Evaluation of Classroom Teachers reports a survey made by the NEA Research Division of public school administration practices in evaluation and the reactions of superintendents, teachers and principals to the practices. Since a survey could not report all the complexities of the range of evaluation practices, it was necessary to find out only in a general way the practices used. Several patterns emerged: formal evaluations were more likely to be made of probationary teachers than of continuing teachers; school systems of 25,000+ enrollments were more likely to follow formal evaluation procedures than smaller systems (3,000 to 24,999), and this size more than the smallest (300-2,999); elementary teachers were given formal evaluation more than secondary teachers.

Superintendents and principals agreed that instructional supervisors played a role second only to principals in evaluating teachers in the schools of the two larger types, and in about one-third of the elementary and secondary schools instructional supervisors helped in the evaluation process. Yet, this group of educators was not included in the study. Superintendents indicated that improvement of instruction was the major use of evaluation, but only 32.9% of all teachers reported any changes that came about as a result of their evaluation.

Recommendations from the 76-page report emphasize the need to establish criteria for good teaching, a necessity for fair evaluation and reminders that the chief goal of evaluation is the improvement of instruction. It was recommended that every member of a professional staff must be evaluated periodically and at the same time recommended that teachers' professional organizations should have major roles in determining evaluation policies. This recommendation seems questionable. Why should teachers' organizations be the only professional organization involved to this extent when all professional staff members are to be evaluated?

No doubt analysis of the 40 pages of tables of data cannot bring general agreement, but even a casual look at the data indicates the need for careful study of evaluation, its purposes and procedures. Significant is the omission from this study of instructional supervisors, a group charged in most school systems with the responsibility for the improvement of instruction, which was the major purpose given by superintendents for evaluation. This supervisory group, especially in smaller systems, perhaps spends more time with individual teachers than do principals. Time for evaluation was a need cited by the study. Also, there was evidence that evaluators need more skill in evaluation, another characteristic required of instructional leaders. In fact failure to include this group in the study may be a weakness in attempting to get a true picture of evaluation of teachers.
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