THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

by

（C）   NORMA COLLEEN COOPER

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1972

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to examine (1) the
methods used to evaluate instructors, (2) the purposes
of evaluating instructors, and (3) the criteria of
instructor evaluation employed when evaluating
instructors for (a) competence, and (b) promotion to
an administrative position, in community colleges in
Western Canada.

Two instruments were sent to thirty community
colleges in Western Canada. The first one was sent
to the chief executive officer of each college to
determine the number of people involved in evaluating
instructors as well as the methods and purposes of
evaluation (87% return). The second instrument was
sent to the evaluators of instructors in each college
(80% return). It consisted of nine personal and
professional data items and two thirty-item question-
naires--one for each of the two evaluative situations--
made up of ten each of Mitzel's categories of process,
product, and presage criteria. Respondents scored
each criteria on a four point scale. Space was
provided on the instrument for evaluators to list
additional criteria which they would employ in each
of the two evaluative situations, and also to make

any comments on the study.

Statistical procedures used to analyze the data included a frequency count of the use made of different methods of evaluating instructors; a categorization of the purposes of evaluating instructors and a ranking of the categories; a frequency count to place criteria in rank order for both evaluative situations to determine if a common body of criteria was used in either or both of the situations; a factor analysis to see if criteria tended to cluster in Mitzel's categories of process, product, and presage criteria; chi square tests to isolate significant differences between categories of six personal and professional variables and evaluators' uses of specific criteria; a classification of the additional criteria used by evaluators according to a scheme devised by Barr; and a classification of respondents' comments on the study.

Analysis of the data revealed that the most commonly used methods of evaluating instructors were student evaluation, classroom observation, and team evaluation. The major purpose of evaluating instructors was to improve instruction. It was also found that a common body of evaluative criteria was employed in both situations. Process criteria were stressed when evaluating instructor competence and presage criteria were stressed when rating instructors for administrative

promotion. Thirty significant relationships were found to exist between the personal and professional variables and the use of certain criteria. Over five hundred additional criteria used in the two evaluative situations were listed by the evaluators. Analysis of these revealed that a common body of criteria was used in each of the evaluative situations.

This study would seem to show the lack of emphasis on product criteria, the possibility of constructing evaluation instruments based on the commonly used criteria which were identified, the timeliness of pursuing new approaches to evaluating instructors, and the need for increased useage of direct information in evaluating instructors.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank the members of the committee, Dr. D. Massey, Dr. R. C. Bryce, and especially Dr. D. A. MacKay for their advice and assistance in preparing the thesis.

I am grateful to my colleagues and the faculty members of the Department of Educational Administration for their encouragment and support, and to my typist, Mrs. C. Mossman, for her efficiency.

I also thank my husband and children for their patience and cooperation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter   Page

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE

INTRODUCTION

Of the many problems facing the community

college, perhaps none is more crucial than that of

providing meaningful instruction. Since individual

instructors remain the key to implementing an effective

instructional program, the need for assessing their

competencies is obvious. It has been claimed that a

community college is a unique institution of higher

education. One facet of its uniqueness is the emphasis

placed on teaching rather than research. If community

colleges hope to fulfill this promise of providing

good instruction, evaluation of their instructors is of

prime importance. Evaluation of instructors, both those

on probation and those with tenure, is a prerequisite

for establishing and maintaining the reputation of a

"teaching" college (NFA, 1970).

Presently, little is done by Canadian teacher-

training institutions to prepare instructors expressly

for teaching in community colleges. Instructors differ

widely in academic qualifications and teaching experience.

The varied ages, skills, and interests of community

college students necessitate adjustments in the teaching

techniques which will effectively translate curriculum content into terms meaningful to students. In view of these factors, assessment of the competencies of its instructional staff becomes a crucial and sometimes difficult task for the community college.

Methods, criteria, and instruments for evaluation are legion, but comparative reliability has not been determined as yet. Whether evaluation is conducted formally or informally, jointly or individually, the problem of criteria to be used always exists.

Previous studies by Moore (1966), Thomas (1969), and Rogers (1970), using Mitzel's criteria of process, product, and presage, have found that many problems concerning criteria exist when principals and inspectors evaluate teachers. No studies similar to these have been conducted in community colleges in Western Canada.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Numerous rating forms and check lists are provided in community colleges in Western Canada for the purpose of evaluating instructors. No research has been carried out to determine the degree of consistency among criteria upon which evaluations are based. This study has attempted to assess whether there is a common body of criteria used.

Methods used to evaluate instructors and approaches to evaluating the instructional process vary among the community colleges in Western Canada. The

emphases placed on different methods and purposes of instructor evaluation are changing. This study has attempted to determine the major purposes of instructor evaluation as well as the principal methods currently being used.

Major Problems

    1. Is there a common body of criteria used in evaluating instructors?

    2. What methods are used to evaluate instructors?

    3. What are the purposes of evaluating instructors?

Sub-Problems

    1. Is there a common body of criteria used in evaluating instructor competence?

    2. Is there a common body of criteria used in evaluating instructors as being worthy of promotion to an administrative position?

    3. Is the emphasis placed in certain classes of criteria different in the different situations of (1) and (2) above?

    4. Is a particular emphasis placed upon certain of the categories of process, product, or presage in either or both of the situations in (1) and (2) above?

    5. What particular criteria are used both most often and least often in the two evaluative situations?

    6. Is there any relationship (and if so, what?)

between the evaluative criteria used by evaluators and variables such as administrative position, length of experience in the position, age, time spent in teaching, teaching experience, and professional training?

7. What criteria, other than those included in the instrument, are employed by evaluators?

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The potential merits of the study are as follows:

1. It should provide a re-examination of the complexity of the task of instructor evaluation, perhaps enabling evaluators to see their own practices in the light of what their colleagues are doing.

2. It should isolate criteria commonly used by evaluators of instructors in community colleges in Western Canada; this information should be of some value to instructors, administrators, and governing boards.

3. It should help to focus attention on the variability and subjectivity of evaluation processes, perhaps resulting in an effort to increase the objectivity of instructor evaluation through the use of researched criteria which are both relevant and reliable.

4. The study closely approximates that of Rogers (1970) carried out in Alberta. Rogers' study was based to some extent on theses by Thomas (1969) and Moore (1966). Findings of the present study should therefore either support or negate their findings.

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

It has been suggested that compared with other institutions of higher education community colleges stand in a much better position to make advances in the evaluation of teaching (Lee, 1967). New teachers and teachers from high schools, universities, and industry represent a group who either have established no tra-ditional patterns of instruction or who may be willing to change their traditional patterns. The opportunity exists for improving classroom teaching and instructional methods through constructive evaluation. An awareness of what criteria are being used to evaluate instructors as well as an awareness of the current methods and purposes of instructor evaluation should provide a basis for further advancement in evaluation.

DEFINITION OF SIGNIFICANT TERMS

Evaluation

Evaluation is an assessment by measurement, rating, or ranking of teacher effectiveness and competence involving value judgments based on observations. Evaluation may be formative (for the purpose of promoting the professional growth and development of the teacher) or summative (for the purpose of official reporting of the effectiveness of the teacher which may lead to a decision regarding the acceptability of teacher performance.)

Teacher Effectiveness

This term refers to the effect of a teacher in a given classroom or clinical situation.

Teacher Competence

This term refers to the possession of one or more abilities to produce agreed upon educational effects.

Criteria

The categories of criteria used in the study are Mitzel's categories of process, product, and presage criteria (Mitzel, 1960: 1481-86).

1. Process criteria consist of aspects of teacher behavior and student behavior. They involve methods, techniques, rapport, climates, and situations involving the social interactions of students and teacher.

2. Product criteria depend upon a set of goals toward which teaching is directed, and involve some appraisal of changes in student behavior. They relate to student gains or growth, both academic and otherwise, resulting from the teacher's performance.

3. Presage criteria involve personal characteristics of the teacher, such as his personality attributes, his knowledge and achievements, intelligence, status, appearance, academic qualifications, and so on. They are often referred to as pseudo criteria, for their relevance depends upon an assumed or conjectured relationship to either process or product criteria.

<u>Instructor and Teacher</u>

These terms are used interchangeably.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

PURPOSES OF EVALUATION

Lehmann (1961) states that the ultimate purpose
of evaluating instruction is to improve the quality of
the learning experiences for students. He cites three
ways in which improvement may result from evaluation:
(1) Poor teachers are released and better ones are
hired. (2) Individual teachers are given opportunity and
help to improve in their teaching. (3) Students obtain
more insight into their own role in learning and accept
more responsibility for it.

Egnatoff (1971) cites a recent study of staff
evaluation procedures in 211 local school systems in the
United States which identified ten ways in which teacher
evaluation might be used. Six of the most frequently
checked purposes were: (1) to stimulate improvement of
performance, (2) to establish evidence where dismissal
from service is an issue, (3) to recommend probationary
teachers for permanent status, (4) to decide on re-
appointment of probationary teachers, (5) to select
teachers for promotion, and (6) to decide on reappoint-
ment of permanent teachers. Egnatoff contends that the

primary purpose for establishing a system of staff evaluation procedures is twofold: (1) to improve learning conditions, and (2) to facilitate administrative decisions.

Recent studies (Ladd, 1970) stress evaluation of instruction as a basis for rewarding excellence in teaching. During the 1960's several colleges and universities in the United States became aware of the need for change in fundamental policies. Among the institutions that undertook self-examination studies were eleven colleges and universities, including the University of Toronto. There was ready agreement, that among the frequent problems encountered was that of improving the quality of teaching. Most of the studies focused on the need to make the quality of the professor's teaching more readily observable to those who make crucial decisions about his status and emoluments.

The reports were concerned with ways to evaluate teaching since, as Ladd suggests, there is general recognition that rewards for teacher performance must be based on prior evaluation. The most comprehensive proposal for evaluation is contained in the Berkeley report, which called for a formal dossier on the teaching performance of the candidate for tenure. This dossier would include (Berkeley, 1966:44):

> . . . all significant tangible evidence, such as course materials and plans, syllabi, study guides, examinations, and textbooks written by the candidate. It should also include written reports by colleagues, evaluating the candidate's classroom performance on the basis of classroom visitations, and a statement

by the candidate describing the rationale of his teaching efforts.

The Toronto report included a generalized discussion of teaching and learning and recommended that undergraduate teaching be more suitably and obviously rewarded. This was backed up by proposals for the use of student evaluations of teachers and courses and for the inspection, by senior faculty members, of the classes of junior teachers. Both of these would be used in departmental decisions about faculty promotion and tenure.

If the purpose of evaluation is not to prove but to improve, the approach taken in evaluation procedures will be radically different from the traditional approach. Bruner (1967) states that the most important aspect of evaluation is to provide information for improvement and the least important is its possible detection of ineffectiveness. By stressing positive purposes such as recognition of and reward for good instruction, improvement of instruction and research, faculty fears of evaluation as a threat to career advancement can be largely alleviated.

In addition to deciding which teachers to retain and/or reward, many institutions of education are under pressure to improve instruction and better reward good teachers. The public employs professionally trained individuals to operate its schools, colleges, and universities, and is entitled to demand an accounting of their efforts. It is impossible to render a true

and complete account without evaluating the teaching
and its effects.

CRITERIA

Introduction

Acceptable evaluations must conform to certain
criteria to warrant being called "acceptable." According
to Stufflebeam (1971), selection of criteria always
implies some value system. He lists three types of
criteria and their characteristics as follows: (1)
Scientific criteria possessing internal validity, external
validity, reliability, and objectivity. (2) Practical
criteria which are essential if the evaluative information
is to be informative to the receiver. These include,
relevance, importance, scope, credibility, timeliness,
and pervasiveness. (3) A prudential criterion of effi-
ciency, involving requirements such as time, cost, and
personnel.

Mitzel (1960) states that criteria should possess
four basic attributes: (a) relevance, (b) reliability,
(c) freedom from bias, and (d) practicality. Of these
four, he denotes relevance, whether direct or indirect,
as the paramount attribute.

Lehmann (1961) lists six functions as descriptive
of the obligations of college and university teaching. He
suggests that if one accepts these functions, the
evaluation of college instruction can proceed by an

examination of the extent to which the functions are fulfilled. It may also proceed by looking for significant behavioral changes in the students. One approach involves an examination of the process; the other, an examination of the results of instruction.

Dressel (1967) emphasizes evaluation of class-room behavior rather than personality traits. His approach to evaluation of college teaching is in line with similar proposals made by Tyler, McKeachie, Mayhew, Umstattd, and others (Rowland, 1970). They disagree over the relative weights to be placed on teacher behaviors (means) and student behaviors (ends).

Teacher effectiveness criteria are frequently classified, on the basis of methodology used in obtaining the criterion measurements (Morsh and Wilder, 1954; Barr, 1948), as either ultimate or proximate (Remmers, 1952) or as first-order and second-order (Kelly and Fiske, 1951). Mitzel (1960) proposed that teaching effectiveness criteria be classified according to goal-proximity as: (a) product criteria, (b) process criteria, or (3) presage criteria. The present study is most closely related to the work of Mitzel in analyzing the use of process, product, and presage criteria for evaluation of instructor competence.

In 1950, a special committee on the Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness, appointed by the American Educational Research Association pointed out in their

first report that there is only one ultimate criterion against which to view a teacher's work and this is the effect on the pupils. This suggests that evaluation in terms of product alone is supported by the committee. Lehmann stated (1961: 354) that, "ultimately, the quality of instruction must be found, not in what the instructor does, but in what it inspires the students to do." Rose (1962) suggests that two other factors must be taken into account: (1) the teacher as a person with all his particular characteristics, and (2) the teaching process itself, the way in which the teacher performs to achieve his effects. A combination of these two views leads to the kind of general classification of criteria adopted by Mitzel.

Research Linking Process, Product, and Presage

Flanders (1969) summarizes a set of widely separated research studies which provide statistically significant support for a particular type of relationship between process and product (1969: 1426):

> . . . it can now be stated with fairly high confidence that the percentage of teacher statements that make use of ideas and opinions previously expressed by pupils is directly related to average class scores on attitude scales of teacher attractiveness, liking the class, etc., as well as to average achievement scores adjusted for initial ability.

He states that the most theoretically complete research involving differential effects of process and product variables has been the work of Taba (1964). In his

opinion, the study stands as an excellent model for the
development of teaching patterns which simultaneously
are concerned with the cognitive and socioemotional
consequences of teaching acts when they occur in
different sequences. He concludes that the preponderance
of evidence gathered so far would indicate that most
currently practicing teachers could adopt patterns
which are more responsive to the ideas and opinions
expressed by students and realize a gain in both positive
student attitudes and student achievement.

In a study by Soar (1966), a set of criterion
measures of teacher effectiveness was developed by
factor-analyzing process and product measures together.
These were related to presage measures from the
Minnesota Multiphase Personality Inventory (MMPI) and
the National Teacher Examinations (NTE), years of
teaching experience, and semester hours in education.
The number of significant correlations was approximately
that expected by chance. When these presage measures
were related to the product measures of classroom
mean residual true gain, the MMPI produced more
significant relations with product measures than the
three criteria commonly used for evaluating teachers--
years of experience, amount of preparation, and scores
on the NTE.

Fielstra (1963) discovered that measures which
best discrimated the excellent student teachers from the
poor (using a composite rating scale on teacher

performance) were, adaptability to a variety of teaching

situations, skill in planning, success in carrying out

plans, resourcefulness in teaching, and effective teacher-

pupil relationships. Smalzried and Remmers (1944)

isolated two factors of teacher effectiveness: empathy,

which included such traits as a liberal and progressive

attitude, fairness in grading, attractive personal

appearance, and a tolerant sympathetic attitude toward

students, and professional maturity, which included self-

reliance, effectiveness in presentation of subject matter,

and confidence. Olander and Klagle (1959) listed emotional

maturity first among the four best predictive measures of

success in teaching.

Lehmann (1961) states that research on instructional

methods, class size, and use of various media shows no

distinct advantage for any particular approach in regard to

learning outcomes. Dressel (1959) lists the following

factors as being involved in successful teaching: (1) the

objectives of the course, (2) methods and materials of

instruction and evaluation, (3) content or subject matter,

(4) personality and background of the teacher, (5) per-

sonality and background of the student, (6) physical

characteristics of the classroom, and (7) educational

setting and institutional characteristics. Since teaching

results depend upon the proper balancing of these factors,

individual rather than general solutions must be found.

Hence the need for developing means to evaluate

instructional practices on an individual basis.

Dubin and Taveggia (1968) found that no particular method of college instruction was measurably to be preferred over another, when evaluated by student examination performances. However, the case for incorporating a variety of stimuli in the instructional process is research based. The United States Navy audio-visual studies (1967) found that visual displays are twenty-two times more powerful than auditory signals in transmitting impulses to the brain. Evidence indicates that disadvantaged students learn best by a multitude of sensory experiences.

One answer to Taveggia's conclusion is given by McKeachie (1970). He argues that their study deals only with the effects of teaching on course examinations—that if we ask whether knowledge is remembered after the final examination, whether it can be applied to new problems, or whether it is related to attitudes and motives, we find that class size and teaching method do make a difference. MacMillan (1971) states that alternative instructional approaches have different consequences in student persistence, in attitude, and retention of learning after the final examination.

Medley and Mitzel (1962) conducted research to find out what patterns of classroom behavior were characteristic of those graduates of a teacher education program who were effective teachers. Their conclusion

was (1962: 320):

> . . . that some behavior patterns effective in
> securing high ratings from supervisors, high pupil-
> teacher rapport, and a wholesome classroom atmosphere
> have been identified, but that no progress has yet
> been made in finding behaviors effective in
> stimulating pupil growth.

Fattu (1963) and Ornstein (1970) review more
recent research up to 1970. Ornstein discusses the
categories of teacher behavior research as follows:
organizing by model systems, by instructional process,
and by teacher behavior characteristics. He concludes
that most critics seem to agree that the lack of agree-
ment in which behaviors constitute good teaching, plus
the multiplicity of behaviors, has confused the findings.
Fattu (1963) points out the problems of using student
behavior as a criterion: (1) achievement is difficult
to measure reliably and comprehensively, and (2) it can
seldom be stated with certainly that the change can be
attributed to a particular teacher or to a specified
aspect of his behavior.

Morsh and Wilder (1954) concluded that evidence
of student change appears to be the most direct and
reliable criterion but the problem of relating specific
teacher influences, be they behavior or traits, to student
achievement is largely unresolved. Ryans (1960) and
Byrne (1965) agree. According to Mueller (1971), most
researchers feel that student achievement is, on the whole,
the most reliable measure available at present.

In summarizing presage-process research, Flanders

(1969) laments the continuing difficulty of relating teacher traits to performance variables. Extensive research has been undertaken in an effort to equate teacher qualities and characteristics with teacher effectiveness. These studies have attempted to relate effectiveness with (1) intelligence, (2) experience, (3) knowledge of subject matter, (4) socio-economic status, (5) cultural background, and (6) other aspects such as attitude, aptitude, job interest, voice, discipline, and cooperation. Phillips (1968) observes that although all of these factors may be important in the teaching-learning process, research has failed to show a significant correlation between these qualities and characteristics, and teacher competence and effectiveness.

Broudy (1969) suggests an alternative to the so-far unproductive effort to determine what constitutes good teaching: didactic teaching can be defined but what he terms "encounter teaching," that which leads to critical creative learning cannot. Mueller (1971: 231) states:

> Students of the evaluation process approach consensus in the belief that a universal definition of good teaching pertinent to all situations and to every teacher is unrealistic. Therefore it follows that developing the perfect instrument with which to evaluate is impossible. Student and teacher behaviors and characteristics and the demands of the specific teaching situation introduce innumerable variables. Logic, then, suggests that teachers be evaluated on the basis of student progress toward strictly limited, defined objectives. Yet this solution may be simplistic.

She offers a possible solution to the problem (1971: 232):

> Since a universally valid instrument to measure
> teaching competence is not available . . . an alter-
> native could be the local development of a useful
> instrument. Bradley (1967) and Kinney describe
> steps in the process that allow enough flexibility
> for adaptation to local goals and philosophy. . . .
> Development of reliable instruments valid for
> specific local situations should open the way for
> coordination of efforts, finding grounds of
> commonality in teaching behaviors to be evaluated.
> Among others, the California Teachers Association
> (1964) and Woodruff and Taylor (1968) have defined
> areas of teaching competency and behaviors that
> provide common criteria for evaluating teaching.
> And instruments designed to meet local needs are in
> existence, e.q., those developed by the Hartford
> Public Schools and the University of Hawaii and
> California Schools. These are important steps on
> the way to determination of what good teaching is,
> if we remember always that no teacher is uniformly
> effective for all classroom situations, learning
> outcomes, and student characteristics.

METHODS OF EVALUATING INSTRUCTORS

Introduction

Many authors offer classifications of evaluation

based on the purpose for which it is used but evaluation

in general may be classified as formal and informal.

The latter is highly subjective. It may include classroom

observation, verbal feedback from the students, colleagues,

and administrators, personal interaction with the

evaluatee, and value judgements of the evaluatee's

general competencies. Formal evaluation is based upon

predetermined policies and involves written evaluations

which may or may not be valid, depending upon the

instruments used and the evaluator, but in every case,

the information is used as a basis for legitimate

decision making. The line between informal and formal evaluation is not distinct; nor are there research findings to assess and/or substantiate the degree of influence which informal evaluation may have upon the formal.

There are three common methods of evaluating instructors in community colleges: student evaluation, instructor self-evaluation, and team evaluation involving the instructor, administrator(s), and/or colleagues (peers). In Boyer's opinion, (1970) the third method, basing evaluation on student attainment of learning objectives is most directly related to the purpose of evaluation which is to improve instruction. A fourth method is a negative one. That is, the policy of the institution may simply be that for each instructor, a written evaluation must be submitted annually. The assumption is made that the instructor is competent unless specific complaints are made by students, staff members, or administrators.

Student Evaluation

Student evaluation is receiving increased attention despite the fact that instructors sometimes deny the reliability and value of student ratings. Bannister (1961) claims that student evaluations, when carefully and properly handled, provide the best criterion of quality of instruction. Lehmann (1961) notes that a commonly voiced faculty concern is that

student ratings may be influenced by such traits as appearance, the severity of grading, the grade received, or the amount of homework assigned. Research conducted by Clark and Keller (1954) and Rayder (1968) demonstrates that student ratings of instructors are not substantially related to the student's sex, grade point average, or grade(s) previously received from the instructor being rated. Rayder (1968) states that students, unlike administrators or even teaching colleagues, have the opportunity to view the instructor in his day-to-day teaching activities and therefore should not be ignored as evaluators.

Most of the self-studies in selected colleges and universities (Ladd, 1970) called for the use of student appraisals of individual teaching performance. The Swarthmore study also asked for evaluation by graduates and by outside examiners. However, only New Hampshire and Duke specifically called for the use of these in tenure and promotion decisions. In most cases, they suggest that appraisals go to the individual instructor, who, if he wishes, may pass them on to his academic superior. Neagley (1970) also advocates student evaluation since it can be revealing and at the same time stimulate instructors to improve their programs. Phillips (1968) claims that instructors are missing a valuable opportunity to gain significant insights into the effectiveness of their work. According to Phillips

(1968: 22):

> The concepts that the purposes of American
> education are to help meet the needs of each
> individual and to help him to develop to his
> maximum potential are widely held. If these
> principles of learning and purposes of education
> are accepted, then it is logical to assume that one
> of the most valid sources of data in evaluating the
> teaching-learning situation and determining teacher
> effectiveness can be gained from the students.
> This concept involves the assumption that unless
> the student perceives teaching as effective teaching,
> it is not effective regardless of the standards or
> criteria which are met.

The most common method employed in student
ratings is the opinionnaire. Most require the student
simply to rate his instructor on various attributes
relevant to teaching ability; several, however, include
open-ended questions or invite suggestions and comments.
Whitlock (1966) criticizes rating scales which only
measure the response of the rater to the set of his
observations which provided the stimuli for such a
response. Based on previous research at the University
of Tennessee, he and others devised a rating instrument
using "performance specimens" collected from the students
themselves. They found that the scores had high
reliability, were less subject to bias, were highly
relevant, and produced good spread among ratings.

The possible value of student evaluations is
demonstrated in a study conducted at St. Johns River
College (Overturf, 1966). A comparison of scores achieved
by the full-time faculty on student rating scales over
two years yielded the following results: (1) Of the

full-time instructors rated the first year, 14 did not return in the fall. Ten of these were in the lower half of the rating. thus reducing the spread of returning faculty by nearly one-third. (2) Fifteen instructors who rated in the lower half did return; all but one of these instructors improved on the next rating. It was further reported that faculty members who made significant improvement had taken the students' ratings seriously, particularly their written comments.

If student evaluation is used, a number of questions remain concerning the best time to administer the instruments, who should conduct the procedure, and how much value to attach to the results. There is no agreement upon the best time. Those who would administer student ratings before a course is completed cite the immediate feedback as a source of improvement from which the same students could benefit. Those who favor administering the questionnaires after course completion contend that it is only with a certain amount of perspective that a student can render a reliable evaluation. There is general agreement that the best person to administer the ratings is the instructor himself. The use made of the results in decision making is still a controversial issue.

Self-Evaluation

Instructor self-evaluation through student achievement and feedback is not uncommon or new. What

has changed is the increased use of rating scales and
audio-tapes or audio-visual tapes of classroom operation
in an attempt to achieve more objective self-appraisal.
Anderson (1964) lists the advantages of using tapes as
follows:

(1) Evidencing interest in the teaching process
itself by the administration.

(2) Indicating confidence by the administration
in the faculty's ability to evaluate themselves as
professionals and make self-indicated improvement.

(3) Giving the faculty a workable and frequently
interesting method whereby they may improve themselves.

(4) Preservation of anonymity of faculty, thus
forestalling feelings of "big brother" watching.

(5) Establishing essentially a self-operating
and perpetuating system not calling for a great amount
of time.

(6) Placing of the dean in the position of being
called in for aid by a motivated faculty member, rather
than being looked upon as an instructor with unwanted
advice.

(7) Providing specific and concrete examples of
problems which can be referred to on replay without
having to rely on notes or faulty memory.

According to Simpson (1966), self-evaluation can
help the teacher define his role as well as help combat
teacher dropouts. The former is particularly important for

as Boy (1963) concluded, unless teachers become involved
in defining and redefining their role, there is a strong
possibility that the small percentage of time currently
available for teaching will be even more greatly
diminished as time passes. Simpson (1966: 11) states:

> Teacher self-evaluation is almost unanimously
> recommended by teacher organizations and
> professional experts on teacher improvement.
> Regardless of the extent of disagreement on other
> characteristics of good teachers there is almost
> universal consensus that self-improvement based on
> self-evaluation is both desirable and crucial.

Team Evaluation

Team evaluation is the most time consuming but
it can also be the most profitable in terms of improving
the instructional process. Here the emphasis is on
evaluation by objectives where the instructor is observed
as one force in the learning environment. One technique
for evaluating instructors by student attainment is
proposed by Israel (1969). It is based on the premise
that the ends of instruction must be agreed on before
evaluation procedures can be established and teacher
effectiveness assessed. The essence of this technique is
the development of a carefully selected set of objectives
for the student to accomplish and an assessment of the
skills, attitudes, and uses of knowledge exhibited by the
instructor. The objectives are developed cooperatively
by the instructor and the administrator. Israel (1969)
provides three alternative methods for implementing this

technique. One distinct advantage of this technique is
that, in addition to providing a framework for evaluating
instruction, it facilitates instruction.

In 1961, when California's "instant tenure"
ruling went into effect, Golden West College "seized the
opportunity to abandon the archaic practice of classroom
visitation and to replace it with genuine instructional
coordination (Cohen, 1970)." They introduced a new type
of supervisory scheme. The scheme involves a dean of
instruction, the division chairman, and the instructor,
where the focal point is the learner. Of prime importance
is the fact that administrators and instructional staff
are meeting on an issue that enhances the basic purpose
of the institution--that of predicting, assessing, and
causing student learning.

Recent Developments

Faculty evaluation and termination procedures
were developed by a special commission of the National
Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges in the
United States. They were approved by their board of
directors and adopted by the NFA delegate assembly (1970).
These procedures describe the frequency, nature, process,
and scope of such actions. The criteria and methods of
evaluation are set at an initial conference between the
evaluation team and the faculty member, and the college is
obligated to make a genuine effort to assist each member
in the improvement of his instruction. Fundamental to the

establishment of these procedures are the following

concepts:

(1) Such procedures should apply to all faculty--

probationary or tenured--from initial date of employment.

(2) Evaluation and the possibility of dismissal

are inseparable.

(3) Evaluation should be made by colleagues

in the same area of specialization.

(4) Evaluation should be based on the particular

instructor's objectives and instructional environment.

(5) Only those procedures that are conducive to

improvement and that cannot be applied in an arbitrary

and threatening way should be used.

Of the fifteen essential research projects listed

by Cohen and Quimby (1970), one is that of assessing

teaching effectiveness. They suggest that a holistic

model should be developed for decision-oriented assessment

of teaching effectiveness and that it be developed on the

following assumptions: (1) That teachers are accountable

to their students for intended or planned as well as for

unintended or unplanned effects of instruction. (2) That

evaluation of teacher effectiveness is concerned with

measuring the efficacy of cognitive and affective trans-

actions between teachers and students.

Sawin (1969) states that sometimes the unplanned

or side effects of an educational program may be as

important educationally as anything else that is happening

in the school. There are differing points of view on
what should be done about unplanned learning once it has
been discovered, but he is of the opinion that teachers
need to know what the unplanned effects are and assess
them on a continuing basis.

Cohen and Brawer (1969) contend that, although
evaluation is often stated to be for the purpose of
improving instruction, the methods seldom relate to
instructional practices and even less to the results of
instruction. They propose that evaluation would be more
meaningful if it were related to instruction as a discipline
rather than to the person of the instructor. They suggest
that student achievement of learning objectives as a
measure of teacher effectiveness is generally acknowledged
as being more valid than the use of such criteria as, for
example, the teacher's effort expended or the various
perceptions of observers. They also note that faculty
evaluation may eventually prove effective in promoting
the development of instructional specialists. Currently,
a college instructor must be competent in all aspects
of the instructional process; through instructor
specialization, an institution may be staffed by a core
of people who collectively, but not necessarily indi-
vidually, display excellence in all matters relating to
teaching.

Implications

The use of student evaluation of the instructional

process and of the instructor in the community college,
recognizes the student as a client who can make judge-
ments commensurate with his degree of maturity, as a
person who has the right to influence the instructional
process to which he is exposed, and as a valuable source
of information which can facilitate instructional
improvement and/or decision making. Mayhew (1967) states
that the college must test its performance through the
reactions of those who receive its service, just as any
other profession must ultimately test its performance
by what happens to its clients.

Trimble (1968) states that student ratings have
their dangers. If they are administered by adminis-
trators they become a form of spying. If the results
are published by students they can inflict injustice on
some instructors and make others too concerned about
popularity. He believes that they do serve a purpose
when they are administered by an instructor with his
own students.

Prerequisite to instructional improvement is the
desire to improve and the starting point is a self-
assessment of present effectiveness. According to
Lehmann (1961: 358):

> The prime characteristic of the good teacher
> is that he continually modifies his teaching in
> response to his finds. Thus he engages in
> evaluation and, in evaluating the learning of his
> students, he finds an evaluation of his teaching.

Trimble (1968) expresses mixed feelings about the results of video-tapes for self-analysis. He says that on television, we have come to expect a degree of slickness that is quite inappropriate in the classroom. In his words

> When a teacher sees himself on the tube, his little mannerisms and eccentricities shout at him and he may try to get rid of them. These very mannerisms may be what give color and uniqueness to his teaching.

The chief advantage of self-evaluation is that the instructor has the opportunity for self-improvement without external threat.

The effectiveness of team evaluation is dependent upon mutual trust and respect, a strong commitment to the institutional goals, a recognition of mutual dependencies, and a continuous effort to improve the instructional process. It is essentially the same process as "clinical supervision" as it is defined by MacKay (1971) and Goldhammer (1969). The improvement of teaching competence is given higher priority than either that of protecting education from incompetence or identifying suitable candidates for positions other than classroom teaching. In MacKay's opinion (1971), team evaluation, involving colleagues and/or administrators is a closer approximation to professionalism than some of the more usual interpretations of the term.

Goldhammer's (1969) approach to team evaluation

is a blend of traditional administrative skills in human
relations, organization, and interpersonal communication,
and the skills of the psychological counsellor who works
in the clinical setting in a counsellor-client relation-
ship. If his approach is the ideal, then some effort must
be made to reach it. Even the best procedures are doomed
to failure unless those involved in implementing them
possess the necessary skills.

In setting specific objectives of instruction,
there is a possibility of neglecting unspecified learning
outcomes. When pre and post-tests become ends in them-
selves, they often pre-determine learning experiences.
Sergiovanni (1971) suggests the use of additional
evaluative tools. He emphasizes the need to evaluate
antecedent, transactional, and outcome variables--in
other words, the entire process.

The Leggett model for instruction (large lecture,
small discussion groups, and independent study), where
fifty per cent of the scheduled course time is devoted
to independent study, will require new criteria for the
evaluation of instruction. The simplest approach would
be to use student achievement as a basis for evaluation;
but unless the program itself is evaluated, the measure
of student achievement might be misleading. Implementing
many new programs where the use of "instructional
packages," library and A-V resources, programmed modules,
and the like, are the basis for half the learning process,

means that the success of the program is highly dependent upon the quality of content and accessibility of resources. How can you evaluate an instructor who for circumstantial reasons may be forced to rely upon inferior software? The inexperienced instructor will be at a disadvantage unless provision is made for assistance from senior instructors and various consultant personnel.

In all three methods of evaluating instruction, the use of valid and reliable instruments is essential. Rosenshine (1970) divides all types of instruments into two kinds: category and rating. The former are more objective because of limited reliance upon inference. Both types have unique advantages and when used together provide an optimum measure of teaching effectiveness.

Self-evaluation and team evaluation are congruent with McGregor's Theory Y concerning the nature of man. The administrative climate is primarily determined by the prevailing assumptions about the nature of man (Schein, 1965), and the evaluation procedures employed will reflect this climate. In Western Canada, the instructional staff of community colleges exhibit a widely divergent range of qualifications, experience, and educational expertise. Obviously the level of needs will vary accordingly. It is possible that different evaluative techniques might be required for different staff members. Those involved in the evaluation process should be flexible and prepared to accept a variety of

interpersonal relationships, patterns of authority, and
psychological contracts.

Working in evaluation groups may not be an
effective procedure if the members are unskilled in
interpersonal relationships and group dynamics; Schein
(1965) suggests training through laboratory methods as
one way to become more effective. Since sensitivity to
community needs is basic to the philosophy of community
colleges, adaptability of the organization is of prime
importance. Part of this process involves the addition
or change of programs and/or program content which, as
a part of the instructional process must be continually
evaluated. Schein (1965) states that the more the sub-
system (evaluative groups), which must change, participates
in decisions about how to manage the change, the less
likely it is to resist change and the more stable the
change is likely to be.

Self-evaluation as a vehicle for self actualization
is not likely to become commonplace in educational
institutions where job security is minimal, group conflict
is prevalent, and employment opportunities are limited.
Hence the need for increased communication and conditions
which stimulate collaboration and effect security.

The negative approach to evaluation has ambivalent
implications. On the one hand, it implies a professional
commitment on the part of instructors to their students
and the college, which negates the need for evaluation. On

the other hand, it implies that the college is unconcerned with teacher competencies and hence the services rendered to the students. Neither does it provide for recognition of skilled instructors nor interest in and stimulation of instructional improvement. It might be argued that professional growth is the responsibility of the instructors themselves but this is not consistent with organizational effectiveness (Schein, 1965). Schein emphasizes internal integration of individual needs and organizational goals as the underlying criterion of organizational effectiveness. He suggests that organizations must develop training and management development programs which stimulate genuine psychological growth, develop assumptions about people which fit reality, and train its personnel for effective group membership and leadership.

Boyer (1970) states that regardless of who designs the evaluation procedures and regardless of the techniques employed, certain principles should be followed. Morin (1968) lists six guiding principles. Egnatoff (1971) lists thirteen principles and conclusions based on research. Lehmann (1961) concludes that because of the elusive nature of the teaching-learning process, no completely adequate mode of evaluation exists, but there is evidence that properly constructed rating scales are valuable aids in evaluating instructional methods and instructors, especially when the emphasis

is placed on improvement of the quality of instruction.

In Rowland's words (1970: 157):

> Each approach to evaluation of college teaching
> has its place as well as its limitations and short-
> comings. None will work effectively unless they
> function in a friendly atmosphere. That atmosphere
> will prevail only when assessment of instruction is
> regarded throughout the academic community as a means
> of accomplishing over-all improvement rather than as
> a threat to specific individuals. . . . Because of
> the very nature of college teaching, its measurement
> can never be entirely accurate and objective. But
> with effort and cooperation from all involved, it
> certainly can be made less haphazard and subjective
> than it is now.

SUMMARY

Purposes of evaluating instructors include the

following: (1) improvement of instruction, (2) to

assist instructors, (3) facilitate administrative

decisions, (4) reward excellence in teaching, (5) account-

ability to the public, and (6) students benefit from

evaluating instruction.

Above all, criteria upon which evaluation is

based must be relevant. Criteria may be classified as

presage (concerned with teacher characteristics), process

(concerned with the teaching process), or product

(concerned with observed changes in students). There is

no consensus of opinion on what weight to attach to each

category, but product criteria are gaining increased

recognition.

Research studies have supported the existence of

relationships between process and product criteria, and

between presage and product criteria. These studies
represent a minority of the research attempts to link
the categories. More recent studies have supported the
use of audio-visual media and the direct relationships
between instructional approaches and student attitude,
persistence, and retention of learning. Because of the
multiplicity of variables involved in the learning
process and the confusion resulting from research findings,
emphasis is now being placed on the following:

1. Developing means to evaluate instructional
practice on an individual basis

2. Concern with "encounter teaching" and student
change in the affective and cognitive domains of learning

3. Evaluation based on student progress toward
limited, defined objectives

4. Local development of useful evaluation
instruments.

There is increasing evidence of the reliability
of student evaluation of instructors and programs. There
are many benefits to be derived by both instructors and
students when open-ended questions or "performance
specimens" constitute a part or all of the rating
instrument and when the instruments are properly
administered and interpreted.

Instructor self-evaluation has great potential,
particularly with the increasing number of technological
devices available as assists. It offers many advantages

to both administrators and instructors.

Team evaluation may involve administrators, colleagues, and/or students. It can be as time consuming as the team prefers. It may involve one or more of the following: joint setting of objectives, classroom observations, evaluation of tests and examinations, modification of program content, teaching methods, or physical factors, subjective assessments, student assessments, student achievement, and so on.

The National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges in the United States has developed and adopted a set of faculty evaluation and termination procedures.

It has been suggested that a holistic model for decision-oriented assessment of teaching effectiveness be developed on the following assumptions: (1) that teachers are accountable to their students for unplanned effects of instruction, and (2) that evaluation of teaching effectiveness is concerned with measuring the efficacy of affective as well as cognitive transactions between teachers and students.

Emphasis is being placed on achievement of learning objectives as a measure of teacher effectiveness. One potential factor of faculty evaluation is that it may promote the development of instructional specialists.

Student evaluation of the instructional process and the instructor constitutes a valuable source of

information.

Self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness is a prerequisite to the improvement of teaching performance.

Team evaluation requires many skills; without these skills, the evaluation procedures have little chance for success.

Not all objectives of instruction can be specifically stated, much less measured. Many experts caution against extremely rigid means of evaluating the teaching-learning process.

The changing modes of instruction as well as the variety of programs offered in community colleges necessitate the development of varied criteria and instruments for instructor evaluation. Category and rating instruments, when used together, yield an optimum measure of teacher effectiveness.

There are principles and conclusions based on research which should serve as guidelines in the development and improvement of evaluation procedures. But no approach to the evaluation of college teaching will work effectively unless evaluation is regarded basically as a means to improving instruction.

All three methods of evaluation (student, self, and team), depend upon the existence of maximum communication and conditions which stimulate collaboration and effect security. Commitment to the philosophy of the community college is essential.

Total accuracy and objectivity in the measurement
of college teaching is not possible and perhaps not
even desirable. Yet the community college may, with
its emphasis on good teaching and through its efforts
to evaluate instruction, make a major contribution to
the theory of instruction.

Chapter 3

THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

SYNOPSIS OF THE PROBLEMS

The emphasis placed on specific purposes of
evaluating instructors has an effect on the receptivity
of an instructor to classroom observation as well as on
his communication with administrators and other staff
members. The methods used evoke his confidence or lack
of confidence in the resulting evaluation. This study has
attempted to determine the purpose most emphasized and
the methods most commonly used in evaluating instructors
in community colleges in Western Canada.

An instructor who seeks an administrative
position or an improved position as an instructor, with
the accompanying rewards, is better able to direct his
efforts toward his particular goal if he is aware of the
criteria upon which his evaluators base their judgments
and recommendations. This study has attempted to
determine whether or not evaluators in community colleges
in Western Canada apply a common body of criteria when
evaluating instructors regarding (a) their competence as
teachers, and (b) their suitability to an administrative
position. By applying identical criteria to both

40

evaluative situations, one could determine whether there was a change in emphasis from one evaluative situation to another.

The emphasis placed upon each of Mitzel's three categories of process, product, and presage criteria could also be established. This study also attempted to identify any relationships which existed between the evaluative criteria used by evaluators and variables such as the age of the evaluator, his administrative position, length of experience in this position, the amount of time he is engaged in classroom teaching, his teaching experience, and academic qualifications. Finally, this study sought to determine whether evaluators used criteria in addition to those listed in the instrument and to analyze the nature of these additional criteria.

THE INSTRUMENT

Two instruments were used. The first, which is included in Appendix A, page 148, is a questionnaire which requested the following information from each of thirty community colleges in Western Canada:

1. The name of the college

2. The number of people involved in evaluating instructors in the college

3. The name of a staff member who would accept the responsibility for distributing the second instrument to and collecting the completed second instrument from

the evaluators in the college.

4. The primary reasons, in order of importance, for evaluating instructors in the college

5. The methods used in evaluating instructors in the college.

The second instrument, which is included in Appendix A, page 151, consists . of two sections: a Personal and Professional Data Questionnaire and an Instructor Evaluation Questionnaire. The former included nine variables:

1. Number of instructors whom the evaluator is responsible for evaluating

2. The evaluator's administrative position in the college

3. Length of experience in this administrative position or a comparable one

4. Age of the evaluator

5. Amount of time the evaluator is engaged in classroom teaching

6. If not teaching, the year during which the evaluator last did any classroom teaching

7. Years of teaching experience

8. Degrees and diplomas held and the year each was obtained

9. Date of the most recent course taken, name of the course, and institution where taken

The second section consisted of two parts:

1. A questionnaire for the evaluation of instructor competence

2. A questionnaire for evaluating for promotion to an administrative position.

Both of these questionnaires included the same thirty evaluative criteria, although the criteria were ordered differently. The criteria were identified as being ten each of Mitzel's three criteria of process, product, and presage. Space was provided for free comments and the listing of criteria used by evaluators but not included in the list of thirty criteria.

Response categories for the evaluative criteria sections were scored according to a scale which indicated whether evaluators used each criterion always (A), frequently (F), seldom (S), or never (N) when considering whether teachers were competent classroom teachers or were worthy of promotion to an administrative position. The criteria of evaluation used in the Instructor Evaluation Questionnaire are a modification of the criteria prepared by Moore (1966) and selected for inclusion on the instrument he used in his study, after a pilot study had been carried out to isolate ten in each of the categories suggested by Mitzel: that is, Product, Process, and Presage. See Appendix B for Moore's grouping of criteria according to Mitzel's categories.

COLLECTION OF DATA

The first instrument was sent to the chief
executive officer in each of thirty community colleges
in Western Canada. The names and addresses of these
colleges were extracted from the publication College
Canada, October, 1970. Twenty-nine colleges responded;
twenty-six colleges completed the questionnaire and two
of the remaining four sent printed information regarding
their evaluation procedures and criteria used in
evaluating instructors. Twenty out of twenty-six
colleges specified the exact number of staff members
involved in evaluating instructors. The return on the
second instrument was almost eighty-one per cent
(calculated for the above twenty colleges). This
represented 182 returns, while the total number of
returns was 250. Four of these were not useable,
leaving 246 returns to be analyzed.

Personal and Professional Data

Table 1 presents information concerning the
respondents. Nearly seventy per cent (68.7%) of the
evaluators held positions as department heads or program
heads (category 2), or divisions directors or division
chairmen (category 3). The categories were as follows:

1. Coordinator, supervisor, librarian,
instructor, or chief instructor

2. Department head or program head

3. Division director or division chairman

4. Assistant dean, associate dean, dean, registrar, assistant administrative officer, assistant principal, vice-principal, or principal.

Approximately twenty per cent (20.7%) of the evaluators were responsible for evaluating more than twenty-five instructors. Nearly ninety per cent (89.5%) of the evaluators had been in their present administrative positions (or comparable ones) for ten or fewer years. Approximately seventy per cent (69.5%) of the evaluators were between the ages of thirty and fifty. About twenty per cent (19.9%) were not engaged in any class-room teaching and of these (49), forty-four (17.9%) had taught within the last five years. Thirteen per cent had under five years of teaching experience. Approximately thirty per cent (29.3%) of the evaluators held one or more degrees in Education. The categories were as follows:

1. B. Ed.

2. M. Ed., Ed. D., PhD. in Education or comparable degrees in Education

3. B. Ed. plus another degree(s) not in Education

4. One or more degrees but none in Education

5. Diplomas, certificates, and other comparable credentials.

Nearly two-thirds (65.9%) of the evaluators had taken a course(s) in the last five years.

Table 1

Personal and Professional Data
(Frequencies by Percentages)
N=246

Variable	Categories				
Number of instructors evaluated	Under 10 43.9	10-25 30.5	26-50 14.6	51+ 6.1	
Evaluator's administrative position	1 18.7	2 45.1	3 23.6	4 11.8	
Length of experience in the administrative position (or a comparable one) in years	Under 5 59.8	5-10 29.7	11-15 4.5	16+ 5.3	
Age of evaluator	Under 30 6.1	30-40 35.4	41-50 34.1	51-60 22.0	61+ 2.4
Amount of time evaluator is engaged in classroom teaching	None 19.9	Under 25% 32.1	25-50% 28.0	51%+ 19.9	
The year evaluator last did any classroom teaching (if not teaching now)	1971-1967 17.9	1966-1962 3.3	1961- 0.4		
Evaluator's number of years of teaching experience	Under 5 13.0	5-10 45.9	11-15 17.5	16* 23.6	

Table 1 (continued)

Variable	Categories				
	1	2	3	4	5
Degrees and diplomas held by the evaluator	6.5	10.6	12.2	55.5	15.1
Date of most recent course taken by the evaluator	1972-1968 65.9	1967-1963 15.9	1962⁻ 4.5	No date given 13.8	

.47

Statistical Procedure

Purposes of evaluating instructors were categorized as follows:

1. Primarily for the improvement of instruction

2. As a basis for administrative decision making

3. Other purposes

The maximum number of reasons given by a single college for evaluating instructors was five. A frequency count, based on the three categories, was made and a weight of 5, 4, 3, 2, or 1 assigned to each, the weight corresponding conversely to the order of importance in which it was listed. A total weight was calculated for each category, enabling the determination of the emphasis placed on each category. A frequency count was made of the methods and techniques used in evaluating instructors.

Data analysis on the second instrument was performed using the IBM 360/67 computer and programs documented by the Division of Educational Research at The University of Alberta.

A frequency count was used to place criteria in rank order for both evaluative situations according to the percentage of respondents scoring A ("Always") or F ("Frequently"). This enabled the determination of whether or not evaluators applied a common body of criteria when evaluating instructors for (a) teaching

competence, and (b) administrative promotion.

The rank ordering of criteria used in evaluation for the two evaluative situations enabled comparisons to be made of the emphasis placed upon individual criteria employed in each of the two situations.

The Spearman rho correlation from ranks was calculated to determine whether or not any overall difference existed between the two different evaluative situations and the ranking of all thirty criteria as used in the two evaluative situations.

When the thirty criteria, ranked according to frequency, were classified according to Mitzel's categories of process, presage, and product, it was possible to compare the emphasis placed upon these categories of criteria.

A factor analysis was performed to determine whether criteria tended to cluster in Mitzel's categories of criteria; an absolute value of .40 was used as the lowest level of significance. For this purpose, the data were assumed to be interval scaling.

Chi square tests were used to ascertain whether significant differences existed according to specific categories of six personal and professional data variables. An alpha level of .05 was used as the confidence level to reject the null hypothesis that no significant differences existed.

Additional criteria used by principals were

ranked according to frequency of mention. An arbitrary weighted score was assigned to each criterion on the basis of an allotment of five points for each A ("Always"), three points for each F ("Frequently"), and one point for each S ("Seldom"). Further categorization was done according to a classification scheme devised by Barr (1948: 207-211).

Comments on the study made by respondents were classified under five headings:

1. General Reaction to the Instrument
2. Criticism of the Instrument
3. Methods of Evaluation Used
4. Selection of Administrators
5. Criteria
6. General comments

LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Limitations

This study was essentially a replication of Rogers' study. It was limited to the basic format of the instrument used in that study although a number of the criteria were modified for purposes of clarification. Different personal and professional data variables were used in this study but no attempt was made to adapt the criteria used in Rogers' study for use in community colleges.

No personal contact was made with the selected

colleges. Information regarding evaluation procedures was limited to printed material if it was available and/or short comments on the questionnaires.

Delimitations

The study was delimited to community colleges in Western Canada (British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba), and only those listed in College Canada, October, 1970.

Chapter 4

PURPOSES OF EVALUATING INSTRUCTORS AND

METHODS EMPLOYED

METHODS

One of the purposes of the study was to
determine the methods and techniques used in evaluating
instructors in community colleges.

Table 2 lists the methods used and the fre-
quency of use by twenty-eight community colleges in
Western Canada. The most frequently used method was
that of student evaluation (16). In nine of the six-
teen colleges, student evaluation of instructors is
obtained through the use of questionnaires or opinion-
naires. Three of the sixteen colleges indicated that
student evaluation was verbal and informal. The
remaining four colleges did not specify the manner in
which student evaluation of instructors was elicited.

The second major technique employed was that
of classroom observation (15). Ten of the fifteen
colleges specified the use of check lists or rating
forms for evaluating instructor performance in a
classroom situation.

The third major method used was team (coop-

Chapter 4

PURPOSES OF EVALUATING INSTRUCTORS AND

METHODS EMPLOYED

METHODS

One of the purposes of the study was to
determine the methods and techniques used in evaluating
instructors in community colleges.

Table 2 lists the methods used and the fre-
quency of use by twenty-eight community colleges in
Western Canada. The most frequently used method was
that of student evaluation (16). In nine of the six-
teen colleges, student evaluation of instructors is
obtained through the use of questionnaires or opinion-
naires. Three of the sixteen colleges indicated that
student evaluation was verbal and informal. The
remaining four colleges did not specify the manner in
which student evaluation of instructors was elicited.

The second major technique employed was that
of classroom observation (15). Ten of the fifteen
colleges specified the use of check lists or rating
forms for evaluating instructor performance in a
classroom situation.

The third major method used was team (coop-

Table 2

Methods and Techniques Used in Evaluating
Instructors in Community Colleges
N=28

Methods and Techniques	Frequency of Use
1. Student evaluation	16
2. Classroom observation	15
3. Team evaluation	14
4. Colleagial evaluation	6
5. Governmental rating forms	4
6. Self-evaluation	1
7. Informal evaluation of lesson and course material	1
8. General observation	1
9. Personal discussions	1
10. Informal subjective analysis	1
11. Course evaluation	1
12. Success of students	1
13. Contribution to college, community and conferences	1
14. Negative evaluation	1
15. Hearings	1

erative) evaluation (14). This would include evaluation of an instructor by a committee or evaluation by more than one evaluator. Self evaluation was listed by only one college; colleagial (peer) evaluation was listed by six colleges. Four colleges indicated the use of Provincial, Civil Service, or Public Service rating forms, although one of these colleges had adapted the Government rating rate for its own use.

One college listed the use of "negative evaluation"; that is, no evaluation is made unless a specific complaint about an instructor is received from students, administrators, or other staff members. Five colleges indicated that they were either currently reviewing or just developing their evaluation procedures.

Thirteen colleges returned printed material concerning the evaluation of instructors. Three of these thirteen included formal written guidelines for instructor evaluation in their colleges. All three specified that use of evaluation committees with policies closely related to those adopted by the National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges in the United States (1970). One of the three indicated that the criteria used for instructor evaluation had been determined by a committee consisting of administrators, faculty members, and students.

From the comments and the information returned with responses to the questionnaires, it was evident

that a number of colleges had interviews or conferences
with the instructor after he had been evaluated.
Several colleges requested the instructor to complete
part of his own profile form and in one case the instructor
was invited to include additional information concerning
his participation in community activities. The profile
form is filed in an administrative office and is
accessible at all times to the instructor.

The findings of this study might be compared
with a similar study carried out in the United States.
In a survey of current practices in the evaluation of
college teaching (Lee, 1967) in the United States,
classroom teaching was the highest ranked criterion in
all eight types of undergraduate colleges, for promotion,
salary, or tenure. But in community and junior colleges,
it was much more heavily weighted than any other factor.
When the sources of evaluative information were requested,
it was found that in community and junior colleges,
classroom visits ranked third. There are many factors
precluding the use of classroom visits as a source of
information to evaluate instructors but on the basis of
both studies it might be questioned why more community
colleges aren't using direct sources of information to
evaluate teaching since their integrity as institutions
of teaching and learning is at stake.

PURPOSES OF EVALUATING INSTRUCTORS

Of the many reasons why instructors are evaluated,
the emphasis placed on a specific purpose partially
determines the instructor's attitude toward evaluation.
The evaluative climate reflects this emphasis and if
evaluation is viewed by an instructor as a threat to
his security, little benefit will be derived by either
the instructor or the college.

This study attempted to determine the purposes
of evaluating instructors in community colleges as well
as the emphasis placed on a specific purpose. The
purposes were categorized as follows:

1. Primarily for the improvement of instruction

2. As a basis for administrative decision
making

3. Other reasons

In the first category were included items such as
assistance to instructors, achievement of objectives,
to increase instructional effectiveness, to share
innovative ideas, and so on. Such items as salary
increments, tenure, promotions, and the like were
included in the second category since they were viewed
primarily as aids to administrators.

The first instrument requested that the purposes
of evaluating instructors be listed in order of
decreasing importance. Weights were then arbitrarily
assigned as follows: the first purpose listed--5, the

second purpose listed--4, the third--3, the fourth--2.

and the fifth--1. Table 3 ranks the three categories

by total weight. The emphasis placed on improvement

of instruction was almost twice that placed on the

evaluation of instructors as a basis for administrative

decision making.

Table 3

Emphasis on Purposes of Evaluating
Instructors by Category

Category	Total Weight	Rank
Primarily for improving instruction	185	1
As a basis for administrative decision making	94	2
Other purposes	24	3

Table 4 lists all the purposes of evaluating

instructors and their respective weights. They have

been reproduced as originally written and in the same

order as they appeared on the returned questionnaires.

The purposes are listed by college to enable a comparison

of differences in emphasis. While the overall emphasis

of the twenty-six colleges is on improvement of

instruction, the emphasis varies from one college to

another.

Table 4

Purposes of Evaluating Instructors in Each
College by Category and Weight

College Number	Purposes of Evaluating Instructors in Decreasing Order of Importance	Category	Weight
1.	Quality control	2	5
	Salary Adjustment	2	4
2.	To evaluate ability to impart knowledge	1	5
	To assess if instructors are working toward terminal behavior	1	4
	To assess ability to plan and organize lessons and methods and techniques used	1	3
	To assist instructors where possible in improving their methods and techniques of presentation	1	2
	To assess whether instructors are meeting predetermined objectives	1	1
3.	To identify areas of individual weakness and strength as a basis for counselling and remedial action	1	5
	To mutually arrive at performance objectives	1	4
	As a basis for salary increments	2	3
4.	To ensure their teaching competence is adequate to meet the needs of the program	1	5
	To ensure their technical knowledge meets the standard for their trade or profession	1	4
5.	To ensure that each instructor be given the maximum opportunity and assistance to grow (develop) into an effective teacher	1	5

Table 4 (continued)

College Number	Purposes of Evaluating Instructors in Decreasing Order of Importance	Category	Weight
6.	To help instructor pinpoint weaknesses in methods	1	5
	To help instructor increase effectiveness of total course	1	4
	To get student evaluation of course value in a curriculum	1	3
	To evaluate instructor for promotional purposes	2	2
7.	For pay purposes--increases are based on performances	2	5
	For effectiveness of instruction--constructive criticism	1	4
	For efficiency of operation--overtime, the ineffective or instructor of limited range of talent can be eliminated	2	3
	To bring home the continuing concern for performance	1	2
8.	Assist instructors	1	5
	Permanent appointment and increments	2	4
9.	To improve the teaching function of the college	1	5
	Basis for permanent status	2	4
10.	For renewing annual appointments during probationary period	2	5
	For confirming tenure of staff	2	4
	In assessing promotional potential	2	3
11.	For the improvement of instruction	1	5
	For the evaluation of instructors to decide whether they should be promoted to a tenure situation, whether they should be retained as instructors, etc.	2	4

Table 4 (continued)

College Number	Purposes of Evaluating Instructors in Decreasing Order of Importance	Category	Weight
12.	Improving and developing instructional competence	1	5
	Sharing information--who is doing what innovations	1	4
	As evidence in granting tenure	2	3
	Protect students from malpractice	2	2
13.	Improve quality of instruction	1	5
	To identify and assist instructors who may be experiencing difficulty with classes and curriculum	1	4
	To provide information for the completion of an employee performance rating questionnaire as required annually by departmental regulations	2	3
	To provide information for recommending to the Department of Education that Teaching Certificates be granted	2	2
14.	Tenure	2	5
15.	To assess the effectiveness of the August in-service education program for modification where necessary	3	5
	To assess the individual instructor's ability to guide the students' learning toward the instructional objectives	1	4
	To offer help and advice to instructors on instructional design and performance	1	3
	To assist administration in tenure decisions	2	2

Table 4 (continued)

College Number	Purposes of Evaluating Instructors in Decreasing Order of Importance	Category	Weight
16.	To ensure proper standards of education are provided to enrolled students	1	5
	To assist instructors to meet standards required and to aid in any arising difficulty in classroom instruction	1	4
17.	Improvement of instruction	1	5
	Renewal of contracts	2	4
	Salary increments	2	3
18.	Teaching ability and success	1	5
	Community involvement	3	4
	Research	3	3
19.	Maintenance of high level instruction	1	5
	Provide to instructors formal opinion of his worth	3	4
	Provide college with evidence of proficiency of faculty	2	3
20.	Excellence of teaching	1	5
	Dedication to their own continued academic growth	3	4
	Concern for comprehensiveness of the educational offerings provided by a regional college	1	3

Table 4 (continued)

College Number	Purposes of Evaluating Instructors in Decreasing Order of Importance	Category	Weight
21.	To gauge the effectiveness of the instructor in the classroom and to attempt to measure the quality of instruction	1	5
	To seek out and recognize new and exciting approaches to teaching and to pass such ideas on to other instructors	1	4
	To assist instructor to recognize any weaknesses in his methodology etc. so that these may be rectified (by himself or with assistance from others	1	3
	To assist in determining continuation of instructor's appointment	2	2
22.	Contract renewal	2	5
	Complaints	3	4
	Promotion transfer appointment	2	3
23.	To improve instruction	1	5
	To assist instructor to have a rewarding experience	1	4
	To establish merit increments on Master Teacher designation	2	3
	To make decisions regarding retention of staff	2	2
24.	To assess the effectiveness of the instruction	1	5
	To share new teaching methods	1	4
	To assist the instructor in improving his effectiveness	1	3
	Tenure	2	2

Table 4 (continued)

College Number	Purposes of Evaluating Instructors in Decreasing Order of Importance	Category	Weight
25.	Attempt to measure the quality of instruction	1	5
	To identify innovative methods	1	4
	To aid the instructor in improving instruction	1	3
	Administrative decisions	2	2
26.	To gauge the effectiveness of instruction	1	5
	To seek effective instructional methods	1	4
	To assist the instructor in improving his methods	1	3
	Tenure	2	2

SUMMARY

A combination of methods and techniques for
evaluating instructors is used by most community
colleges in Western Canada. Student evaluation,
classroom observation, and team evaluation are the
most frequently used methods.

One college stated that the choice of methods
used in evaluating instructors is left up to each
department. Another college indicated that faculty
cooperation and open communication negated formal
evaluation of instructors by administrators. Several
colleges indicated that they were considering the
implementation of student evaluation of instructor
performance and/or courses and programs. Colleagial
evaluation and self-evaluation were not commonly used
by the colleges.

The purpose of evaluating instructors which was
most emphasized collectively by the colleges was that
of improving instruction. An analysis of Table 4 reveals
that seven of the twenty-six colleges do not consider
the improvement of instruction as the primary purpose
of evaluation. Since the purpose most emphasized will
depend to a large extent on the administrative level
involved, the findings could differ if different
sources of information were used.

Chapter 5

EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

One of the purposes of the study was to

determine whether or not evaluators employed a common

body of criteria, chosen from among the thirty listed

for scoring, when (a) evaluating instructors' competence

and when (b) evaluating instructors as being suitable

for an administrative position.

EVALUATIVE CRITERIA COMMONLY EMPLOYED BY EVALUATORS
OF INSTRUCTORS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES
IN WESTERN CANADA

Evaluation of Instructor Competence

For Instructor Evaluation Questionnaire One,

evaluators scored thirty criteria which they may or

may not consider when their purpose was to evaluate

instructor competence. Each of the thirty criteria

was scored on a four point scale, according to the

respondent's use of it when evaluating: always,

frequently, seldom, or never.

Table 5 ranks these criteria according to their

use, "always" or "frequently," by evaluators. Nineteen

of the thirty criteria were used "always" or "frequently"

by a majority of the respondents. Four were "always" or

"frequently" employed by more than ninety per cent of

Table 5

Frequency of Mention of Criteria Employed by Evaluators
in Evaluating Instructor Competence
N=246

Rank	Criteria	Percentage A[a]	F[b]	Response Total
1	The enthusiasm displayed by the instructor in teaching	67.4	30.2	97.6
2	The dependability of the instructor	68.7	28.4	97.1
3	Instructor-student relationships	52.7	42.9	95.6
4	The instructor's knowledge of the curriculum	63.9	29.5	93.4
5	Qualities of leadership displayed by the instructor	35.0	54.3	89.3
6	Lesson preparation and planning	65.4	23.6	89.0
7	The degree of cooperation by the instructor with other staff members	39.9	48.1	88.0
8	Concern with the all-round development of the students	48.4	38.6	87.0
9	The personality attributes of the instructor	39.4	46.3	85.7
10	Class management	36.3	48.3	84.6

[a]Always used   [b]Frequently used

Table 5 (continued)

Rank	Criteria	Percentage Response		
		Aa	Fb	Total
11	Student participation in lessons	34.6	49.2	83.8
12	Provision made for individual differences	27.9	50.0	77.9
13	The development of the process of individual inquiry in the students	22.5	50.0	72.5
14	The instructor's standing with the students	21.5	50.0	71.5
15	The methods of lesson presentation used	33.5	36.8	70.3
16	The use of teaching aids	22.0	47.7	69.7
17	The degree of self-evaluation of the general teaching methodology used	15.8	53.3	69.1
18	Academic qualifications of the instructor	23.7	42.0	65.7
19	The professional activities of the instructor	15.2	45.3	60.5
20	Examination results	13.6	34.6	48.2
21	Concern with character development of the students	10.8	37.3	48.1
22	The training of the students in self-expression	12.3	35.7	48.0
23	The students work well without supervision	7.8	37.9	45.7

Table 5 (continued)

Rank	Criteria	Percentage Response		
		A[a]	F[b]	Total
24	The dress and appearance of the instructor	15.5	28.2	43.7
25	Checking of written work	14.1	29.0	43.1
26	The students' clarification and recognition of values	8.4	33.2	41.6
27	Attitude of students toward self-conduct	5.4	31.5	36.9
28	The attitude of students to authority	9.0	23.8	32.8
29	The development in students of a sense of community responsibility	5.7	27.0	32.7
30	The instructor's standing in the community	2.5	10.5	13.0

the evaluators. The data support the conclusion that community college evaluators employed a common body of criteria when evaluating instructor competence. Rogers (1970) drew the same conclusion in his study but found that almost all (28) of the criteria were used "always" or "frequently" by a majority of the principals in Alberta secondary schools.

The criterion of The Enthusiasm Displayed by the Instructor in Teaching ranked first; it was used "always" or "frequently" by ninety-seven per cent of the respondents. Ranking second was the criterion of The Dependability of the Instructor (97.1%) and third was Instructor-Student Relationships (95.6%). It was concluded that evaluators conceived of a competent instructor as being one who was dependable, displayed enthusiasm in his teaching, and who maintained good relationships with his students. The fourth ranked criterion was The Instructor's Knowledge of the Curriculum (93.4%); the fifth was Qualities of Leadership Displayed by the Instructor (89.3%); the sixth and seventh were respectively Lesson Preparation and Planning (89.0%) and The Degree of Cooperation by the Instructor with Other Staff Members (88.0%).

Some evaluators stated in their comments that they would have preferred to weight the criteria rather than indicate usage, as a means of indicating the importance of each criterion in assessing instructor

competence. Some evaluators also felt that in different

situations different criteria would be used in differing

degrees.

When only the response category of "always used"

was considered, and then only at the fifty per cent

level of frequency or greater, it was found that five

criteria were isolated:

1. The dependability of the instructor (68.7%)

2. The enthusiasm displayed by the instructor

in teaching (67.4%)

3. Lesson preparation and planning (65.4%)

4. The instructor's knowledge of the

curriculum (63.9%)

5. Instructor-student relationships (52.7%)

It was concluded that there was some consistency

by respondents concerning common evaluative criteria

for rating instructor competence.

Evaluation for Promotion to an Administrative Position

In Instructor Evaluation Questionnaire Two,

evaluators scored the same thirty criteria in the same

way as the criteria in Instructor Evaluation Questionnaire

One, but the criteria were ordered differently in the

second questionnaire. In this case, the evaluative

situation was assessing an instructor's suitability to

an administrative position.

As before, the criteria were ranked according to

the frequency with which evaluators stated they "always"
or "frequently" used each particular criterion. The
results are shown in Table 6. Seven criteria were used
"always" or "frequently" by more than ninety per cent
of community college evaluators. Twenty-three of the
criteria were used for administrative promotion by the
majority of the respondents. This suggested that
evaluators employed a common body of criteria when
evaluating instructors for administrative promotion.

The criterion which ranked first was The Degree
of Cooperation by the Instructor with Other Staff
Members. The Dependability of the Instructor ranked
second; more than ninety-one per cent of the respondents
said they would "always" use this criterion. Ranking
third was the criterion of Qualities of Leadership
Displayed by the Instructor (99.0%).

The Personality Attributes of the Instructor
ranked fourth (97.0%) and Instructor-Student Relation-
ships fifth (92.1%). The sixth and seventh were
respectively The Enthusiasm Displayed by the Instructor
in Teaching (91.6%) and The Instructor's Knowledge of
the Curriculum (91.2%).

The five criteria which ranked the highest
according to their use "always" or "frequently" by
evaluators were all concerned with the instructor's
personal qualities which might suit him for a leader-
ship position, or with human relations skills.

Table 6

Frequency of Mention of Criteria Employed by Evaluators
in Evaluating Instructors for Promotion to
Administrative Positions
N=204

Rank	Criteria	Percentage Response		
		A[a]	F[b]	Total
1	The degree of cooperation by the instructor with other staff members	86.1	13.9	100.0
2	The dependability of the instructor	91.1	8.4	99.5
3	Qualities of leadership displayed by the instructor	88.7	10.3	99.0
4	The personality attributes of the instructor	73.4	23.6	97.0
5	Instructor-student relationships	53.9	38.2	92.1
6	The enthusiasm displayed by the instructor in teaching	54.0	37.6	91.6
7	The instructor's knowledge of the curriculum	56.9	34.3	91.2
8	Class management	52.7	36.9	89.6
9	Concern with the all-round development of the students	55.0	33.7	88.7

[a]Always used   [b]Frequently used

Table 6 (continued)

Rank	Criteria	Percentage		Response Total
		Aa	Fb	
10	The degree of self-evaluation of the general teaching methodology used	34.3	48.8	83.1
11	The professional activities of the instructor	39.4	42.9	82.3
12	The instructor's standing with the students	28.9	52.0	80.9
13	Academic qualifications of the instructor	36.9	43.8	80.7
14	Lesson preparation and planning	41.4	37.9	79.3
15	Provision made for individual differences	32.5	46.5	79.0
16	The development of the process of individual inquiry in the students	27.9	41.8	69.7
17	The dress and appearance of the instructor	22.5	47.1	69.6
18	Student participation in lessons	23.4	44.8	68.2
19	Concern with the character development of the students	25.4	38.8	64.2
20	The development in students of a sense of community responsibility	13.9	43.1	57.0
21	The methods of lesson presentation used	22.4	34.3	56.7

Table 6 (continued)

Rank	Criteria	Percentage Aa	Fb	Response Total
22	The attitude of students to authority	22.9	32.3	55.2
23	The instructor's standing in the community	19.8	33.7	53.5
24	The training of the students in self-expression	10.9	38.1	49.0
25	The students' clarification and recognition of values	12.3	36.4	48.7
26	The use of teaching aids	12.4	35.3	47.7
27	Attitude of students toward self-conduct	6.1	41.1	47.2
28	Checking of written work	17.9	28.6	46.5
29	The students work well without supervision	9.6	33.3	42.9
30	Examination results	9.0	32.8	41.8

CRITERIA USED INFREQUENTLY IN THE
TWO EVALUATIVE SITUATIONS

Evaluators commonly did not use certain criteria with a high frequency, just as they did employ a common body of criteria with consistency. This was true for both evaluative situations.

Evaluation of Instructor Competence

Table 7 presents the ranking of criteria which were used "seldom" or "never" when evaluators were assessing instructor competence.

The least used criterion was that of The Instructor's Standing in the Community. This criterion was used "seldom" or "never" by eighty-seven per cent of the respondents. The Development in Students of a Sense of Community Responsibility ranked second in most infrequent use, and The Attitude of Students to Authority was the next lowest ranked criterion. The fourth lowest ranked criterion was Attitude of Students Toward Self-Conduct; the next lowest ranked criterion was that of The Students' Clarification and Recognition of Values, which ranked twenty-sixth out of the thirty criteria.

Except for the least used criterion, some of the evaluators felt that the other four criteria were more relevant to the elementary and secondary school situation.

One of the respondents said that he found it

Table 7

Criteria Used Infrequently by Evaluators in
Evaluating Instructor Competence
(lowest ranked criteria)
N=246

| Rank | Criteria | Percentage | | Response |
		S^a	N^b	Total
30	The instructor's standing in the community	46.0	41.0	87.0
29	The development in students of a sense of community responsibility	49.2	18.0	67.2
28	The attitude of students to authority	44.7	22.4	67.1
27	Attitude of students toward self-conduct	43.2	19.9	63.1
26	The students' clarification and recognition of values	40.8	17.6	58.4

^{a}seldom used ^{b}Never used

difficult to score any of the thirty criteria in the "seldom" or "never" categories since they would all be considered but weighted differently. Eleven of the thirty evaluative criteria were found to be commonly used "seldom" or "never" by evaluators when evaluating instructor competence. As one respondent commented, it is very difficult to change a student's attitudes once he has reached the age required for post secondary education.

Evaluation for Promotion to an Administrative Position

The ranking of the criteria used least frequently by evaluators when assessing an instructor's suitability to an administrative position is presented in Table 8.

In this evaluative situation the least used criterion was that of Examination Results; the second lowest ranked criterion was The Students Work Well without Supervision and the third lowest was Checking of Written Work. Attitude of Students toward Self-Conduct and the Use of Teaching Aids were also infrequently used criteria. Rogers (1970) found both Examination Results and The Use of Teaching Aids among the three most infrequently used criteria for evaluating teacher competence. In view of the emphasis placed on the use of audio-visual media for instructing the disadvantaged student it may be that the latter criterion warrants greater use in the future.

Table 8

Criteria Used Infrequently by Evaluators in Evaluating Instructors
for Promotion to an Administrative Position
(lowest ranked criteria)
N=204

Rank	Criteria	Percentage Response		
		Sa[a]	N[b]	Total
30	Examination results	38.3	19.9	58.2
29	The students work well without supervision	43.4	13.6	57.0
28	Checking of written work	37.2	16.3	53.5
27	Attitude of students toward self-conduct	34.0	18.8	52.8
26	The use of teaching aids	39.8	12.4	52.2

[a]seldom used   [b]Never used

In both evaluative situations, the criterion of students' examination results occupies a low position in the hierarchy of criteria (twentieth for instructor competence and thirtieth for administrative promotion). This may be indicative of the current de-emphasis on marks or it may reflect a lack of concern regarding the high drop-out rate in community colleges.

Evaluators employ a common body of criteria, chosen from among the thirty listed for scoring, when evaluating instructor competence and when evaluating for administrative promotion. However, different criteria were differently stressed in the two situations.

COMPARISONS OF EVALUATORS' EMPHASES PLACED ON CRITERIA OF EVALUATION EMPLOYED IN EACH EVALUATIVE SITUATION

If the reward for good teaching is promotion to an administrative position, the implication is that good teachers make good administrators. There are many who would question such a statement.

One purpose of the study was to determine whether evaluators of community college instructors use the same criteria of evaluation when evaluating instructors as to (a) their teaching competence and (b) their suitability to an administrative position. If evaluators think that competent instructors can and/or will become competent administrators, they will place approximately the same emphasis upon (a) individual criteria, and (b) categories of criteria.

Emphasis Placed Upon
Individual Criteria

Table 9 presents the rank order of the evaluative

criteria employed in each of the two evaluative

situations and also the degree of difference of stress

placed on individual criteria. A different emphasis

was placed upon many criteria as the evaluative situation

changed. The highest ranked criterion for instructor

competence--The Enthusiasm Displayed by the Instructor

in Teaching--ranked sixth for administrative promotion.

The Dependability of the Instructor ranked second in

both evaluative situations. The first and third ranked

criteria for administrative promotion, namely The Degree

of Cooperation by the Instructor with Other Staff

Members and The Qualities of Leadership Displayed by the

Instructor, ranked seventh and fifth respectively for

the evaluation of instructor competence.

The greatest difference in emphasis involved

the criteria of The Use of Teaching Aids and Examination

Results (by rank) and The Instructor's Standing in the

Community and The Dress and Appearance of the Instructor

(by percentage).

Of the five highest ranked criteria for evaluating

competence, three were included in the first five listed

for administrative promotion.

Spearman Rho Calculation

The Spearman rho was calculated, and was found to

Table 9

Rank Order of Criteria of Evaluation Employed in Each
Evaluative Situation (As Per Tables 5 and 6)

Criteria	Instructor Competence %	Instructor Competence Rank	Administrative Promotion %	Administrative Promotion Rank	Difference in Ranks
The enthusiasm displayed by the instructor in teaching	97.6	1	91.6	6	5
The dependability of the instructor	97.1	2	99.5	2	0
Instructor-student relationships	95.6	3	92.1	5	2
The instructor's knowledge of the curriculum	93.4	4	91.2	7	3
Qualities of leadership displayed by the instructor	89.3	5	99.0	3	2
Lesson preparation and planning	89.0	6	79.3	14	8
The degree of cooperation by the instructor with other staff members	88.0	7	100.0	1	6
Concern with all-round development of the students	87.0	8	88.7	9	1
The personality attributes of the instructor	85.7	9	97.0	4	5

Table 9 (continued)

Criteria	Instructor Competence %	Rank	Administrative Promotion %	Rank	Difference in Ranks
Class management	84.6	10	89.6	8	2
Student participation in lessons	83.8	11	68.2	18	7
Provision made for individual differences	77.9	12	79.0	15	3
The development of the process of individual inquiry in the students	72.5	13	69.7	16	3
The instructor's standing with the students	71.5	14	80.9	12	2
The methods of lesson presentation used	70.3	15	56.7	21	6
The use of teaching aids	69.7	16	47.7	26	10
The degree of self-evaluation of the general teaching methodology used	69.1	17	83.1	10	7
Academic qualifications of the instructor	65.7	18	80.7	13	5
The professional activities of the instructor	60.5	19	82.3	11	8
Examination results	48.2	20	41.8	30	10

Table 9 (continued)

Criteria	Instructor Competence %	Rank	Administrative Promotion %	Rank	Difference in Ranks
Concern with character development of the students	48.1	21	64.2	19	2
The training of the students in self-expression	48.0	22	49.0	24	2
The students work well without supervision	45.7	23	42.9	29	6
The dress and appearance of the instructor	43.7	24	69.6	17	7
Checking of the written work	43.1	25	46.5	28	3
The students' clarification and recognition of values	41.6	26	48.7	25	1
Attitude of students toward self-conduct	36.9	27	47.2	27	0
The attitude of students to authority	32.8	28	55.2	22	6
The development in students of a sense of community responsibility	32.7	29	57.0	20	9
The instructor's standing in the community	13.0	30	53.5	23	7

be .90. This value suggests that there is a strong positive correlation between the use of all criteria independent of the evaluative situation; that is, the criteria which evaluators considered to be important in one situation tend to be stressed in the other situation and, conversely, those used less often in one situation tend to be of less importance in the second situation.

Emphasis Placed upon Categories of Criteria

An analysis of the emphasis which evaluators placed upon each of Mitzel's categories of process, product, and presage criteria when evaluating instructor competence is presented in Table 10. This table was derived from Table 5 (p. 66) and is dependent upon the categorization of criteria presented in Appendix B.

Analysis of Table 10 shows that evaluators placed the heaviest emphasis on process criteria and the least emphasis on product criteria when evaluating instructor competence. This finding coincides with that of Moore (1966), Thomas (1969), and Rogers (1970) who found that both inspectors and principals emphasized process criteria and de-emphasized product criteria in the same situation.

Table 11 analyzes the emphasis placed upon the three different categories of criteria when evaluating for promotion to an administrative position. This table

Table 10

Rank Order of Criteria of Evaluation Employed for Instructor Competence
Grouped According to Mitzel's Categories

Category	Rank as Per Table 5
Product	8, 20, 23, 13, 21, 29, 27, 26, 22, 28
Process	6, 11, 3, 10, 1, 25, 15, 16, 12, 17
Presage	9, 24, 18, 4, 19, 7, 2, 5, 30, 14

refers to Table 6 (p. 72) and to the grouping of criteria presented in Appendix B.

Evaluators placed the most emphasis on presage criteria and the least emphasis on product criteria when evaluating for administrative promotion. This finding again agrees with the findings of Moore, Thomas, and Rogers.

It was concluded that process criteria were stressed for evaluation of instructor competence, but that presage criteria were considered to be most important in the evaluation of instructors for administrative promotion.

Results of Factor Analysis

A factor analysis of the data was carried out to determine whether there was any clustering of criteria into groups. When an absolute value of .40 was used as the lower limit of significance, it was possible to identify at least six out of ten criteria for instructor competence, in each of three categories (product, process, and presage). The results are listed in Appendix C.

Factor analysis of the data resulted in no distinctive clustering of the criteria for administrative promotion (see Appendix C). When a four factor analysis was made of the sixty criteria, the thirty criteria for administrative promotion all clustered in one group and the thirty criteria for instructor competence again

separated into three distinct categories which could be identified as Mitzel's categories of product, process, and presage.

Moore suggested that his thirty criteria were evenly distributed over Mitzel's categories of process, product, and presage criteria. Both Thomas (1969) and Rogers (1970) performed a factor analysis of their data and found that there was some clustering of the thirty criteria into three groups.

The results of the factor analysis in this study strongly suggest that the three clusters of criteria used, may be validly considered to meet Mitzel's characteristics of process, product, and presage categories when used for assessing instructor competence.

Chapter 6

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CERTAIN EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

AND CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

One of the purposes of the study was to determine
whether any significant relationships existed between
specific criteria used by evaluators and six personal
and professional variables. The six variables were as
follows: the evaluator's administrative position in
the college; length of experience in this administrative
position or a comparable one; the amount of time the
evaluator is engaged in classroom teaching; the length
of the evaluator's teaching experience; the age of the
evaluator; and degrees and diplomas held by the evaluator
(see Appendix A).

The original response categories of the six
variables were retained. A chi square test was performed
to determine differences, which were accepted as being
significant at the .05 level or less. Significant
differences were found in thirty instances.

Administrative Position

Table 12 shows that significant differences
existed between the categories when responding to
three criteria in each of the two evaluative situations.

Table 12

Significant Differences in Responses to Criteria of Evaluation of Respondents in Different Administrative Positions (.05 Level of Significance)

Criteria	Instructor Competence			Administrative Promotion		
	Chi Square	df	Prob-ability	Chi Square	df	Prob-ability
The dress and appearance of the instructor	40.355	12	.00006	*	-	-
The training of the students in self-expression	24.907	12	.01527	*	-	-
The instructor's standing with the students	36.399	12	.00028	*	-	-
The instructor's knowledge of the curriculum	*	-	-	22.488	12	.03240
The degree of cooperation by the instructor with other staff members	*	-	-	11.119	4	.02525
The professional activities of the instructor	*	-	-	28.740	12	.00430

*No significant difference

The administrative categories were as follows:

    1. Coordinator, supervisor, librarian, instructor, or chief instructor

    2. Department head or program head

    3. Division director or division chairman

    4. Assistant dean, associate dean, dean, registrar, assistant administrative officer, assistant principal, vice-principal, or principal.

In evaluating instructor competence, department heads or program heads indicated the use of The Dress and Appearance of the Instructor as a criterion "always" or "frequently," more than any other category; division directors or chairmen indicated less use of the criterion of The Training of the Students in Self-expression than any other category; categories three and four used the criterion of The Instructor's Standing with the Students more than the other categories.

When evaluating instructors for promotion to an administrative position, categories two and three used the criterion of The Instructor's Knowledge of the Curriculum more than the other categories; all categories indicated extensive use of the criterion of The Degree of Cooperation by the Instructor with other Staff Members but categories three and four tended to use this criterion "always," more than the other categories; division directors or chairmen tended to use the criterion of The Professional Activities of the

Instructor more than any other category.

Length of Experience in this Administrative Position (Table 13)

It was inferred from the data that for evaluating instructor competence, category one (less than five years of experience) used the criterion of The Dress and Appearance of the Instructor least; evaluators with eleven to fifteen years of experience in the same administrative position tended to use the criterion of The Attitude of Students toward Self-Conduct and the criterion of The Students' Clarification and Recognition of Values far more than the other categories.

For administrative promotion, evaluators in categories three and four tended to use the criterion of Examination Results and the criterion of Lesson Preparation and Planning more than evaluators with ten or fewer years of experience, who felt that these criteria were considerably less important; evaluators with less than five years of experience in the same administrative position used the criterion of The Use of Teaching Aids less than any other category.

Age of the Evaluator (Table 14)

When evaluating instructor competence, evaluators over fifty years of age indicated the use of the criterion of The Dress and Appearance of the Instructor more than younger evaluators.

For administrative promotion, evaluators under

Table 13

Significant Differences in Responses to Criteria of Evaluation of Respondents According to their Length of Experience in the Administrative Position (.05 Level of Significance)

Criteria	Inspector Competence			Administrative Promotion		
	Chi Square	df	Prob-ability	Chi Square	df	Prob-ability
The dress and appearance of the instructor	31.048	12	.00194	*	–	–
Attitude of students toward self-conduct	22.283	12	.03447	*	–	–
The students' clarification and recognition of values	21.159	12	.04811	*	–	–
Examination results	*	–	–	21.380	12	.04509
The use of teaching aids	*	–	–	28.208	9	.00088
Lesson preparation and planning	*	–	–	29.929	9	.0005

*No significant difference

Table 14

Significant Differences in Responses to Criteria of Evaluation of Respondents in Different Age Groups (.05 Level of Significance)

Criteria	Teacher Competence			Administrative Promotion		
	Chi Square	df	Prob- ability	Chi Square	df	Prob- ability
The dress and appearance of the instructor	27.412	12	.00674	27.239	12	.00714
The use of teaching aids	*	—	—	26.761	12	.00836
Academic qualifications	*	—	—	26.064	12	.01051

*No significant difference

thirty years of age used the criterion of The Dress

and Appearance of the Instructor and the criterion of

Use of Teaching Aids considerably less than older

evaluators; the criterion of Academic Qualifications

was used least by evaluators between the ages of

fifty-one and sixty.

Time Spent in Classroom
Teaching (Table 15)

No significant differences were found between

the amount of time spent in teaching and the use of

the thirty criteria when evaluating instructor com-

petence.

When evaluating instructors for promotion to an

administrative position, evaluators who are not engaged

in classroom teaching used the criterion of The Instruc-

tor's Knowledge of the Curriculum less than any other

category; the criterion of Provision made for Individual

Differences was used least by evaluators who spend less

than twenty-five per cent of their time in classroom

teaching; the criterion of The Instructor's Standing in

the Community was used most by evaluators who are not

engaged in classroom teaching.

Length of Teaching
Experience (Table 16)

No significant differences were found between

the categories and their use of criteria for evaluating

instructor competence.

Table 15

Significant Differences in Responses to Criteria of Evaluation of
Respondents According to the Amount of Time Evaluators
Were Engaged in Teaching (.05 Level of Significance)

Criteria	Teacher Competence			Administrative Promotion		
	Chi Square	df	Prob-ability	Chi Square	df	Prob-ability
The instructor's knowledge of the curriculum	*	–	–	16.754	9	.05000
The instructor's standing in the community	*	–	–	19.940	9	.01828
Provision made for individual differences	*	–	–	24.240	9	.00394

*No significant difference

Table 16

Significant Differences in Responses to Criteria of Evaluation of
Respondents According to the Length of the Evaluator's
Teaching Experience (.05 Level of Significance)

Criteria	Teacher Competence			Administrative Promotion		
	Chi Square	df	Prob- ability	Chi Square	df	Prob- ability
Classroom management	*	—	—	22.914	9	.00639
The degree of cooperation by the instructor with other staff members	*	—	—	7.934	3	.04739

*No significant difference

For administrative promotion, the criterion of
Class Management was used extensively by all categories
but less by evaluators with less than five years of
teaching experience; all categories used the criterion
of The Degree of Cooperation by the Instructor with
other Staff Members either "always" or "frequently"
but evaluators with five to ten years of teaching
experience tended to use this criterion "always" more
than evaluators with fewer or greater years of teaching
experience.

Degrees and Diplomas held by Evaluators (Table 17)

This variable accounted for more significant
differences (nine) than any other variable. Seven of
these differences were inferred from the use of criteria
for evaluating instructor competence. The categories
were as follows:

1. B. Ed.

2. M Ed., Ed. D., PhD. in Education or comparable
degrees in education

3. B. Ed. plus another degree(s) not in
Education

4. One or more degrees but none in Education

5. Diplomas, certificates, and other comparable
credentials.

When evaluating instructor competence, the
criteria of The Dress and Appearance of the Instructor,

Table 17

Significant Differences in Responses to Criteria of Evaluation of
Respondents According to the Degrees and Diplomas held
by Evaluators (.05 Level of Significance)

Criteria	Teacher Competence			Administrative Promotion		
	Chi Square	df	Prob-ability	Chi Square	df	Prob-ability
The dress and appearance of the instructor	28.840	12	.00416	*	-	-
Class management	27.668	12	.00618	*	-	-
Concern with character development of the students	26.345	12	.00959	*	-	-
Checking of written work	22.021	12	.03729	*	-	-
The use of teaching aids	25.332	12	.01332	*	-	-
Qualities of leadership displayed by the instructor	27.281	12	.00704	*	-	-
The attitude of students to authority	30.088	12	.00271	*	-	-
Examination results	*	-	-	22.847	12	.02905

*No significant difference

Table 17 (continued)

Criteria	Teacher Competence			Administrative Promotion		
	Chi Square	df	Prob- ability	Chi Square	df	Prob- ability
The use of teaching aids	*	-	-	41.484	12	.00004

The Checking of Written Work, and The Attitude of Students

to Authority were used much more by evaluators in the

fifth category than in the other categories; the

evaluators in category two used the criteria of Class

Management, Concern with Character Development of the

Students, and Qualities of Leadership Displayed by the

Instructor much less than evaluators in the other

categories; the criterion of The Use of Teaching Aids

was used more by evaluators in category one and category

five than by evaluators in the other categories.

For Administrative promotion, the criteria of

Examination Results and The Use of Teaching Aids were

used more by evaluators in category five than by evaluators

in the other categories.

Summary

Two-thirds of the significant relationships

found, existed between the use of certain criteria

and the following variables: administrative position

of the evaluator, years of experience in this position

or a comparable one, and degrees and diplomas held by

the evaluator. While this last variable accounted

for nine of the significant differences found, a

further analysis would be needed to determine whether

the differences are attributable to the degrees and

diplomas held by the evaluator or to the adminis-

trative position of the evaluator in the college.

In previous studies carried out by Thomas (1966)

and Rogers (1970) fewer significant differences were found between the use of certain criteria and the personal and school data variables. In their studies the only administrative position involved was that of a principal of a secondary school In this study, where evaluators held positions at varying administrative levels, the use of certain criteria would be determined to some extent by the proximity of the position to the level of instructor and by the use or non-use of classroom observation of teaching performance as a method of evaluation.

Chapter 7

ANALYSIS OF ADDITIONAL CRITERIA USED BY

RESPONDENTS WHEN EVALUATING IN

BOTH EVALUATIVE SITUATIONS

Introduction

Space was provided on the instrument (see

Appendix A) for respondents to list criteria which they

would use when evaluating instructors, but which were

not included in the list of thirty criteria to be scored.

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they would

use each of these additional criteria "always" (A),

"frequently" (F), or "seldom" (S).

Forty-four per cent of the respondents listed

additional criteria for the evaluation of instructor

competence. Thirty-eight per cent listed additional

criteria which they would use when evaluating instructors

for administrative promotion. It was concluded that

evaluators in community colleges use many criteria in

addition to those included in the instrument for both

evaluative situations.

Techniques Used in the Analysis

Two techniques were used in both evaluative

situations to analyze the additional criteria. The

criteria were arbitrarily weighted according to use as

follows:

1. "always" -- 5 points

2. "frequently" -- 3 points

3. "seldom" -- 1 point.

They were then categorized on the basis of a classi-

fication scheme devised by Barr (1948) in his analysis

of studies related to the measurement and prediction

of teaching efficiency. Barr's (1948) classification

scheme involves breaking down characteristics of

teaching efficiency and its prerequisites into five

different categories: personal qualities, expected

competencies of the teacher, desired student outcomes

(or effects of teacher leadership), behavior controls

such as knowledges, skills, interests, attitudes, and

ideals, and a collection of background personal data.

Additional Criteria Used in Evaluating
Instructor Competence

A listing of additional criteria used by

respondents for evaluating instructor competence may

be found in Appendix D. They are listed in the same

order as they appear in Table 18 to facilitate con-

venient reference to categories of criteria.

Table 18 lists the criteria by number and

weight (in parentheses) according to Barr's categories.

Weighted scores for each criterion and for each category

of criteria are included. It was found that the category

Table 18

Categories of Additional Criteria Used by
Evaluators in Community Colleges When
Evaluating Instructor Competence

Category*	Gross Weighted Score
1. PERSONAL QUALITIES	
1. Drive 9(3), 23(5), 36(5), 38(5), 41(5), 42(5), 45(5), 47(5), 50(3), 67(5), 71(5), 99(5), 149(5), 205(5), 226(5), 249(5)	76
2. Resourcefulness 3(3), 4(3), 5(3), 21(5), 24(5), 35(5), 44(5),48(5), 61(5), 62(5), 93(3), 144(5), 202(5), 211(5), 240(5), 245(3), 246(3)	73
3. Cooperativeness 19(3), 26(3), 31(5), 90(3), 103(5), 115(5), 136(3), 147(5), 157(5), 158(5), 182(1), 188(5), 216(5), 255(5), 263(3)	61
4. Reliability 63(5), 70(5), 97(5), 101(5), 107(5), 131(5), 203(5), 239(5), 260(5)	45
5. Buoyancy 52(3), 152(5), 155(5), 207(5), 218(5)	23
6. Personality (general) 40(3), 134(3), 153(5), 229(3)	14
7. Dominance 6(5), 68(3), 106(5)	13
8. Considerateness 30(5), 171(5)	10
9. Intelligence 168(5)	5
10. Emotional Stability 18(5)	5
11. Attractiveness 172(5)	5
12. Refinement 175(5)	5

*According to Barr (1948). (The numbers represent the criteria listed in Appendix D, with the weighted score shown in brackets.)

Table 18 (continued)

Category	Gross Weighted Score
13. Objectivity 125(3)	3
	338

II. COMPETENCIES (abilities to do)

1. As a director of learning 1(3), 7(5),
8(5), 10(5), 13(5), 14(5), 15(5), 16(3),
17(5), 33(5), 51(3), 53(3), 66(5), 72(3),
76(3), 77(5), 80(5), 85(5), 86(5), 87(5),
91(5), 94(3), 96(5), 104(5), 105(5),
108(5), 109(5), 110(5), 111(5), 112(5),
120(5), 122(5), 137(5), 141(3), 154(3),
159(5), 165(5), 166(5), 179(3), 180(5),
181(5), 183(5), 184(5), 189(5), 192(5),
198(5), 204(5), 206(5), 208(5), 209(5),
212(3), 214(3), 220(5), 221(5), 223(3),
225(5), 231(3), 232(5), 242(3), 244(3),
257(3), 259(5)   276

2. As a member of a profession 25(5), 78(5),
81(5), 121(5), 151(5), 210(5), 237(5),
245(5)   40
          316

III. EFFECTS OF INSTRUCTOR LEADERSHIP (results)
11(3), 32(5), 46(5), 114(5), 118(5),
119(5), 140(5), 161(5), 163(5), 190(3),
194(5), 199(5), 261(3)   59
          59

IV. BEHAVIOR CONTROLS

1. Skill in communication (verbal and
written) 34(5), 49(3), 59(5), 60(5),
64(5), 69(5), 102(5), 113(5), 123(5),
164(5), 174(5), 177(5), 178(5), 219(5),
228(5), 258(5)   78

2. Professional attitudes 74(3), 79(1),
92(5), 95(3), 98(5), 139(3), 160(5),
169(5), 195(5), 201(5), 224(5), 230(3),
251(5), 253(5), 256(5)   63

Table 18 (continued)

Category	Gross Weighted Scores
3. Efforts toward self-improvement 28(5), 58(5), 65(5), 75(3), 83(3), 88(5), 162(3), 185(3), 213(5), 222(3), 234(5), 235(5), 238(5), 252(3)	58
4. Knowledge 20(5), 55(5), 127(5), 130(5), 142(5), 167(5), 197(5), 233(5), 243(3)	43
5. Skill in human relationships 2(3), 56(5), 82(3), 89(5), 133(3), 135(3), 200(5), 241(3)	30
6. Enthusiasm for instruction 170(5), 186(5), 215(5)	15
7. Work habits 143(5), 193(5), 236(5)	15
8. General skills 29(5), 39(3), 132(3), 146(5)	16
9. Interest in preparation of course outlines 12(5), 196(5)	10
10. Interest in students 150(5), 217(5)	10
11. Interests (general) 138(5), 187(5)	10
12. Extra-curricular activities 54(3), 84(3), 191(3)	9
13. Empathy with young people 124(5), 250(3)	8
14. Attitude toward change 37(5)	5
15. Performance under stress 57(5)	5
16. Health 126(3)	3
17. Citizenship 176(3)	3
18. Instructor requests 227(3)	3
19. Internal economics 264(1)	1

Table 18 (continued)

Category	Gross Weighted Scores
20. Administrative pressures 265(1)	1
	386

V. STATUS FACTS
    27(3), 43(5), 73(5), 117(5), 128(3), 145(5),
    148(5), 156(5), 173(5), 247(5), 248(5), 262(5)   56

56

of Behavior Controls weighted the highest. The category
of Personal Qualities weighted the second highest and
Competencies of the Instructor third highest. Much
less used categories were those of Effects of Instructor
Leadership and Status Facts.

In the category of Behavior Controls, the
criteria ranking highest were Skill in Communication,
Professional Attitudes, Efforts toward Self-Improvement,
Knowledge, and Skill in Human Relationships. In the
category of Personal Qualities, Drive, Resourcefulness,
Cooperativeness, and Reliability were considered the
most important qualities.

In the category of Competencies of the Instructor
were included the following items:

    A. Competencies as a director of learning

        1. Skill in identifying student needs

        2. Skill in setting and defining goals

        3. Skill in providing for individual
differences, in making activities meaningful, and in
organizing experiences into meaningful wholes

        4. Skill in instructor-student relationships

        5. Skill in appraising student growth and
achievement

        6. Skill in instruction (general)

    B. Competencies as a member of a profession.

Included in the category of Effects of Instructor
Leadership were student assessment, effectiveness of

teaching, specific accomplishments during the year, and records of student achievement. Included in the category of Status Facts were training, experience, and specific original accomplishments.

In their additional criteria for evaluating instructor competence, evaluators in community colleges placed great emphasis on personal qualities of the instructor, competencies of the instructor, and behavior controls. Little emphasis was placed on the results that he obtains and status facts about him.

Additional Criteria Used in Evaluating for Promotion to An Administrative Position

A list of the additional criteria used by evaluators when evaluating instructors for promotion to an administrative position may be found in Appendix D. Several respondents indicated in their comments that either there were no procedures for instructional staff obtaining administrative positions in the college or they were not involved in evaluating instructors for administrative positions; however, they still answered the questionnaire on administrative promotion on the basis of criteria they would use if they were in such an evaluative position.

Two hundred and twenty-four additional criteria were listed by respondents. Once again many of the criteria were repeated. The same techniques were used to analyze these additional criteria but Competencies

as Administrators was substituted for Competencies as
Instructors in Barr's (1948) classification scheme.

Table 19 lists the additional criteria by
number (see Appendix D) and weight (in parentheses)
according to Barr's classification. The main emphasis
was placed on Personal Qualities and Behavior Controls.
Competencies as Administrators ranked third in importance
with Effects of Instructor Leadership and Status Facts
receiving little emphasis.

Of the personal qualities, Reliability, Drive,
Resourcefulness, Intelligence, and Cooperativeness were
considered most important. In the category of Behavior
Controls, Professional Attitudes were accorded the
highest weight. Other criteria in this category con-
sidered to be of importance were Skill in Human
Relationships, Communication Skills, Efforts toward
Self-Improvement, Work Habits, and Performance under
Stress.

Competencies as Administrators included skill
in the following areas:

1. Organization
2. Planning
3. Supervision
4. Management
5. Delegating authority
6. Decision making
7. Administration

In their additional criteria for evaluating
instructors for administrative promotion, evaluators
in community colleges placed great emphasis on personal

Table 19

Categories of Additional Criteria Used by Evaluators
in Community Colleges When Evaluating for
Administrative Promotion

Category*	Gross Weighted Score
I. PERSONAL QUALITIES	
1. Reliability 10(5), 46(5), 53(5), 65(5), 68(5), 72(5), 78(5), 84(5), 121(5), 127(5), 149(5), 163(5), 172(5), 178(5), 197(3)	73
2. Drive 54(5), 59(5), 81(5), 89(5), 105(5), 106(5), 128(5), 159(5), 161(5), 168(5), 180(5), 193(5), 210(5), 220(5)	70
3. Resourcefulness 11(5), 12(3), 37(5), 39(5), 44(5), 67(5), 70(5), 122(5), 141(3), 146(5), 162(5), 164(5), 177(5), 214(3)	64
4. Intelligence 5(5), 20(5), 64(5), 73(3), 118(5), 144(5), 151(5), 190(5), 194(3), 203(5)	46
5. Cooperativeness 14(3), 17(5), 18(5), 31(3), 62(5), 80(5), 92(5), 137(5), 191(5), 201(3)	44
6. Personality (general) 63(5), 86(5), 157(5), 179(5), 182(5)	25
7. Considerateness 19(5), 49(5), 147(5), 195(3)	18
8. Buoyancy 152(5), 176(5), 181(5), 196(3)	18
9. Emotional stability 13(5), 115(5), 135(5)	15
10. Dominance 15(5), 16(5), 133(3)	13
11. Objectivity 116(3), 130(5)	8
12. Refinement 150(5)	5
13. Attractiveness 148(5)	5
	404

*According to Barr (1948). (The numbers represent
the criteria listed in Appendix D, with the weighted
score shown in brackets.)

Table 19 (continued)

Category	Gross Weighted Score
II. COMPETENCIES (abilities to do) 21(5), 22(5), 25(5), 27(5), 28(5), 32 (3), 35(5), 36 (5), 41(3), 56(5), 61(5), 66(5), 71(3), 76(5), 85 (5), 90 (5), 91 (5), 96(5), 100(5), 101 (5), 103(3), 107(5), 111(5), 112(5), 117(5), 123(5), 142(5), 143(5), 158(5), 165(3), 167(5), 184(5), 185(5), 187(5), 189(5), 200(5), 202(5), 206(5), 209(5), 216(5), 217(5), 219(5)	198
	198
III. EFFECTS OF INSTRUCTOR LEADERSHIP 3(5), 4(5), 9(5), 29(3), 58(5), 94(5), 166(5), 199(5)	38
	38
IV. BEHAVIOR CONTROLS	
1. Professional attitudes 1(3), 48(5), 60(3), 74(5), 75(5), 77(5), 83(5), 98(3), 102(5), 108(5), 109(3), 129(5), 132(5), 140(5), 156(5), 169(5), 174(5), 183(5), 186(5), 205(3), 223(5)	95
2. Skill in human relationships 7(5), 8(3), 42(5), 93(5), 126(5), 139(5), 154(5), 173(5), 175(5), 188(5), 211(5), 215(5), 221(5)	63
3. Skill in communication (verbal and written) 33(5), 47(5), 50(5), 52(3), 79(5), 110(3), 145(3), 170(5), 192(5), 198(5)	44
4. Efforts toward self-improvement and development of staff members 24(5), 26(5), 99(3), 208(3), 212(5), 213(5), 224(3)	29
5. Work habits 2(3), 43(5), 82(5), 114(5), 120(5), 138(5)	28
6. Performance under stress 38(5), 45(5), 51(5), 88(5), 104(3), 113(5)	28
7. Knowledge 40(3), 87(5), 124(5), 171(5)	18
8. Positive attitude 160(5), 204(5)	10

Table 19 (continued)

Category	Gross Weighted Score
9. Health 6(5)	5
10. Enjoys administrative work 155(5)	5
11. Political awareness 95(5)	5
12. Off-campus activities 57(1)	1
	331
V. STATUS FACTS 23(5), 30(3), 97(3), 119(5), 125(5), 131(5), 136(5), 207(5), 222(1)	37
	37

qualities and behavior controls, some emphasis on competencies as administrators, but very little importance was attached to the effects of instructor leadership or status facts.

Summary

Additional criteria used in both evaluative situations placed very little emphasis on the effects of instructor leadership or status facts. These findings add weight to earlier conclusions that product criteria are generally of low prioity.

The category of Competencies ranked third in importance in the additional criteria used for both evaluative situations. In evaluating instructor competence, Behavior Controls received the greatest weighting while in evaluating instructors for administrative promotion, Personal Qualities ranked first. Competencies as an Instructor was given considerably more emphasis than Competencies as an Administrator.

In both evaluative situations, respondents stressed the importance of the following additional criteria: drive, resourcefulness, reliability, cooperativeness, professional attitudes, skill in communication, skill in human relationships, and efforts toward self-improvement. These findings corroborate earlier conclusions that evaluators in community colleges do use a common body of criteria when evaluating instructors. The similarily between

criteria used in both evaluative situations is evident
from the analysis of the additional criteria as well
as from the analysis of the thirty criteria included
in the instrument. The main difference in the use of
additional criteria for the two situations was in the
category of competencies.

Many of the criteria included in the instrument
were reiterated in the additional criteria. All of the
additional criteria included in the category of Personal
qualities were analogous to the criterion of The
Personality Attributes of the Instructor. Many of the
additional criteria classified as Competencies (as a
director of learning) were identical to the criteria
of Provision Made for Individual Differences, The
Methods of Lesson Presentation Used, Lesson Preparation
and Planning, Instructor-Student relationships, and The
Enthusiasm displayed by the Instructor in Teaching. The
additional criteria classified as Professional Attitudes
and Efforts Toward Self-Improvement were similar to the
criterion of The Professional Activities of the Instructor.
It was concluded that the use of additional criteria by
respondents which were identical or similar to criteria
included in the instrument was indicative of the
importance they attached to these criteria when evaluating
instructors.

Chapter 8

EVALUATORS' COMMENTS ON THE STUDY

All respondents were invited to comment on
any aspect of personnel evaluation and/or the study.
Nearly thirty-eight per cent of the evaluators made
such comments. They varied in length from one sentence
to more than a page. Because of the large number of
comments (93), only a few have been included below;
they have been reproduced as originally written, although
in many cases only excerpts have been taken from
lengthy comments.

The comments were categorized under six basic
headings (see p. 50 and the following detailed listings).
The number of comments in each category are listed in
Table 20. Although many comments could be classified
in more than one heading, the categorization was based
on the predominant theme of the comment, with the
following exception. If the comment included any
criticism of the instrument or study, it was classified
under the heading, Criticism of the Instrument. Forty-
six out of ninety-three comments included some critical
statement, but in most cases these comments included
additional valuable information. The large number of
comments is indicative of the extent to which instructor

117

Table 20

Comments by Category and Frequency

Category	Frequency
1. General reaction to the instrument	8
2. Criticism of the instrument	46
3. Methods of evaluation used	9
4. Selection of administrators	4
5. Criteria	6
6. General comments	20

evaluation is perceived to be of vital concern to

community colleges.

General Reaction to the
Instrument

A comparison of the two lists of "30" seems to indicate that the architect of the questionnaires feels that the qualities that make a good instructor also make a good administrator.

The assumption seems to be that evaluation is an individual thing done by a supervisor. I feel that student and graduate evaluation of instructors should play a large part.

Evaluation of academic staff holding library positions involves evaluation of situations ranging from the formal classroom situation (e.g. orientation lectures) to the more frequent informal interaction with students at the individual instructional level as well as interaction with other faculty and staff. Therefore, the factors checked in the questionnaire have been interpreted as they relate to the library situation, and imply a broader definition of the competence of the individual as an educator than the classroom situation may embody.

Most of the factors listed are valid. Thus they should always be considered. In evaluation of the instructional performance, a supervisor must consider the whole person and the overall contribution. Many of the factors listed will be comsidered directly--others only indirectly. A much more difficult question is the weighting to be given to various valid factors.

Perhaps it would be advisable to differentiate between levels of administration in the second questionnaire.

Those points concerned with student self-discipline and character, etc., are important but not as relevant to the college situation as to high school. Many of these points are difficult to measure; in fact, the degree of measureability differs and the points listed are by no means of equal weight.

It has been quite enlightening to compare the responses in the two situations.

Criticism of the Instrument

Study 2 should have had some different questions.
A good instructor is not necessarily a good adminis-
trator and vice versa. To administer a college
requires more acumen when dealing with people than
an instructor has to possess. A good administrator
cannot simply be a good example because his instruc-
tors do not perform the same tasks. His qualities
are thorough understanding of human relations,
enthusiasm about his work, a good sense for
business transactions, the willingness to ask for
advice, weigh it, and finally make a decision which
is his own and which he defends without vacillating.

Based on questionnaires in section two, this is
academically oriented and does not take into
consideration one of the largest group areas in
a community college.

Many of the factors listed involve actual classroom
visitation. Since this is not the case at our
college, much of this form is inappropriate. In
addition, many of the questions refer to the same
things and are repetitious. Thus you may find a
general factor listed as "always," while some of
the factors which make it up may be marked "seldom"
or "never."

The different connotations possible in most questions,
the variety of programs being considered, and the
generality of most questions make it possible for
the researcher to arrive at any conclusions he
may desire.

Some of the questions are vague. For example, I'm
not as concerned about actual examination results
as what the instructor does about them.

Naturally I favor an objectives approach and some
desire to work toward individualized instruction.
A pedagogical background plus supervisory experience
are main concerns for administrative positions. We
have found a good administrator does not require
specific or detailed knowledge of curriculum unless
in foreman or first line supervision. I would have
used a much different questionnaire.

The attitude of students to authority is unclear.
It does seem to relate to the other questions. The
students have many instructors--one cannot be held
responsible for their entire attitudes.

There are many factors not included in the question-
naire which differentiate between administrative
competence and instructional competence.

You have allowed no space for business skills which
are usually most desirable in addition to a
thorough understanding of instructional principles.

The questionnaire seems to have been made up for
a pure academic without consideration for the
possibility that the instructor may have a wealth
of practical and business experience in his field.

Many questions seemed to apply to efforts of the
students which are not always within a teacher's
control in a college situation and/or which would
be difficult for an evaluator to gauge.

Seems to be directed more at secondary school than
post secondary.

This questionnaire does not even list the key
criteria used by me in selecting, evaluating, or
recommending my staff.

Methods of Evaluation

To evaluate staff validly, criteria must be laid
down and agreed to by supervisor and staff member.

Our faculty are evaluated on the basis of (1) student
evaluation--we consider the student opinion is
valid and reasonably honest, (2) peer group eval-
uation, and (3) attitude and participation.

Work loads do not permit enough time to be devoted
to analyzing the success of programs and instructor
competence. Possibly a team teaching approach
could be considered periodically with each team
member evaluating his counterpart in a series of
similar classroom and field situations. In field
oriented engineering subjects, evaluation of the
instructor's competence presents some problems.
This evaluation at the technical level is far more
important than analysis of classroom activities
and requires far more time.

The civil service is not evaluated in an unen-
cumbered manner as this survey would tend to
assume. We have to do our evaluation within a
rather strict set of rules which are not always
appropriate.

Evaluation of instructors should involve students
(through written evaluations and carefully con-
structed interviews), peer evaluation, and adminis-
trative evaluation (which is the least important).

Personnel should be evaluated in a positive manner
at least once a year. Evaluation should be
discussed freely before being formally submitted.

Formalized recorded evaluations are unnecessary--
largely a waste of time and are too detached from
the individual concerned. Evaluation is on-going
and can be tapped when required by the more personal
method of interview.

The evaluation of staff is completed in any one
day which may be an "off" day for the instructor
or the evaluator. This leads to biased reports.

At the moment we do not engage in classroom
visitations or in tight supervision or direct
assessment of faculty. The questionnaire assumes
that some form of direct supervision and assess-
ment takes place and is reminiscent of a high
school situation. Our instructors are given much
more freedom to innovate, develop courses, and
curricula. Assessment is dependent in part on
negative feedback from any quarter.

In our program, the clinical instructors are
situated in places remote from the institute.
They are, in most cases, the only members of the
Department of Education in the area and must work
independently. They are visited on a rather regular
basis for approximately a week at a time (about
3 to 4 times a year--oftener if necessary--problems
or new instructors).

Selection of Administrators

The selection of both teaching and administrative
personnel should be done by committees of adminis-
trators, faculty, and students (above second year
institutions).

A "good" teacher usually leads to a "good" adminis-
trative man.

This college has no procedure for a faculty member
to become an administrator.

The qualities which make a good administrator are
not necessarily the same as those which make a good

J

instructor. The result of this kind of evaluation
is to place your master teachers in administrative
positions and leave the lesser teachers in the
classrooms to do all the actual teaching.

Criteria

All evaluation should be based only on the stated
objectives and responsibilities which the employee
is expected to meet and the method which is to be
used in their achievement.

Too many people are rated according to how they
conform to an established system rather than on
the strength of their abilities and potential.

Evaluation of instructors depends on many things
and what may be right for one department may be
entirely wrong for another.

All that matters is the overall impact of all these
factors on the student; that is, are the students
enthusiastic about the class and are they learning
something.

The only difference in evaluation I would use between
instructor and administrative competence would be
in regard to organization, inter-personal relation-
ships, and innovative leadership.

The elements of evaluation must coincide with the
specific course objectives and the characteristics
of the student population.

General Comments

Department heads have neither the proper amount
of time available or the training required for
proper evaluation and assistance. They do have
knowledge and control of subject content and changes
and these tasks take up most of the non-instructional
time. This leaves little time for professional
development.

My responses in questionnaire two are based not
on experience but rather on a consideration of
those factors that I think I would stress if I
were placed in an administrative position.

Are you not interested in how I gain insight into
an instructor's teaching techniques, student
relationships, etc.?

I do not evaluate instructors for administrative promotion so I didn't complete the second questionnaire.

Our students seem very concerned with the credibility of what the instructor is teaching. If the instructor is able to relate the theory to actual practice which he has experienced, his theory is much more acceptable to the student.

Summary

The comments were an important contribution to the study. They were not restricted solely to criticisms or general reactions to the instrument. They revealed the many different instructional situations in community colleges, methods of evaluating instructors, the need for criteria relevant to individual evaluative situations, and a diversity of opinion regarding the whole area of instructor evaluation.

While there is no consensus of opinion on any aspect of instructor evaluation, it is apparent from the comments that community colleges in Western Canada consider the assessment of their faculty members to be a vital function. Regardless of the methods used, the purposes of evaluation, and the criteria on which evaluations of instructors are based, if a major concern of the community college is to create an evaluative climate conducive to faculty security and improvement in teaching performance, the potential for progress in evaluation will be greatly increased. An analysis of the comments and the written

information received revealed this concern in many

community colleges in Western Canada.

Chapter 9

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

SUMMARY

The basic purposes of the study were to
examine (1) the purposes of evaluating instructors
in community colleges in Western Canada, (2) the
methods used to evaluate these instructors, and
(3) the criteria of evaluation employed when evaluating
instructor competence and when evaluating instructors
for promotion to an administrative position.

Answers to the following questions concerning
the evaluation of instructors were sought: Is a
common body of criteria employed? Are the same criteria
used when evaluating for both instructor competence
and administrative promotion? Which of Mitzel's
categories of process, product and presage criteria
are stressed in each situation? Are there any relation-
ships between certain personal and professional variables
and the criteria employed? What methods and techniques
are used to evaluate instructors? What are the major
purposes of evaluating instructors?

Two instruments were used in the study. The
first one consisted of five items which requested

information regarding the methods used in evaluating

instructors, purposes of evaluating instructors, and

three items required for administering the second

instrument. The sample for the first instrument

consisted of twenty-six community colleges in Western

Canada.

The second instrument consisted of nine personal

and professional data variables and two thirty-item

questionnaires--one for evaluating in each of the two

evaluative situations--which were made up of thirty

criteria of instructor evaluation, ten in each of

Mitzel's categories of process, product, and presage.

The sample for this instrument consisted of two hundred

and forty-six evaluators of instructors in Western

Canada.

Statistical procedures included a frequency

count of the use made of different methods of evaluating

instructors: a categorization of the purposes of

evaluating instructors and a ranking of the categories;

a frequency count to place criteria in rank order for

both evaluative situations to determine if a common

body of criteria was used in either or both of the

situations; a factor analysis to see if criteria tended

to cluster in Mitzel's categories of process, product,

and presage criteria; chi square tests to isolate

significant differences between categories of six

personal and professional variables and evaluators'

uses of specific criteria; a classification of the
additional criteria used by evaluators according to a
scheme devised by Barr; and a classification of
respondents' comments on the study.

The different analyses of the data revealed the
following:

1. Community colleges use a variety of methods
and techniques for evaluating instructors, the most
commonly used being student evaluation, classroom
observation, and team evaluation

2. The major purpose of evaluating instructors
in community colleges was to improve instruction; this
included assistance to instructors in increasing their
effectiveness.

3. Evaluators employed a common body of evalua-
tive criteria for rating instructor competence and when
evaluating for administrative promotion

4. There were several criteria which evaluators
commonly did not use with high frequency in both
evaluative situations

5. Changes in emphasis on certain criteria
occurred as the evaluative situation changed; process
criteria were stressed when evaluating instructor
competence, and presage criteria were stressed when
rating for administrative promotion

6. Several significant relationships existed
between the personal and professional variables and

the use of certain criteria. The majority of these
were connected with differing administrative positions,
years of experience in the position, and the pro-
fessional training of the evaluator.

7. Evaluators listed additional criteria for
evaluating instructors, many of which were analogous
or identical to the criteria included in the instrument.
Once again it was found that a common body of criteria
was used in each of the evaluative situations.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions were based on the
findings of the study:

1. While the overall emphasis on purposes of
instructor evaluation is placed on the improvement
of instruction, there are a number of colleges in
which instructor evaluation is carried out mainly to
serve as a basis for administrative decision making.
An examination by each college of its primary purpose
in evaluating instructors might result in a change in
emphasis.

2. Direct sources of information for instructor
evaluation could be used more than is presently the case.

3. Since community college evaluators use a
common body of criteria with consistency when evaluating
instructors, the possibility exists that an evaluative
instrument could be constructed, made up largely of

those criteria listed in the instrument and those

additional criteria listed by the respondents which

were commonly used. Using these commonalities as a

basis, criteria relevant to the particular instructor

could be added to adapt the instrument to different

instructional situations.

4. Evaluation of administrators still receives

little attention in educational institutions. Both

instructors seeking administrative positions and

administrators seeking different or higher adminis-

trative posts could benefit from an awareness of criteria

upon which their performance is based. The findings of

this study could provide a basis for the construction

of such an instrument.

5. Evaluators conceived of a competent

instructor as being one who was dependable, displayed

enthusiasm in teaching, had a good knowledge of the

curriculum, and maintained good relationships with his

students. Based on the additional criteria, evaluators

conceived of a competent instructor as being one who

possessed considerable drive, was resourceful,

cooperative, and reliable. Their assessment of an

instructor was also based on his skill in communication,

professional attitudes, efforts toward self-improvement,

knowledge, skill in human relationships, and his

competencies as a director of learning. It would

appear that what students actually learn is given low

priority. It is suggested that product criteria are deserving of a greater emphasis in evaluation. With objectives approach to evaluation, a shift in emphasis away from the person of the instructor toward student outcomes is possible.

6. If an instructor displays qualities of leadership, cooperates well with other staff members, is dependable, and has a "good" personality, he is likely to be rated highly for suitability to an administrative position. On the basis of the additional criteria used, evaluators conceived of a good administrator as possessing the same personal qualities as a competent instructor but with the added quality of intelligence. Their assessment of instructors for administrative promotion was based upon the same behavioral controls as their assessment of instructor competence but with the added criteria of work habits and performance under stress.

7. The additional criteria and the criteria included in the instrument exhibited a high degree of similarity. The common useage of many additional criteria was indicative of the increased weight that was given to several criteria included in the instrument.

8. Generally speaking, the criteria which evaluators considered to be important in one situation tended to be stressed in the other situation. In both

evaluative situations, the product criteria were given low priority. This leads to the suggestion that either there are few valid instruments for measuring student gain as a result of instructor behavior, or the evaluators in general are not as concerned as they should be with student gains. In either case, the need for a change in emphasis is essential.

9. While it is true that in some cases evaluators who differed in the six personal and professional variables responded differently to different criteria (see Chapter 6), in most cases these variables had a limited effect on evaluators' responses to the evaluative criteria.

10. From the personal and professional data, it was apparent that the majority of community college evaluators are continually increasing their knowledge, experience, and academic qualifications. In addition to taking courses in their academic field, many evaluators have increased their expertise in teaching and broadened their knowledge through taking courses in instructional methodology, behavioral sciences and administration.

11. From the comments, it was concluded that evaluators in community colleges were vitally concerned about evaluative criteria and evaluation procedures. It would appear that with continued interest and efforts in the area of evaluation, community colleges

can contribute greatly to increasing the validity,
reliability, and relevance of evaluative instruments.
They may lead the way for institutions of higher
education in pursuing objective, realistic approaches
to evaluating the effectiveness of the instructional
process.

IMPLICATIONS

The following implications while related to
the evaluation of instructors are not based on the
findings of the study.

All educational institutions are being pressured
to evaluate their staff, programs and general operations.
The public is demanding that educational institutions
be held accountable for the expenditure of public funds.
Perhaps in no other institution of higher education is
more emphasis being placed on the evaluation of
instructor performance than in the community college.
It has been suggested that the community college offers
a second chance to many who have not been successful
in other educational programs and institutions. If
this is true, the onus on community colleges to ensure
the success of their students demands a concerted
effort on their part to provide the best possible
instruction. Inherent in instructional improvement
is the process of evaluation.

Many questions concerning the evaluation of

instructors in community colleges still remain unanswered.
Firstly, is it a professional responsibility? That is,
should faculty members evaluate each other and
cooperatively seek to improve their instructional
methods and techniques? A case could easily be made
for the control, by an organization of professional
educators, of its own membership. Since much experi-
mentation in instructional methods and learning strategies
is still required, would it be better to exclude adminis-
trators, particularly those involved in college policy
making and decision making, from evaluative situations
where the possibility of set-backs, failures, or
negative findings is ever present? Perhaps evaluation
of instruction, primarily for the purpose of improving
instruction, should be carried out by instructors and
their colleagues, while evaluation of instructors as
a basis for college decision making should be done
exclusively by administrators. Yet, it is difficult
for a department head to separate the formative
evaluation of instructors from his other administrative
duties.

Secondly, is there much to be gained by de-
emphasizing the person of the instructor himself and
instead concentrating on student outcomes, reaching
objectives, and/or contributing to the theory of
instruction? It has been suggested that perhaps we
should forget about evaluating teaching performance

and concentrate on other measures of faculty that may
have more value or significance (Cohen and Brawer, 1969).
It has also been suggested that until the capabilities
needed to carry out this function are acquired and
developed, an over commitment to either total evaluation
or no evaluation should be avoided and/or evaluation
activities slowed down (MacKay, 1971).

The methods used to evaluate instructors are
dependent upon many factors such as time, cost, practi-
cality, evaluator skills, differing educational and
instructional philosophies, and so on. Although it
may not be possible to establish a healthy evaluative
climate immediately throughout the college, much
progress may be made by those groups of faculty members
who are committed to excellence in teaching and are
already striving to improve procedures for evaluating
the instructional process. Some instructors may
always resist evaluation of their teaching performance,
but the majority of new instructors in community
colleges complain about the lack of guidance and of
criteria for improving classroom teaching (Lee, 1967).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER
RESEARCH AND STUDY

Experimental studies could be carried out to
assess the effectiveness of colleagial (peer) evaluation
and/or student evaluation of instructors, particularly
new or inexperienced instructors.

Student opinionnaires for rating instructors and programs could be developed cooperatively by student and faculty members. The use of "performance specimens" could be enlightening to instructors.

In view of the innovative instructional climate in many community colleges, studies could be conducted to assess student gains due to factors such as a new instructional method, a programmed module for learning, a behavioral objectives approach to learning, a developmental program for disadvantaged students, new software for audio-visual media, and so on.

Criteria for the evaluation of instructor competence based on research findings related to learning theories and theories of instruction need to be developed for use in institutions of higher education.

In addition to the development of common criteria applicable to all instructors, criteria relevant to different instructional situations and instructional specialists are urgently needed in community colleges, especially in those where instructional teams are in operation.

Studies could be carried out to assess the effectiveness of seminars, courses, workshops, and laboratory methods for increasing the evaluators' skills in assessing instructor competence.

Evaluative instruments are required to assess student gains in the affective domain of learning.

The effects of different methods of instruction
and multiple learning strategies could be researched
using design paradigms which control extraneous variance,
maximize systematic variance, and minimize error variance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

138

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, John E.
    1964 "The Auto-Critique Method of Instructional
          Evaluation." Improvement of Instruction.
          Proceedings of the Fourth Junior College
          Administrative Teams Institute, Pensacola,
          Florida. ER 013 634

Bannister, John et al
    1961 "Evaluating College Teaching." Curriculum
          Reporter Supplement, No. 1, December.
          ED 022 450

Barr, A.S.
    1948 "The Measurement and Prediction of Teaching
          Efficiency: A Summary of Investigations."
          Journal of Experimental Education, 16:207-211.

Boy, A.V., and G.J. Pine
    1963 "Needed for Teachers: A Role Description."
          The Clearing House, 38, September.

Boyer, Marcia
    1970 Teacher Evaluation: Toward Improving
          Instruction. American Association of Junior
          Colleges, Washington, D.C., California
          University. ED 035 408.

Bradley, Ruth et al.
    1967 Measuring Teacher Competence: Research
          Backgrounds and Current Practices. Burlingame:
          California Teachers Association. ED 141 152.

Broudy, H.S.
    1969 "Can We Define Good Teaching." Teacher
          College Record, 70:583-592.

Bruner, J.S.
    1967 Toward a Theory of Instruction. Cambridge:
          The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Byrne, T.C.
    1965 "Evaluation: Is Your Infallibility Showing?"
          Canadian Education and Research Digest,
          5:297-308.

Clarke, K.E. and R.J. Keller
      1954 "Student Ratings of College Teaching." A
            University Looks at its Programs. Eckert,
            R.E., R.J. Keller (eds.). Minneapolis:
            University of Minnesota Press.

Cohen, A.M., and Florence B. Brawer
      1969 Measuring Faculty Performance. Monograph No.4.
            American Association of Junior Colleges,
            Washington, D.C..

Cohen, A.M., and E.A. Quimby
      1970 "Trends in the Study of Junior Colleges."
            Junior College Research Review, September.

Cohen, A.M., and W.F. Sharol
      1970 "Coordinating Instruction Through Objectives."
            Junior College Journal, October.

Dressel, Paul L.
      1967 "Evaluation of Instruction." Journal of Farm
            Economics, 49, February.

Dressel, Paul L.
      1959 "The Current Status of Research on College and
            University Teaching." The Appraisal of Teaching
            in Large Universities. Ann Arbor: University
            of Michigan.

Dubin, R. and T.C. Taveggia
      1968 The Teacher-Learning Paradox: A Comparative
            Analysis of College Teaching Methods.
            University of Oregon Press.

Egnatoff, John G.
      1971 "A New Look at Evaluating Teacher Performance."
            Education Canada, December.

Fattu, N.A.
      1963 "Research on Teacher Evaluation." The National
            Elementary Principal, 43:19-27.

Fielstra, C.
      1963 "Discriminative and Predictive Values of Rating
            Given to UCLA Student Teachers on the Secon-
            dary School Level." California Journal of
            Educational Research, 14:11-18.

Flanders, N.A.
      1969 "Teacher Effectiveness." Encylopedia of Edu-
            cational Research. Fourth Edition. Robert L.
            Ebel (ed.). New York: The Macmillan Company.

Goldhammer, Robert
    1969 Clinical Supervision. New York: Holt,
          Reinhart and Winston Inc..

Israel, Jack W.
    1969 Innovation in Evaluation: Teacher Assessment
          by Objectives. Seminar Paper, University of
          California. ED 029 625.

Kelly, E. Lowell, and Donald W. Fiske
    1951 The Prediction of Performance in Clinical
          Psychology. University of Michigan.

Kinney, Lucien B.
          Developing Instruments to Direct Appraisal of
          Teacher Effectiveness. Mimeographed. Local
          Collection of the Clearinghouse.

Ladd, Dwight R.
    1970 Change in Educational Policy. Self-Studies in
          Selected Colleges and Universities. A General
          Report Prepared for the Carnegie Commission on
          Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lee, Calvin B.T.
    1967 "Will Evaluations of Teachers Be Welcome?
          Open-Door Classrooms For Open-Door Colleges."
          Junior College Journal, 37(5).

Lehmann, Irvin F.
    1961 "Evaluation of Instruction." Evaluation in
          Higher Education. Herold C. Hunt (ed.).
          Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

MacKay, D.A.
    1971 Clinical Supervision: The Principal's Role.
          Unpublished Leadership Course for School
          Principals, University of Alberta.

MacKay, D.A.
    1971 "Evaluation of Teaching: A New Look." The
          Canadian Administrator, X(4).

MacMillan, Thomas F.
    1971 Experimental Strategies for the Evaluation
          of Instruction. ED 053 715.

Mayhew, Lewis B.
    1967 "A Tissue Committee for Teachers." Improving
          College and University Teaching, 15, Winter.

McKeachie, Wilbert J.
    1970 Research on College Teaching: A Review. ERIC
          Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington,
          D.C.

Medley, D.M. and H.E. Mitzel
    1962 "A Tentative Framework for the Study of
          Effective Teacher Behavior." Journal of
          Experimental Education, 30(4).

Mitzel, H.E.
    1960 "Teacher Effectiveness: Criteria." Encyclo-
          pedia of Educational Research. Third Edition.
          Harris, Chester W., Marie R. Liba (eds.).
          New York: The Macmillan Company.

Moore, T.J.
    1966 An Identification and Analysis of the Criteria
          Employed in Teacher Evaluation. Unpublished
          Master's Thesis, University of Alberta,
          Edmonton.

Morin, Lloyd H.
    1968 A Feasible Scheme for the Evaluation of
          Instructors. Seminar Paper, University of
          California. ED 024 361.

Morsh, Joseph E. and Eleanor W. Wilder
    1954 Identifying the Effective Instructor: A
          Review of the Quantitative Studies, 1900-
          1952. ASAF Personnel Training Research
          Center.

Mueller, Dorothy G.
    1971 "How to Evaluate Teaching." The Journal of
          Teacher Education, 22(2).

Neagley, Ross L. and N. Dean Evans
    1964 Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruc-
          tion. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Olander, H.T., and H.M. Klagle
    1959 "Differences in Personal and Professional
          Characteristics of a Selected Group of
          Elementary Teachers with Contrasting Success
          Records." Educational Administration and
          Supervision, July.

Ornstein, Allan C.
    1970 Methods for Conducting Teacher Behavior
          Research: With Implications for Educating
          the Disadvantaged. Mimeographed.

Overturf, C.L.
    1966 Student Rating of Faculty at St. Johns River
          Junior College. Palalka, Florida. ED 013 066.

Phillips, Ray C.
    1968 Evaluation in Education. Merrill's Foundations
          of Education Series. Phillips, Ray C., Robert
          J. Stalcup (eds.).

Rayder, Nicholas F
    1968 College Student Ratings of Instructors. Office
          of Educational Series, Michigan State
          University. ED 021 527.

Remmers, H.H.
    1952 "Second Report of the Committee on Criteria
          of Teacher Effectiveness." Journal of
          Educational Research, 46:641-658.

Rogers, K.G.
    1970 An Empirical Study of the Criteria of Teacher
          Evaluation Employed by High School Principals
          in Alberta. Unpublished Master's Thesis,
          University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Rose, G.W.
    1963 "Performance Evaluation and Growth in Teaching."
          Phi Delta Kappan, 45:48-52.

Rosenshine, Barak
    1970 "Evaluation of Classroom Instruction." Review
          of Educational Research (AERA), 40:279-300.

Rowland, Ray
    1970 "Can Teaching Be Measured Objectively."
          Improving College and University Teaching,
          18:153-157.

Ryans, D.G.
    1960 "Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness."
          Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Third
          Edition. Harris, Chester W., Marie R. Liba
          (eds.). New York: The Macmillan Company.

Sawin, E.I.
    1969 Evaluation and the Work of the Teacher.
          Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.

Schein, Edgar H.
    1965 Organizational Psychology. Englewood Cliffs:
          Prentice-Hall.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J., and Robert J. Starratt
    1971 Emerging Patterns of Supervision; Human
           Perspectives. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Simpson, Ray H.
    1966 Teacher Self-Evaluation. The Psychological
           Foundation of Education Series. New York:
           The Macmillan Company.

Smalzried, N.T.. and H.H. Remmers
    1943 "A Factor Analysis of the Purdue Rating
           Scale for Instructors." Journal of Educational
           Psychology, 34:363-367.

Soar, Robert S.
    1966 Research in the Teaching Processes: Four
           Studies with the OScAR Technique. National
           Society of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Stufflebeam, Daniel L. et al.
    1971 Educational Evaluation and Decision Making.
           Itasca: F.E. Peacock Publishers Inc.

Taba, Hilda et al.
    1964 Thinking in Elementary School Children. USOE
           Cooperative Research Project No. 1574, San
           Francisco State College.

Thomas, E.B.
    1969 An Examination of the Criteria of Teacher
           Evaluation Employed by High School Principals
           in Victoria, Australia. Unpublished Master's
           Thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Trimble, B.S.
    1968 "Improvement of College Teaching." Improving
           College and University Teaching. Ohio State
           University Press, Summer.

Whitlock, Gerald H.
    1966 "Dimensions of Professional Competencies and
           Their Measurement." Research on Academic
           Input. Clarence H. Bagley (ed.). The
           Association for Institutional Research.

Woodruff, Asahel D., and Janyce L. Taylor
    1968 A Teaching Behavior Code. Monograph VI.
           Baltimore, Md.: Multi-State Teacher Project.

1970 NFA. Faculty Evaluations and Termination
      Procedures. National Faculty Association
      of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington,
      D.C. ED 043 319.

1964 Six Areas of Teacher Competence. California
      Teachers Association, Burlingame. ED 140 162.

1966 Berkeley Select Committee on Education:
      Education at Berkeley. Academic Senate,
      University of California.

1967 U.S. Naval Academy, Faculty Course in Edu-
      cational Technology. The Academy, Annapolis.

APPENDIX A

THE INSTRUMENTS AND LETTERS TO COLLEGES

146

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please fill in the following information:

1. Name of college._____

2. Number of people involved in evaluating instructors in your

   college. _____

3. Name of a staff member who would accept the responsibility for

   distributing the questionnaires to and collecting the completed

   questionnaires from the evaluators in your college._____

4. Primary reasons, in order of importance, for evaluating instruct-

   ors in your college.

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

5. Methods used in evaluating instructors in your college. (e.g. class-
   room observation, co-operative evaluation, student evaluation,
   use of check lists, written guidelines, college policies, etc..)

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

Note: 1. Please attach a copy of any printed forms, check lists,
         or guidelines used in the evaluation of instructors in
         your college.

      2. Additional comments or pertinent information would be
         appreciated. Please use the other side of this form.

      THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO/OPERATION

                                    N. C. Cooper

INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRES

For Evaluators of Community College Instructors

There are TWO SECTIONS to this Questionnaire:

SECTION ONE: PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE
SECTION TWO: EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTORS (TWO QUESTIONNAIRES)

1. You are asked to complete the questionnaires at your earliest convenience.
    Your co-operation will be greatly appreciated. A report on the findings
    will be used at the Community College Workshop to be held on June 16 and
    17, 1972 at the University of British Columbia.

2. After you have completed the questionnaires, please feel free to make any
    comments you wish on the evaluation of personnel, or on the study.

SECTION ONE

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE

Please complete each of the items below:

1. Number of instructors in your college whom you evaluate:......................

2. Your administrative position in the college:.................................

3. Length of experience in this position (or a comparable one): Check (✓) one.
    (1) Less than 5 years ....   (3) 11-15 years ....
    (2) 5-10 years ....   (4) More than 15 years ....

4. Your age (nearest birthday): Check (✓) one.
    (1) Under 30 years ....   (4) 51-60 years ....
    (2) 30-40 years ....   (5) Over 60 years ....
    (3) 41-50 years ....

5. Amount of time you are engaged in classroom teaching: Check (✓) one.
    (1) None................................
    (2) Less than 25% of your time..........
    (3) 25-50% of your time.................
    (4) Over 50% of your time..............

6. If you are not engaged in teaching, state the year during which you last did
    any classroom teaching.....................

7. Number of years of teaching experience (include teaching at any level and
    count this year if applicable): Check (✓) one.
    (1) Less than 5 years..................
    (2) 5-10 years.........................
    (3) 11-15 years........................
    (4) More than 15 years.................

8.

Professional Education Degrees Held	Year Obtained	Other Degrees and Diplomas Held	Year Obtained

9.

Date of most recent course taken	Name of Course	Institution where taken

SECTION TWO

EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTORS

Instructions

1. Each of the following questionnaires lists 30 factors which may be taken into account in evaluating instructors. Please score all items on each questionnaire according to, the importance which each factor has for you in your personal evaluation of instructors. Use the following scale:

Please circle your selected response: e.g.:

(A) indicates a factor always used;

(F) indicates a factor frequently used;

(S) indicates a factor seldom used;

(N) indicates a factor never used.

Thus your circling of (F) would indicate that the factor concerned is used frequently in your evaluation of instructors.

2. First score all of Questionnaire One, according to the importance which each factor has for you when forming opinions about the competence of instructors.

Second, score all of Questionnaire Two, according to the importance which each factor has for you when forming opinions that certain instructors are worthy of promotion to an administrative position.

PURPOSE: EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTOR COMPETENCE

Instructor Evaluation Questionnaire One

No.	Factor

1. Lesson preparation and planning.................................. A F S N
2. The personality attributes of the instructor..................... A F S N
3. Concern with the all-round development of the students.......... A F S N
4. Student participation in lessons................................. A F S N
5. The dress and appearance of the instructor .... A F S N
6. Examination results.. A F S N
7. Instructor-student relationships................................. A F S N

No.	Factor				

8. Academic qualifications of the instructor........................ A F S N
9. The students work well without supervision....................... A F S N
10. Class management... A F S N
11. The instructor's knowledge of the curriculum..................... A F S N
12. The development of the process of individual enquiry in the students... A F S N
13. The enthusiasm displayed by the instructor in teaching........... A F S N
14. The professional activities of the instructor.................... A F S N
15. Concern with character development of the students............... A F S N
16. Checking of written work... A F S N
17. The degree of co-operation by the instructor with other staff members.. A F S N
18. The development in students of a sense of community responsibility.. A F S N
19. The dependability of the instructor.............................. A F S N
20. The methods of lesson presentation used.......................... A F S N
21. Attitude of students toward self-conduct......................... A F S N
22. The use of teaching aids... A F S N
23. Qualities of leadership displayed by the instructor.............. A F S N
24. The students' clarification and recognition of values........... A F S N
25. The instructor's standing in the community....................... A F S N
26. The degree of self-evaluation of the general teaching methodology used.. A F S N
27. The training of the students in self-expression................. A F S N
28. Provision made for individual differences........................ A F S N
29. The instructor's standing with the students..................... A F S N
30. The attitude of the students to authority........................ A F S N

Please list below any factor(s) always, frequently, or seldom used by you when evaluating instructors as being worthy of promotion to another classroom situation, and not included in the above list:

1. .... A   F   S

2. .... A   F   S

3. .... A   F   S

4. .... A   F   S

PURPOSE: PROMOTION TO AN ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION

Instructor Evaluation Questionnaire Two

(A) indicates a factor always used;

(F) indicates a factor frequently used;

(S) indicates a factor seldom used;

(N) indicates a factor never used.

1. The dress and appearance of the instructor....................... A F S N
2. Student participation in lessons................................. A F S N

3. Examination results... A   F   S   N
4. The instructor's knowledge of the curriculum..................... A   F   S   N
5. Class management.. A   F   S   N
6. The development of the process of individual enquiry in the
    students... A   F   S   N
7. The degree of co-operation by the instructor with other staff
    members.. A   F   S   N
8. Checking of written work.. A   F   S   N
9. The development in students of a sense of community responsi-
    bility... A   F   S   N
10. Qualities of leadership displayed by the instructor............. A   F   S   N
11. The use of teaching aids.. A   F   S   N
12. The students' clarification and recognition of values........... A   F   S   N
13. The instructor's standing with the students..................... A   F   S   N
14. The attitude of the students to authority....................... A   F   S   N
15. The degree of self-evaluation of the general teaching
    methodology used... A   F   S   N
16. The personality attributes of the instructor.................... A   F   S   N
17. Concern with the all-round development of the students........... A   F   S   N
18. Lesson preparation and planning................................. A   F   S   N
19. Academic qualifications of the instructor....................... A   F   S   N
20. The students work well without supervision...................... A   F   S   N
21. Instructor-student relationships................................ A   F   S   N
22. The professional activities of the instructor................... A   F   S   N
23. Concern with the character development of the students.......... A   F   S   N
24. The enthusiasm displayed by the instructor in teaching.......... A   F   S   N
25. The dependability of the instructor............................. A   F   S   N
26. Attitude of students toward self-conduct........................ A   F   S   N
27. The methods of lesson presentation used......................... A   F   S   N
28. The instructor's standing in the community...................... A   F   S   N
29. The training of the students in self-expression................. A   F   S   N
30. Provision made for individual differences....................... A   F   S   N

Please list below any factor(s) always, frequently, or seldom used by you when evaluating instructors as being worthy of promotion to an <u>administrative position</u>, and not included in the above list:

1. .... A   F   S

2. .... A   F   S

3. .... A   F   S

4. .... A   F   S

<div align="center">COMMENTS

ON THE EVALUATION OF PERSONNEL AND/OR ON THE STUDY</div>

_____

_____

_____

_____

<div align="center">(Use back of page if necessary)</div>

APPENDIX B

CRITERIA USED IN THE SECOND INSTRUMENT

SET OUT IN CATEGORIES

CRITERIA INCLUDED AT RANDOM ON THE SECOND INSTRUMENT

GROUPED ACCORDING TO MITZEL'S CATEGORIES

A. PRODUCT CRITERIA

1. Concern with the all-round development of the
   students.

2. Examination results.

3. The students work well without supervision.

4. The development of the process of individual
   enquiry in the students.

5. Concern with the character development of the
   students.

6. The development in students of a sense of community
   responsibility.

7. Attitude of students toward self-conduct.

8. The students' clarification and recognition of
   values.

9. The training of the students in self-expression.

10. The attitude of students to authority.

B. PROCESS CRITERIA

1. Lesson preparation and planning.

2. Student participation in lessons.

3. Instructor-student relationships.

4. Class management.

5. The enthusiasm displayed by the instructor in
   teaching.

6. Checking of written work.

7. The methods of lesson presentation used.

8. The use of teaching aids.

9. The provision made for individual differences.

10. The degree of self-evaluation of the general
    teaching methodology used.

C. PRESAGE CRITERIA

1. The personality attributes of the instructor.

2. The dress and appearance of the instructor.

3. Academic qualifications of the instructor.

4. The instructor's knowledge of the curriculum.

5. The professional activities of the instructor.

6. The degree of cooperation by the instructor with
   other staff members.

7. The dependability of the instructor.

8. Qualities of leadership displayed by the instructor.

9. The instructor's standing in the community.

10. The instructor's standing with the students.

APPENDIX C

FACTOR ANALYSIS TO IDENTIFY MITZEL"S

CATEGORIES OF CRITERIA

Table 21

Three-Factor Analysis of Categories of Criteria Employed
in Evaluating Instructor Competence:
Varimax Rotated Factors

(P_1 = Product Criteria; P_2 = Process Criteria; P_3 = Presage Criteria)*

No.	Criteria	Communal-ities	Factor Loadings 1	2	3
1.	Lesson preparation and planning	0.496	$0.702P_2$	0.045	0.037
2.	The personality attributes of the instructor	0.270	0.326	-0.017	$0.404P_3$
3.	Concern with the all-round development of the students	0.176	-0.031	$0.411P_1$	0.076
4.	Student participation in lessons	0.481	$0.659P_2$	0.214	-0.001
5.	The dress and appearance of the instructor	0.256	0.333	0.166	0.343
6.	Examination results	0.200	0.323	0.154	0.269
7.	Instructor-student relationahips	0.171	0.204	0.172	0.316
8.	Academic qualifications of the instructor	0.210	-0.065	-0.127	$0.435P_3$

*0.40 Level of Acceptability

Table 21 (continued)

No.	Criteria	Communalities	Factor Loadings 1	2	3
9.	The students work well without supervision	0.460	0.346	$0.576P_1$	-0.092
10.	Class management	0.460	$0.606P_2$	0.234	0.195
11.	The instructor's knowledge of the curriculum	0.429	$0.525P_3$	-0.009	0.391
12.	The development of the process of individual inquiry in the students	0.370	$0.424P_1$	$0.434P_1$	-0.047
13.	The enthusiasm displayed by the instructor in teaching	0.420	$0.460P_2$	0.120	$0.440P_2$
14.	The professional activities of the instructor	0.438	-0.016	0.214	$0.625P_3$
15.	Concern with character development of the students	0.462	0.079	$0.644P_1$	0.205
16.	Checking of written work	0.242	0.333	0.291	0.215
17.	The degree of cooperation by the instructor with other staff members	0.506	0.273	0.163	$0.636P_3$
18.	The development in students of a sense of community responsibility	0.501	-0.011	$0.674P_1$	0.214

Table 21 (continued)

No.	Criteria	Communalities	Factor Loadings 1	2	3
19.	The dependability of the instructor	0.487	0.337	0.166	0.587P3
20.	The methods of lesson presentation used	0.599	0.759P2	0.120	0.087
21.	Attitude of students toward self-conduct	0.469	0.242	0.639P1	0.056
22.	The use of teaching aids	0.491	0.627P2	0.045	0.310
23.	Qualities of leadership displayed by the instructor	0.346	0.273	0.339	0.396
24.	The students' clarification and recognition of values	0.530	0.096	0.719P1	0.058
25.	The instructor's standing in the community	0.486	-0.111	0.526P3	0.444P3
26.	The degree of self-evaluation of the general teaching methodology used	0.149	0.153	0.315	0.162
27.	The training of the students in self-expression	0.486	0.324	0.608P1	0.105
28.	Provision made for individual differences	0.248	0.340	0.361	-0.044
29.	The instructor's standing with the students	0.416	0.044	0.185	0.617P3

162

Table 21 (continued)

No.	Criteria	Communal-ities	Factor Loadings		
			1	2	3
30.	The attitude of the students to authority	0.452	0.242	0.484P1	0.398

Table 22

Three-Factor Analysis of Categories of Criteria Employed
in Evaluation for Promotion to an Administrative
Position: Varimax Rotated Factors

(P_1 = Product Criteria; P_2 = Process Criteria; P_3 = Presage Criteria)*

No.	Criteria	Communalities	Factor Loadings		
			1	2	3
1.	The dress and appearance of the instructor	0.698	0.618P_3	0.298	0.477P_3
2.	Student participation in lessons	0.750	0.446P_2	0.416P_2	0.615P_2
3.	Examination results	0.725	0.375	0.346	0.682P_1
4.	The instructor's knowledge of the curriculum	0.831	0.696P_3	0.306	0.503P_3
5.	Class Management	0.846	0.601P_2	0.411P_2	0.562P_2
6.	The development of the process of individual enquiry in the students	0.748	0.438P_1	0.567P_1	0.484P_1
7.	The degree of cooperation by the instructor with other staff members	0.917	0.802P_3	0.396	0.343
8.	Checking of written work	0.717	0.317	0.348	0.704P_2

*0.40 Level of Acceptability

Table 22 (continued)

No.	Criteria	Communal-ities	Factor Loadings		
			1	2	3
9.	The development in students of a sense of community responsibility	0.811	0.431P$_1$	0.747P$_1$	0.260
10.	Qualities of leadership displayed by the instructor	0.915	0.802P$_3$	0.376	0.361
11.	The use of teaching aids	0.748	0.424P$_2$	0.348	0.669P$_2$
12.	The students' clarification and recognition of values	0.802	0.310	0.779P$_1$	0.313
13.	The instructor's standing with the students	0.833	0.709P$_3$	0.417P$_3$	0.396
14.	The attitude of the students to authority	0.747	0.337	0.652P$_1$	0.456P$_1$
15.	The degree of self-evaluation of the general teaching methodology used	0.777	0.519P$_2$	0.537P$_2$	0.468P$_2$
16.	The personality attributes of the instructor	0.909	0.795P$_3$	0.381	0.363
17.	Concern with the all-round development of the students	0.862	0.674P$_1$	0.582P$_1$	0.262
18.	Lesson preparation and planning	0.825	0.544P$_2$	0.332	0.647P$_2$

Table 22 (continued)

No.	Criteria	Communal-ities	Factor Loadings		
			1	2	3
19.	Academic qualifications of the instructor	0.791	$0.712P_3$	0.281	$0.453P_3$
20.	The students work well without supervision	0.743	0.332	$0.645P_1$	$0.465P_1$
21.	Instructor-student relationships	0.890	$0.763P_2$	$0.411P_2$	0.374
22.	The professional activities of the instructor	0.807	$0.767P_3$	0.327	0.334
23.	Concern with the character development of the students	0.818	$0.526P_1$	$0.689P_1$	0.258
24.	The enthusiasm displayed by the instructor in teaching	0.830	$0.651P_2$	$0.431P_2$	$0.469P_2$
25.	The dependability of the instructor	0.936	$0.800P_3$	$0.405P_3$	0.363
26.	Attitude of students toward self-conduct	0.805	0.304	$0.768P_1$	0.351
27.	The methods of lesson presentation used	0.800	0.373	0.372	$0.723P_2$
28.	The instructor's standing in the community	0.632	$0.612P_3$	$0.412P_3$	0.298
29.	The training of the students in self-expression	0.758	0.398	$0.606P_1$	$0.482P_1$

Table 22 (continued)

No.	Criteria	Communal-ities	Factor Loadings		
			1	2	3
30.	Provision made for individual differences	0.741	0.538P$_2$	0.565P$_2$	0.363

APPENDIX D

ADDITIONAL CRITERIA USED BY EVALUATORS

168

Table 23

Additional Criteria Used by Evaluators When
Evaluating Instructor Competence

(A - Always;   F - Frequently;   S - Seldom)

Number	Criteria	Frequency of use
9	Willingness to take on new duties and responsibilities	F
23	Willingness to undertake tasks within the department not directly involved with teaching	A
36	Available energy and drive displayed	A
38	Willingness to put in extra hours	A
41	Objectives of instructor in position	A
42	Future goals	A
45	Objectives of his or her position	A
47	Future goals of instructor	F
50	Willingness to assume additional duties	A
67	Desire to accept new challenges	A
71	Willingness to accept responsibility in the governance of the college	A
99	Willingness to accept additional work or responsibilities	A
149	Energy and drive	A
205	Willingness to assume the new position	A
226	Volunteering for non-assigned duties	A
249		A
3	Versatility level of instructor	F
4	Willingness to move	F
5	Willingness to try new methods	F
21	Willingness to learn new techniques, methods, facts, etc.	A
24	Willingness to research and undertake the instruction of new subjects	A

Table 23 (continued)

Number	Criteria	Frequency of use
35	Initiative	A
44	Resourcefulness	A
48	Originality and resourcefulness	A
61	Originality	A
62	Initiative	R
93	Initiative	A
144	Initiative	A
202	Being a self-starter rather than a follower	A
211	Initiative in course development	A
240	Initiative in developing curriculum	F
245	Willingness to innovate	F
246	Creative development of curriculum	
19	Adaptability	F
26	Willingness to help colleagues in marking tasks	F
31	Acceptance of change	A
90	Ability to adjust and to accept change	F
103	General participation in operations	A
115	Adaptability to change	A
136	Willingness to participate in the non-teaching needs and activities of the department	F
147	Adaptability	A
157	Flexibility	A
158	Teamwork	S
182	Adaptability (shift from career students)	A
188	Willingness to change to a certain situation	A
216	Cooperation with administration and staff	

Table 23 (continued)

Number	Criteria	Frequency of use
255	Degree of flexibility in job responsibility	F
263	Flexibility and adaptability	F
63	Punctuality	A
70	Attendance	A,
97	The image of honesty and integrity which the instructor projects	A
101	Reliability and responsibility	A
107	Integrity	A
131	Sense of responsibility	A
203	Reliability	A
239	Responsibility in evaluation of students and making decisions	A
260	Sense of responsibility for effect on student's future	A
53	Display of a sense of humor in the instructor	F
152	Keen sense of humor	A
155	Imagery and mime	A
207	Sense of humor	A
218	Instructor's vitality and enthusiasm	A
40	Voice modulation	F
134	Voice inflection tones	F
153	Self-consciousness	A
229	Charismatic leadership	F
6	Self-sufficiency	A
68	Courage to initiate new teaching methods	F
106	Courage to say the student has not learned sufficiently to continue on to the next course	A

Table 23 (continued)

Number	Criteria	Frequency of use
30	Tolerence toward others	A
1.71	Tact	A
168	Intelligence	A
18	Emotional stability and maturity	A
172	Charm	A
175	Sense of social values	A
125	Ability to be fair with self and others (especially students)	F
1	General learning atmosphere	F
7	Goals of lesson (goals reasonable)	A
8	Techniques provide for individual differences	A
10	Application of subject matter in business	A
13	Gearing level of instruction to kind and level of student	A
14	Linking lesson material with what has gone before	A
15	Linking lesson with up-to-date information and current events	A
16	Being firm on assignment deadlines and quick to return them	F
17	Imagination in devising challenging assignments	A
33	Student motivation	A
51	Enthusiasm displayed by students to instructor	F
53	Display of a sense of humor in students	F
66	Ability to adapt to new or different subjects	A
72	Inventiveness in presentation of material	F
76	Develop and implement more efficient teaching methods	F

Table 23 (continued)

Number	Criteria	Frequency of use
77	Ability to relate theory to engineering practice	A
80	Originality of approach or methods in teaching	A
85	Ability of instructor to coordinate class with prerequisites--as indicated by students	A
86	Ability of instructor to coordinate with following classes--as indicated by students	A
87	Ability of instructor to bring meaningful illustrations into the course	A
91	Use of variety in methods of presentation	A
94	Ability to innovate	F
96	Ability of the instructor to inspire enthusiasm in students	A
104	Ability to identify essential learning and concepts rather than assembling a collection of details	A
105	Ability to assess individual students' needs and propose a plan of action to assess students	A
108	Whether the instructor evaluated if he did or did not reach objectives	A
109	Did instruction show appreciation or relevance of objectives	A
110	Instructor's strongest point	A
111	Instructor's weakest point	A
112	Factors of instructor performance in need of improvement	A
120	Adjustment to class level	A
122	Feedback (drawing out questions)	A
137	Organization and correlation of total program for the subject	F
141	Ability to show correct degrees of emphasis on topics	F
154	Timing--hiball or rush	A
159	Student relationship	A
165	Teaching presentation--lively or dull	A
166	Willingness to follow up a lesson	A
179	Ability to stimulate discussion in classroom	F

Table 23 (continued)

Number	Criteria	Frequency of use
180	Willingness to respond to students' questions and answer clearly	A
181	Ability to differentiate between different abilities of students	A
183	Ability of instructor to challenge, stimulate students	A
184	Mutual respect between students and instructor	A
189	Innovative in instructional methods	A
192	Organization of work area	A
198	Excellence in teaching	A
204	Rapport	A
206	Innovation	A
208	Variations in instructional techniques	A
209	Fairness and responsibility in student evaluation	A
212	Variety, degree, and nature of in-class evaluative techniques	F
214	Growth in instructional methodology (formal and/or informal)	F
220	Originality of expression and presentation	A
221	Lesson organization	A
223	Innovative techniques	F
225	Competence	A
231	Active in developing improved techniques	F
232	Patience with slow learners	A
242	Available to students on an individual basis	F
244	Energetic in preparation and presentation	F
257	Competence in discipline	F
259	Ability to engender student interest	A
25	Preparation of new course outlines for use by others	A
78	Continual up-dating of course content	A
81	Development of new programs or ideas re-new programs	A
121	Up-dating program to keep relevant to industrial changes	A

Table 23 (continued)

Number	Criteria	Frequency of use
151	Research work, papers, seminar attendance	A
210	Ability to accept and work within stated rules	A
237	Participation in faculty committees	A
254	Ability to work with other department members	A
11	Rating of instructor by students	F
32	Over-all effectiveness	A
46	Specific accomplishments during the year	A
114	Attainment of course objectives	A
118	Rating of preparation by employers	A
119	Opinions of graduate students regarding the program enabling them to achieve their objectives	A
140	Ability to state objectives and reach them	A
161	Student appraisal questionnaires	A
163	Effectiveness of the teaching	A
190	Student opinion re-teaching	F
194	Records of student achievement	A
199	Student assessments	A
261	Feedback from students	F
34	Oral presentation--voice modulation, expression, projection	A
49	Teaching voice and expression	F
59	Verbal expression	A
60	Written expression	A
64	Ability to communicate	A
69	Verbal expression	A
102	Communication	A

Table 23 (continued)

Number	Criteria	Frequency of use
113	Communication skills	A
123	Audibility and enunciation	A
164	Communication ability	A
174	Ability to communicate ideas	A
177	Quality of voice and expression	A
178	Ability to speak clearly and expound ideas coherently	A
219	Use of the English language	A
228	Ability to communicate	A
258	Ability to communicate verbally	A
74	Acceptance of the idea that "there cannot be teaching without learning"	F
79	Instructor's attitude toward administration	S
92	Dedication depth	A
95	Dedication	F
98	Adherence to the pholosophy of the community college	A
139	Attitude toward self-updating and upgrading programs	F
160	Support of policy	A
169	Commitment to excellence	A
195	Continued liaison with industry	A
201	Enthusiasm for college	A
224	Desire to improve programs	F
230	Subscribes to basic philosophy of college	A
251	Commitment to teaching	A
253	Receptivity to learning how to teach	A
256	Willingness to evaluate and be accountable	A

Table 23 (continued)

Number	Criteria	Frequency of use
28	Willingness to undergo further training	A
58	Self-development	A
65	Desire to keep up with new related material	A
75	Willingness to keep abreast of his field	F
83	Interest shown in self-improvement or just keeping abreast of area of expertise	F
88	Indication that instructor is taking advantage of upgrading opportunities	A
162	Degree to which instructor keeps up to date with developments in aspects taught in the department	F
185	Evidence of ability to grow professionally	F
213	Growth in educational philosophy in terms of college, discipline, specific courses and personnel	A
222	Professional development	F
234	Self-development in either new or established curriculum areas	A
235	Initiative to keep up to date re-trade	A
238	Interest in own professional growth	A
252	Interest in professional development	F
20	Thorough knowledge of trade	A
55	Occupational knowledge	A
127	Command of material	A
130	Expertise in subject	A
142	Knowledge of technology of students concerned	A
167	Grasp on his field of knowledge	A
197	Knowledge and use of supplementary material	A
233	Knowledge of subject matter	A
243	Excellence in knowledge of subject	F

Table 23 (continued)

Number	Criteria	Frequency of use
2	Administrative (management) problems	F
56	Public relations	A
82	Working relationships with the world outside the college particularly as it concerns job placement of students	F
89	Practice of reciprocal behavior	A
133	Ability to get along with others	F
135	Rapport with students and staff	F
200	Ability to get along with people	A
241	Informal association with students	F
170	Enthusiasm for instruction	A
186	Enjoys teaching	A
215	Enthusiasm for the discipline	A
143	Imposes some discipline on himself and on students--returning of assignments	A
193	Accent on safety	A
236	Written work covering modernization re-information and operation sheets	A
29	Practical skills--laboratory or live shop	A
39	Manual dexterity	F
132	Organizing ability	F
146	Clinical skill in an allied field	A
12	Enthusiasm for preparation of course outlines, etc.	A
196	Demonstrated interest in course development	A

Table 23 (continued)

Number	Criteria	Frequency of use
150	A sense of dedication to the students rather than to himself	A
217	Interest in students	A
138	Development of interest in frequently "ordinary material"	A
187	The teacher's particular interest and specialities	A
54	Degree of extra curricular activities with students and the institution	F
84	Extra-curricular activities with students	F
191	Participation--off campus	F
124	Empathy with young people	A
250	Empathy for students	F
37	Open-minded attitude toward change	A
57	Performance under stress	A
126	Personal health	F
176	Citizenship	F
227	Instructor requests	F
264	Internal economics	S
265	Administrative pressures	S

Table 23 (continued)

Number	Criteria	Frequency of use
27	Working experience	F
43	Specific original accomplishments	A
73	Training in the field of instruction (Vocational)	A
117	Instructor industrial experience	A
128	Experience and background	F
145	Experience	A
148	Experience in the practical application of theory taught	A
156	Industrial and engineering experience	A
173	Experience in the discipline	A
247	Practical skills and qualifications	A
248	Extensive industrial experience	A
262	Instructor's span of competence and experience	A

Table 24

Additional Criteria Used by Evaluators When
Evaluating for Administrative Promotion

(A – Always;   F – Frequently;   S – Seldom)

Number	Criteria	Frequency of use
10	Degree of responsibility in carrying out teaching and non-teaching assignments	A
46	Punctuality	A
53	Attendance	A
65	Honesty and openness	A
68	Integrity	A
72	Image of honesty and integrity projected	A
78	Reliability and responsibility	A
84	Integrity	A
121	Reliable	A
127	Can he retain confidential information or is he a "blabbermouth"	A
149	Personal integrity	A
163	Dependability	A
172	Reliability	A
178	Reliability	A
197	Loyalty and integrity	F
54	Willing to accept added responsibility	A
59	Willing to accept responsibilities	A
89	Willingness to accept responsibility	A
105	Desire for such promotion	A
106	Willingness to assume responsibility	A
128	Can he work--does he take on work willingly	A

Table 24 (continued)

Number	Criteria	Frequency of use
159	Drive	A
161	No fear of work	A
168	Willingness to undertake additional responsibilities	A
180	Energy and drive	A
193	Prepared to work overtime	A
210	Energy, drive	A
220	Motivation	A
81	Willingness to accept and carry through responsibility	A
11	Initiative in recommending and planning changes in subjects and courses	A
12	Enthusiasm and initiative in non-teaching duties	F
37	Originality	A
39	Originality	A
44	Initiative	A
67	Willingness to accept challenge and change	A
70	Initiative	A
122	Initiative	E
141	Display of initiative in his subject	A
146	Creativity	A
162	Initiative	A
164	Imagination	A
177	Being a self-starter	A
214	Willingness to innovate	F
5	Social intelligence level	A
20	Common sense	A
64	Conceptual skill to see the enterprise as a whole	A
73	Ability to exercise good judgment	F

Table 24 (continued)

Number	Criteria	Frequency of use
118	Common sense--realistic approach to problems	A
144	Intelligence	A
151	Intelligence	A
190	Common sense	A
194	Ability to see subject as part of a whole	F
203	Evidence of ability to think	A
14	Adaptability	F
17	Cooperation with administration	A
18	Acceptance of change	F
31	Acceptance of existing systems and procedures	A
62	Willingness to cooperate and delegate authority when necessary	A
80	General participation in operations	A
92	Instructor flexibility and adaptability to change	A
137	Flexibility	A
191	Flexibility	A
201	Accepting limitations (for example, budget)	F
63	Self-discipline and setting of examples	A
86	Compatibility in assigned area	A
157	Empathy	A
179	Courage	A
182	Empathy	A
19	Tolerance toward others	A
49	Consideration for others	A
147	Tact	A
195	Tactfulness with firmness	F

Table 24 (continued)

Number	Criteria	Frequency of use
152	Vitality	A
176	Enthusiasm for college	A
181	Sense of humor	A
196	Sense of humor	F
13	Emotional stability and maturity	A
115	Ability to restrain unnecessary expression	A
135	Panic prone, relaxed	A
15	A person who can listen but also make a decision	A
16	A person who can give his reasons for a decision and sees the problem through to the end	A
133	Civil and easy disregard of status (hierarchy)	F
116	Practice of rationalizing activity	F
130	Ability to see both sides of a conflict	A
148	Charm	A
150	Moral sense of values	A
21	Planning and organizing ability	A
22	Handling of financial resources	A
25	Planning and organizing work	A
27	Management of physical and financial resources	A
28	Potential for controlling performance in new position	A
32	Systematic approach to problem solving	F
35	Ability to recognize long term effects of policy decisions	A
36	Ability to cause change without doing it himself	A

Table 24 (continued)

Number	Criteria	Frequency of use
41	Ability to supervise in all situations	F
56	Administrative ability	A
61	Organizational ability	A
66	Ability to assist others to high productivity	A
71	Ability to innovate	F
76	Ability to work within rules of the system	A
85	Planning and organizing ability	A
90	Organizational ability	A
91	Decision making ability	A
96	Problem solving to the mutual satisfaction of all parties concerned	A
100	Proven talent for organizing	A
101	Administrative abilities (demonstrated)	F
103	Ability to solve administrative problems	A
107	Ability to organize and delegate	A
111	Ability to administrate in developmental situations	A
112	Business ability	A
117	Ability to make decisions and produce answers	A
123	Administrative skill	A
142	Ability to evaluate innovations introduced by the instructor	A
143	Organizational ability	A
158	Managerial ability	A
165	Ability to organize and coordinate planning of sites and programs with fellow administrators, industry, and staff	F
167	Demonstrated administrative ability	A
184	Abilities to delegate authority and responsibility	A
185	Ability to gain cooperative effort from others	A
187	Organizing ability	A
189	Innovative leadership	A
200	Ability to lay out distribution of students in areas	A

Table 24 (continued)

Number	Criteria	Frequency of use
202	Plan in coordination with other programs	A
206	Evidence of ability to delegate	A
209	Demonstrated administrative capacity	A
216	Organizational ability	A
217	Ability to accept and fulfill responsibilities	A
219	Organizational ability	A
3	Rating given by peers	A
4	Degree of respect from students	A
9	Does he have confidence in his subordinates	F
29	Effectiveness of instructor in previously assigned administrative position, if any	F
58	Acceptability by peers	A
94	Confidence of others in him	A
166	The instructor's reputation among his colleagues	A
199	Contribution to continuing development of departmental philosophy and curriculum	A
1	Process of feedback to administration	F
48	Concern for entire institution	A
60	Instructor's attitude toward administration	F
74	Adherence to philosophy of the community college	A
75	Willingness to accept the committee form of college governance	A
77	Appreciation for administrative concerns	A
83	Broad area of concern and discussions not confined to own sphere of special interest	A
98	Liaison with industry	F
102	Attitude toward personal growth	A

Table 24 (continued)

Number	Criteria	Frequency of use
108	Concern for staff and students' welfare	A
109	Genuine interest in the institution	F
129	Interest in future of department and program	A
132	Critical of status quo	A
140	Support of policy	A
156	Enthusiastic support of college philosophy or ideals underlying it	A
169	Understanding of and practice of a compatible educational philosophy	A
174	Concern for quality of instruction	A
183	Philosophical scope regarding the position	A
186	Attempts to update philosophy and methods (formal and informal)	A
205	Interest in development of programs	F
223	Acceptance of organizational objectives	A
7	Is he a good listener	F
8	Does he offer and encourage freedom and maturity	F
42	Public relations outside the classroom	A
93	Sensitivity toward others in understanding how and why people do what they do	A
126	Is their approach blunt, persuasive, diplomatic, etc.	A
139	Student relationships	A
154	Able to work without harsh friction with administration	A
173	Effective personnel relationship	A
175	Ability to get along with people	A
188	Interpersonal relationships	A
211	Instant rapport	A
215	Ability to relate well to different types of people, style of work, etc.	A
221	Social popularity	S

Table 24 (continued)

Number	Criteria	Frequency of use
33	Ability to communicate orally and in writing	A
47	Ability to communicate with peers	A
50	Communicative ability	A
52	Verbal expression	F
79	Communication	A
110	Good command of language	F
145	Ability to articulate clearly	F
170	Ability to write good reports	A
192	Ability to communicate	A
198	Communicative abilities	A
24	Development program for subordinates	A
26	Training and development of subordinates	A
99	Study of Ed. Administration developments	F
208	Professional upgrading on a regular basis	F
212	Continued professional development	A
213	Keeping up with professional literature	A
224	Self-improvement	F
2	Administrative paperwork	F
43	Consistent production	A
82	Ability to meet deadlines	A
114	Accuracy	A
120	Organized	A
138	Teamwork	A
38	Performance under stress	A
45	Performance under stress	A

Table 24 (continued)

Number	Criteria	Frequency of use
51	Degree of tolerance under stress	A
88	Performance under stress	A
104	Ability to work under stress	F
113	Response to pressure	A
40	Occupational knowledge	F
87	Knowledge of institutional objectives	A
124	Knowledge and interest in job sought	A
171	Knowledge of general college policies (administration and financing)	A
160	Positive attitude	A
204	Positive in outlook	A
6	Physical and mental health	A
57	Off-campus activities	S
95	Political awareness	A
155	Enjoys administrative work	A
23	Courses relating to management or administration	A
30	Training of instructor in management or administration	F
97	Management training	F
119	Administrative experience	A
125	Administrative experience	A
131	Administrative experience	A
136	Management experience in industry	A
207	Extensive industrial experience	A
222	Political affiliation	S