

A 1950 Census of Evaluation Practices

HAROLD G. SHANE

Harold G. Shane, Professor of Education, Northwestern University, reports on current practices in elementary school evaluation.

ALTHOUGH a great deal has been written about evaluation and the evaluative process in the past ten or fifteen years the question of what actually constitutes appraisal in modern education probably is not yet a matter of common agreement in educational practice. This conclusion seemed evident in a recent informal "1950 census" of evaluation instruments.¹

During the past academic year, in which the "census" was taken, a group of educators in the United States and Hawaii received personal letters in which they were asked to send the writer copies of elementary school evaluation instruments they had at hand and to indicate where additional instruments could be obtained. Public school systems, private and campus schools, institutions of higher education, professional organizations and state departments were among the 200 sources to which inquiries ultimately were directed.

By May 1950, some 200 pieces of printed material had been received and processed. While the sampling obtained cannot be defended as completely representative it probably is a reasonably good reflection of materials in current use.²

Some Interpretations of Evaluation

The survey suggested that five meanings have attached themselves to the

term: (1) evaluation as a synonym for a testing program, (2) evaluation as a means of gauging competence of individual teachers, (3) evaluation as a procedure followed in judging effectiveness of the over-all program of a school, (4) evaluation as an expression of values in the form of criteria to be used subsequently in studying specific problems, practices or conditions in the classroom, administration or curriculum, and (5) evaluation as a process by means of which changes in behavior of children are studied and guided toward goals sought by a school.

To be even more explicit, instruments in circulation which were contributed as evaluative devices tended to be achievement tests, means of rating teachers, check lists for use in judging instructional practices and related items such as material resources, handbooks setting forth criteria, or widely divergent devices for studying children.

Instruments Now in Use

The purpose of this brief report is to call attention to available publications

¹ Conducted by the writer with the aid of Seymour Rovner, Research Assistant, under Northwestern University auspices.

² Detailed information on the survey sample, responses and findings has been accepted for publication in the *Journal of Educational Research* and should be available in the near future under the title, "Recent Developments in Elementary School Evaluation."

rather than to analyze and debate the implications of the interesting and diversified concepts of evaluation which can be discerned in the instruments. In the remaining pages a selection of evaluative devices and related materials is presented under four of the five categories mentioned, achievement-type tests being omitted. Although not individually annotated, a group annotation is given for some of the materials in each of the given categories. A total of only 29 has been selected here although 65 are annotated individually elsewhere.³

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Materials for use in appraising the over-all school program.

(1) Elementary Classroom Teachers' Association and Elementary School Principals' Association, "Self-Evaluation in the Elementary School," (Try-out Edition), Elementary School Bulletin No. 11. Trenton: State of New Jersey Department of Education, 1946. 73 p. (booklet).

(2) Elementary Education Division, Va. State Dept. of Ed., "Looking at Our Elementary Schools." Richmond: State Dept. of Education, July 1949—Experimental Edition. 64 p. (mimeographed and paper bound).

(3) Henderson, K. B., Hand, Harold and Goerwitz, John E., *Follow-Up Study of the Illinois Secondary School Curriculum Program*. Champaign: College of Education, University of Illinois, 1948-49. (u.p. & v.p.) In several parts, mimeographed and printed.

³ The more complete 65-item *Selected and Annotated Bibliography of Evaluation Instruments and Related Materials* is available through the School of Education, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois. Please enclose 25¢ to cover cost of mimeographing, handling and postage. Address requests to Harold G. Shane.

(4) Illinois Association of School Boards, "Characteristics of A Good School." (The School Board Reference Library, Pamphlet No. 7). Springfield, Ill.: Illinois Association of School Boards, February 1947. 51 p.

(5) Mort, P. R., Vincent, W. S. and Newell, C. A., "The Growing Edge." (An instrument for measuring the adaptability of school systems). New York: Metropolitan School Study Council, 1949 (3rd printing). 40 p. (mimeo.).

(6) New York State Department of Education, *Elementary School Inventory Part I: Check Lists* (Third Edition). Albany: The University of the State of New York (Press), 1941. 54 p. (Code No. F77-N41-10,000(201211)).

(7) Office of Education (Washington, D. C.), "How Democratic Is Your School?" Washington, D. C.: Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, Bulletin, 1949. 8 p. (loose sheets).

(8) South-Wide Workshop on Elementary Evaluation, *Elementary Evaluative Criteria*. (Tentative Edition) Volume 2—Workbook. Executive Committee of the Southern Association's Co-operative Study in Elementary Evaluation, 1949. 102 p.

(9) Wilson, Edgar Ellen and Otto, Henry J. (Under the Direction of), *Handbook for Self-Appraisal and Improvement of Elementary Schools* (Revised Edition). Austin: Texas State Department of Education (Bulletin)—Division of Elementary Education, June 1948. 92 p. With mimeographed enclosure: "Suggested Study Program for Use of the Handbook."

The New Jersey item (1) is of interest as a joint Teachers'-Principals' Association effort supported by a state department and has the virtue of flexibility. It also encourages thought on the part of the persons using it. Henderson, Hand and Goerwitz (3) have developed an unusual device for appraising the

school through the eyes of its graduates. The Illinois Association publication (4) seems too general for widespread practical use but should stimulate wholesome discussion by board members. The South-Wide Study's volume (8) and Wilson and Otto's Handbook (9) apparently were influenced by the format of the *Evaluative Criteria* developed by the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards. Each is thorough and useful although many of the process values have accrued to persons constructing the instruments and are lost to persons using them at second-hand.

II. Materials for use in gauging the individual teacher's competence.

(10) Beecher, Dwight E., *The Evaluation of Teaching*. Syracuse: The Syracuse University (Press), 1949. 105 p. (\$1.75).

(11) DEB (Dwight E. Beecher), "Professional Knowledge Tests" (Intensive Teacher Training Program). 4/20/49. 26 p. Mimeographed. Revision. Part I.

(12) State of Delaware, Department of Public Instruction, "Teacher's Rating Card." Dover: State of Delaware, Department of Public Instruction, 1943. (Card Form 2000-3-43).

(13) "A Self-Rating Scale for Teachers." Chicago: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1947. 4 p. (25 copies for \$1.64).

(14) Morrison, J. C. and Ruegsegger, Virgil, *A Scale for Rating Elementary School Practice* (Reprint of Bulletin 1247). Form I (A booklet), "A Scale for Rating the Practice of Concepts Involved in Attaining the Cardinal Objectives of Elementary Education." Form II [a single sheet of the fill-in type, code numbers: F450-Je49-3000-29907] also bears the title, "A Scale for Rating Elementary School Practice." It is enclosed in the booklet designated Form I. Albany: The University

of the State of New York (Press), June 1949. 38 p.

(15) *Ohio Teaching Record*. Columbus: The Ohio State University (Press), 1945. 30 p. Second Revised Edition. (25¢).

The above entries touch on the emotionally charged field of teacher rating. Beecher's slim book (10) is a good and comprehensive survey of the topic. Delaware's rating card (12) is typical of the more formal scales collected. Houghton-Mifflin's "Self-Rating Scale" (13) is one of the few commercially available instruments. Of all materials surveyed, the *Ohio Teaching Record* (15) seems one of the best despite the fact that it requires considerable time to employ properly.

III. Materials expressing values as criteria for use in evaluation.

(16) Arizona State Department of Public Instruction, *Teaching Guide and Philosophy of Education: for Elementary Schools of Arizona*, Bulletin Number One. Phoenix: State Department of Public Instruction, 1948. 40 p. (pamphlet).

(17) King, H. B. et al., *Goals and Objectives Through Curriculum Experiences in The Elementary School* (By Subjects and Year Levels, I-VIII). Dover: State of Delaware, Department of Public Instruction, 1949.

(18) Maryland State Department of Education, "Some Suggested Criteria for Evaluating Maryland's Public School Program." (Second Annual Maryland Educational Conference.) Maryland School Bulletin, Vol. XXX, No. 1. Baltimore: State Department of Education, July 1949. 48 p. (booklet).

(19) South-Wide Workshop on Elementary Evaluation, *Elementary Evaluative Criteria*. (Tentative Edition) Volume 1—Criteria. Nashville: George Peabody Coll., 1949. 42 p.

(20) Virginia State Department of Education, "The Characteristics of a Good Elementary School." Richmond: State Dept. of Education, March 1949, Vol. XXXI, No. 5. 53 p. (booklet).

Each of the publications listed is of considerable value. Maryland's booklet (18) proposes seven "threads" to be woven into the good program and represents one of the more imaginative approaches to the presentation of values to be sought. The "threads" are concerned with democracy, ethics, life adjustment, the use of human and material resources, sound thinking, appreciation of and response to beauty, and competence in skills.

IV. Materials dealing with the appraisal of the status of, or changes in, human behavior.

(21) Haggerty, M. E., Olson, W. C. and Wickman, E. K., *Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedules*. New York: World Book Co., 1930. 6 p. (folded).

(22) Ohio State University, Bureau of Educational Research (in conjunction with other agencies), has produced the following:

a. "A Manual for the Ohio Guidance Tests for Elementary Grades," (Several authors) 1946. 29 p. (booklet).

b. "The Ohio Thinking Check-Up: for Intermediate Grades." (This is Form G-5: with it one uses Forms G-5-IS; G-5-CS; & G-5-K.)

c. "The Ohio Recognition Scale: Who's Who in My Group"—for Intermediate Grades. (This is Form G-4-A: with it one uses Forms G-4-B & G-4-S.)

d. "The Ohio Social Acceptance Scale: For the Intermediate Grades." (This is Form G-3: with it one uses Form G-3-S.)

(23) Olson, Willard C., *The Behavior Journal* (with manual of directions and record sheets—Forms 4926 ML & 4926

9-47 500). Ann Arbor: University Elementary School, University of Michigan, 1948, 3rd ed. v.p.

(24) Philadelphia School District, Board of Public Education. From the Division of Educational Research:

a. "Open-Mindedness Techniques: Problem Solving Group Thinking Leading to Action," April 5, 1948. 1 p. mimeographed.

b. "Open-Mindedness Study Evaluation Committee: Elements in Satisfaction of Emotional and Social Needs of Children," March 8, 1948. 1 p. mimeographed.

c. "Open-Mindedness Techniques: Problem Solving Group Thinking Leading to Action," November 9, 1948. 1 p. mimeographed.

(25) Smith, S. June, "We Learn About Our Feelings." Elgin, Ill.: The Continental Press, 1949. 32 p. (booklet). (Note: A Health Unit—This is one of the series of units known as the Basic Foundation Units.)

Most of the foregoing probably are so well known as to require no annotation. The *Behavior Schedules* (21) have been used for many years, and the Ohio Guidance Tests (22) have been durable favorites since they were introduced. Olson's *Behavior Journal* (23) is an elaborate but useful form recommended to patient and mature teachers. Smith's booklet (25) is a type of workbook to be used by children and through which they reveal something of themselves to the sensitive teacher.

V. Miscellaneous.

(26) Buros, O. K., *Third Mental Measurements Yearbook*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1949.

(27) "Guide to a Functional Program of Evaluation in the San Francisco Elementary Schools." (Bulletin No. 150, San Francisco: Bureau of Research,

September 1949.) Mimeographed.
(28) Smith, E. R. and Tyler, Ralph W., *Appraising and Recording Student Progress*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1942.

(29) Stanford (University) Consultation Service, Diagnostic Instruments:

a. *What Do You Think of Your Teacher?* Form 1. 10/49-300. 5 p. (mimeographed).

b. *What Do You Think of This Pupil?* Form 2. 11/49-300. 3 p. (mimeographed).

c. *Purposes and Activity Rating Blank*. Form 3. 11/49-300. 3 p. (mimeographed).

The *Buros Yearbook* (26) is included here because it reviews most of the achievement-type tests contributed during the "census" of evaluation materials herein reported. The Stanford materials (29) did not seem to fit into any of the categories, hence find their place here. The item from the San Francisco Public School Research Bureau (27) is representative of a number of publications associating evaluation with measurement involving the use of assorted batteries of tests.

How Evaluate Teachers?

ROMA GANS

Several avenues to improvement of teaching services are indicated by Professor Roma Gans, Teachers College, Columbia University.

RENEWED EMPHASIS on the evaluation of teachers can be noticed today. A number of reasons for this might be cited. First, there is the attempt to rate teachers in order to determine salary increases. Several such efforts are structured on a statewide basis. New York State has even gone so far as to write a merit-rating-salary plan into law. However, this movement is being met with such resistance from teachers, supervisors and administrators, who find present-day rating plans of doubtful reliability, that this trend is more likely to be curtailed than extended.

Another reason for this increased emphasis might be that many professions besides that of teaching seem to be placing stress upon evaluation of

personnel. Several schools of medicine have experimented in the selection of candidates. One large school for social workers is conducting a pilot study in which students' personality and performance are carefully studied at several strategic points in their educational program, then observed in the field at work for an extended period of time following graduation.

Of more influence than either of these ventures is the widely publicized work of the Staff of Selective Services in World War II and which is reported in *The Assessment of Men*.¹ These and other attempts to evaluate personnel in relation to particular work to be done

¹ OSS, *The Assessment of Men*, Rinehart Company, New York, 1948.

Copyright © 1950 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.