procedures may include all or some of the following:

- Classroom observations
- Student evaluation of teachers
- Meetings with teacher evaluators
- Peer evaluation
- Examination of lesson plans, materials or other artifacts
- Self-evaluation
- Student achievement

When reference is made in this questionnaire to teacher evaluation, it should be understood to encompass any of these procedures that are followed in the evaluation program within your school district.

Overview

This form has been designed to allow you to describe in some detail your most recent experience with teacher evaluation in your school district. Your responses will be combined with those of other teachers to yield a picture of the key components in the teacher evaluation experience in your school district. The goal of this survey is to determine how the evaluation process can be revised to help it serve relevant and useful purposes. Your frank and honest responses are important to reach this goal and will remain anonymous.

While this questionnaire is designed to be comprehensive in scope, it will take only a short time to complete. Please follow the instructions carefully and set aside about 10 uninterrupted minutes to provide thoughtful responses.

Instructions

Please use the scales provided on the following pages to describe your self and the nature of your most recent teacher evaluation experience in your school district. Do this by:

- Considering each of the items carefully,
- Studying the scale to be used to describe each,
- Circling the number on the scale that best represents your response.

Thank you for your participation.

Section 1: Demographic Information

1. Including the current year, how many years have you taught in your current district?	1. 1 year 2. 2 to 5 years 3. 6 to 10 years 4. 11 to 15 years 5. 16 or more years
2. If you have taught in multiple districts, including the current year, how many total years have you taught?	1. 1 year 2. 2 to 5 years 3. 6 to 10 years 4. 11 to 15 years 5. 16 or more years
3. Your current teaching assignment grade level (select the answer that best describes your current position)	1. Pre-K through K 2. Grades 1 through 4 3. Grades 5 through 8 4. Grades 9 through 12 5. K-12
4. Your gender	1. Female 2. Male
5. Date of most recent evaluation	1. During the academic year 2005-2006 2. During the summer of 2005 3. During the academic year 2004-2005 4. Between 2002-2004 5. Prior to 2002

Section 2: Overall Rating

Please reflect on your most recent experience with the evaluation process in your school district. Consider the entire evaluation process including planning for evaluation, observations, or other procedures and feedback.

A. Rate the overall quality of the evaluation:

Very poor quality 1 2 3 4 5 Very high quality

B. Rate the overall impact of the evaluation on your professional practices. (Note: A rating of 5 would reflect a strong impact leading to profound changes in your teaching practices, attitudes about teaching, and /or understanding of the teaching profession. A rating of 1 would reflect no impact at all and not changes in your practices, attitudes, and/or understanding.)

No impact 1 2 3 4 5 Strong impact

Section 2: Rating Attributes of Evaluation

A. Describe yourself in relation to the following attributes:

1. The strength of your professional expectations of yourself	I demand little 1 2 3 4 5 I demand a great deal

2. Orientation to risk taking	I avoid risks	1 2 3 4 5	I take risks
3. Orientation to change	I am relatively slow to change	1 2 3 4 5	I am relatively flexible
4. Orientation to experimentation in your classroom	I don't experiment	1 2 3 4 5	I experiment frequently
5. Openness to criticism	I am relatively closed	1 2 3 4 5	I am relatively open
6. Knowledge of technical aspects of teaching	I know a little	1 2 3 4 5	I know a great deal
7. Knowledge of curriculum content	I know a little	1 2 3 4 5	I know a great deal
8. Experience with teacher evaluation prior to most recent experience	Waste of time	1 2 3 4 5	Very helpful

B. Describe your perceptions of the person who most recently evaluated your performance:

9. Credibility as a source of feedback	Not credible	1 2 3 4 5	Very credible
10. Working relationship with you	Adversary	1 2 3 4 5	Helper
11. Level of trust	Not trustworthy	1 2 3 4 5	Trustworthy
12. Interpersonal manner	Threatening	1 2 3 4 5	Not threatening
13. Temperament	Impatient	1 2 3 4 5	Patient
14. Flexibility	Rigid	1 2 3 4 5	Flexible
15. Knowledge of technical of teaching	Not knowledgeable	1 2 3 4 5	Very knowledgeable
16. Capacity to model or demonstrate needed improvements	Low	1 2 3 4 5	High
17. Familiarity with your particular teaching assignment	Unfamiliar	1 2 3 4 5	Very familiar
18. Usefulness of suggestions for improvement	Useless	1 2 3 4 5	Very useful
19. Persuasiveness of rationale for suggestions	Not persuasive	1 2 3 4 5	Very persuasive

C. Describe the attributes of the procedures used during your most recent evaluation:

Standards are the criteria used to evaluate your teaching. Describe the procedures related to standards in the items below:

20.	Were standards communicated to you?	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	In great detail
21.	Were the standards clear to you?	Vague	1	2	3	4	5	Very clear
22.	Were standards endorsed by you as appropriate for your teaching assignment?	Not endorsed	1	2	3	4	5	Highly endorsed
23.	Were the standards...	The same for all teachers?	1	2	3	4	5	Tailored for your unique needs?

To what extent were the following sources of performance information considered as part of the evaluation?

24.	Observation of your classroom performance	Not considered	1	2	3	4	5	Used extensively
25.	Meetings with evaluator	Not considered	1	2	3	4	5	Used extensively
26.	Examination of artifacts (lesson plans, materials, home/school communication)	Not considered	1	2	3	4	5	Used extensively
27.	Examination of student performance	Not considered	1	2	3	4	5	Used extensively
28.	Student evaluations	Not considered	1	2	3	4	5	Used extensively
29.	Peer evaluations	Not considered	1	2	3	4	5	Used extensively
30.	Self evaluations	Not considered	1	2	3	4	5	Used extensively

Describe the extent of the observations of your classroom, based on your most recent evaluation experience in your school district. (Note: In these items, formal refers to observations that were pre-announced and/or were accompanied by a pre- or post-conference with the evaluator; informal refers to unannounced drop-in visits.)

31. Number of formal observations per year

1. 0 Observations
2. 1 Observation
3. 2 Observations
4. 3 Observations
5. 4 Observations

32. Approximate frequency of informal observations per year

1. 0 Observations
2. 1 Observation
3. 2 Observations
4. 3 Observations
5. 4 Observations

D. Please describe the attributes of the feedback your received during your last evaluation experience:

33.	Amount of information received	None	1	2	3	4	5	Great deal
34.	Frequency of formal feedback	Infrequent	1	2	3	4	5	Frequent
35.	Frequency of informal feedback	Infrequent	1	2	3	4	5	Frequent
36.	Depth of information provided	Shallow	1	2	3	4	5	In-depth
37.	Quality of the ideas and suggestions contained in the feedback	Low	1	2	3	4	5	High
38.	Specificity of information provided	General	1	2	3	4	5	Specific
39.	Nature of information provided	Judgmental	1	2	3	4	5	Descriptive
40.	Timing of feedback	Delayed	1	2	3	4	5	Immediate
41.	Feedback focused on standards	I ignored the standards	1	2	3	4	5	Reflected the teaching standards

E. Please describe these attributes of the evaluation context:

Resources available for evaluation:

42.	Amount of time spent on the evaluation process, including your time and that of all other participants.	None	1	2	3	4	5	Great deal
43.	Time allotted during the semester for professional development	None	1	2	3	4	5	Great deal
44.	Availability of training programs and models of good practices	None	1	2	3	4	5	Great deal

District values and policies in evaluation:

45.	Clarity of policy statements regarding purpose of evaluation	Vague	1	2	3	4	5	Very clear
46.	Intended role of evaluation	Teacher accountability	1	2	3	4	5	Teacher growth

Appendix B

TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE (TJSQ)

Directions: The following statements refer to factors that may influence the way a teacher feels about his/her job. These factors are related to teaching and to the individual's perception of the ob situation. When answering the following statements, circle the numeral which represents the degree to which you agree or disagree with the statements. Please set aside 10-15 uninterrupted minutes to provide thoughtful responses. Please do not identify yourself on this instrument.

Key:	1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral (neither disagree nor agree)	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree

1.	Teaching provides me with an opportunity to advance professionally.	1 2 3 4 5
2.	Teacher income is adequate for normal expenses.	1 2 3 4 5
3.	Teaching provides an opportunity to use a variety of skills.	1 2 3 4 5
4.	Insufficient income keeps me from living the way I want to live.	1 2 3 4 5
5.	My immediate supervisor turns one teacher against another.	1 2 3 4 5
6.	No one tells me that I am a good teacher.	1 2 3 4 5
7.	The work of a teacher consists of routine activities.	1 2 3 4 5
8.	I am not getting ahead in my present teaching position.	1 2 3 4 5
9.	Working conditions in my school can be improved.	1 2 3 4 5
10.	I receive recognition from my immediate supervisor.	1 2 3 4 5
11.	I do not have the freedom to make my own decisions.	1 2 3 4 5
12.	My immediate supervisor offers suggestions to improve my teaching.	1 2 3 4 5
13.	Teaching provides for a secure future.	1 2 3 4 5
14.	I receive full recognition for my successful teaching.	1 2 3 4 5
15.	I get along well with my colleagues.	1 2 3 4 5
16.	The administration in my school does not clearly define it policies.	1 2 3 4 5
17.	My immediate supervisor gives me assistance when I need help.	1 2 3 4 5

18.	Working conditions in my school are comfortable.	1 2 3 4 5
19.	Teaching provides me the opportunity to help my students learn.	1 2 3 4 5
20.	I like the people with whom I work.	1 2 3 4 5
21.	Teaching provides limited opportunities for advancement.	1 2 3 4 5
22.	My students respect me as a teacher.	1 2 3 4 5
23.	I am afraid of losing my teaching job.	1 2 3 4 5
24.	My immediate supervisor does not back me up.	1 2 3 4 5
25.	Teaching is very interesting work.	1 2 3 4 5
26.	Working conditions in my school could not be worse.	1 2 3 4 5
27.	Teaching discourages originality.	1 2 3 4 5
28.	The administration in my school communicates its policies well.	1 2 3 4 5
29.	I never feel secure in my teaching job.	1 2 3 4 5
30.	Teaching does not provide me the chance to develop new methods.	1 2 3 4 5
31.	My immediate supervisor treats everyone equitably.	1 2 3 4 5
32.	My colleagues stimulate me to do better work.	1 2 3 4 5
33.	Teaching provides an opportunity for promotion.	1 2 3 4 5
34.	I am responsible for planning my daily lessons.	1 2 3 4 5
35.	Physical surroundings in my school are unpleasant.	1 2 3 4 5
36.	I am well paid in proportion to my ability.	1 2 3 4 5
37.	My colleagues are highly critical of one another.	1 2 3 4 5
38.	I do have responsibility for my teaching.	1 2 3 4 5
39.	My colleagues provide me with suggestions or feedback about my teaching.	1 2 3 4 5
40.	My immediate supervisor provides assistance for improving instruction.	1 2 3 4 5
41.	I do not get cooperation from the people I work with.	1 2 3 4 5

42. Teaching encourages me to be creative.	1 2 3 4 5
43. My immediate supervisor is not willing to listen to suggestions.	1 2 3 4 5
44. Teacher income is barely enough to live on.	1 2 3 4 5
45. I am indifferent toward teaching.	1 2 3 4 5
46. The work of a teacher is very pleasant.	1 2 3 4 5
47. I receive too many meaningless instructions from my immediate supervisor.	1 2 3 4 5
48. I dislike the people with whom I work.	1 2 3 4 5
49. I receive too little recognition.	1 2 3 4 5
50. Teaching provides a good opportunity for advancement.	1 2 3 4 5
51. My interests are similar to those of my colleagues.	1 2 3 4 5
52. I am not responsible for my actions.	1 2 3 4 5
53. My immediate supervisor makes available the material I need to do my best.	1 2 3 4 5
54. I have made lasting friendships among my colleagues.	1 2 3 4 5
55. Working conditions in my school are good.	1 2 3 4 5
56. My immediate supervisor makes me feel uncomfortable.	1 2 3 4 5
57. Teacher income is less than I deserve.	1 2 3 4 5
58. I try to be aware of the policies of my school.	1 2 3 4 5
59. When I teach a good lesson, my immediate supervisor notices.	1 2 3 4 5
60. My immediate supervisor explains what is expected of me.	1 2 3 4 5
61. Teaching provides me with financial security.	1 2 3 4 5
62. My immediate supervisor praises good teaching.	1 2 3 4 5
63. I am not interested in the policies of my school.	1 2 3 4 5
64. I get along well with my student.	1 2 3 4 5
65. Pay compares with similar jobs in other school districts.	1 2 3 4 5
66. My colleagues seem unreasonable to me.	1 2 3 4 5

Appendix B

Participant Reminder Notice

Victoria M. Hughes
PO Box 856
Warrensburg, MO 64093
660-429-1513
jvhughes1226@earthlink.net

---

* * * THANK YOU * * *

If you have had the opportunity to complete the Teacher Evaluation Profile and Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire that I distributed last week, I want to thank you for your participation and assistance.

If you have not had a chance to read them and are interested in including your data in the study, there is still time to complete the surveys by October 23, 2006. Completing both surveys should take no more than 10 minutes.

Please contact me if you have questions. I appreciate your help with this project.

Sincerely,

Vici Hughes

VITA

Victoria M. Hughes was born in Independence, Missouri on August 13, 1955 to Victor C. and Barbara J. (Parker) Dinkel. She graduated from Truman High School in 1973. Vici attended Central Missouri State University and received the following degrees: Bachelor of Science Degree in 1988, with a major of Elementary Education and Middle School certification; a Master of Science Degree in Elementary School Administration in 1995; an Education Specialist Degree in Elementary School Administration and Superintendent Administration in 1999. In 2006 she earned a Doctorate of Education Degree in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis from the University of Missouri – Columbia.

In 1988, Vici began her teaching career at South East Elementary School in Warrensburg, Missouri teaching first grade. Vici had the opportunity to teach at the Woodbridge Middle School in Woodbridge, Virginia where she taught 8th grade science and 6th grade physical education for one year. A move back to Missouri allowed Vici to teach in the Blue Springs School District for four years in 5th and 8th grades. For two years Vici was an assistant principal in the Blue Springs School District and was principal for six years before moving to central office administration. In 2004 Vici took the position of Director of Alumni Relations and Development at Central Missouri State

University and currently is the Director of Presidential and University Events at the University of Central Missouri.

Vici is married to Jerry Hughes of Versailles, Missouri. They have four grown children, Greg, Parker, Chad, and Ashley with delightful additions to the family in Catrina, Jennafer, and Matthew. They have four (soon to be five) brilliant and beautiful grandchildren, Tanner, Fallon, Rylie, and Kaiser.