This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received 68-7562

BOERSMA, Wendall Claire, 1924-

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE EVALUATIVE CRITERIA AS A STIMULUS FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT IN ELEVEN MICHIGAN HIGH SCHOOLS.

The University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1967
Education, administration

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

# THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE EVALUATIVE CRITERIA AS A STIMULUS FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT IN ELEVEN MICHIGAN HIGH SCHOOLS

by
Wendell Claire Boersma

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the
University of Michigan
1967

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Lester W. Anderson, Co-Chairman
Professor Kent W. Leach, Co-Chairman
Doctor George S. Hayden
Associate Professor Kenneth E Vance
Professor Frank B. Womer

# THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE EVALUATIVE CRITERIA AS A STIMULUS FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT IN ELEVEN MICHIGAN HIGH SCHOOLS

by Wendell C. Boersma

This study sought to determine the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria, 1960 Edition, as a stimulus for school improvement in eleven Michigan high schools. Teachers were asked to state their perceptions concerning (1) the statement of school philosophy and objectives, (2) course objectives and courses of study, (3) curriculum planning, (4) knowledge of the school program, (5) self-evaluation of teaching performance. Furthermore, these teachers were asked to judge the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria.

In eleven high schools which completed the Evaluative Criteria, 383 teachers served as the experimental group; 131 teachers in four high schools which had not completed the Evaluative Criteria for at least ten years served as the control group. Two questionnaires were administered to teachers in both experimental and control schools. Part I and II of both questionnaires were identical for teachers in both experimental and control schools. The second questionnaire for teachers in experimental schools also

obtained teachers' judgments regarding the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria.

The change in responses by teachers in experimental schools was compared with the change in responses by teachers in control schools in an attempt to determine the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria as a stimulus for school improvement. The chi-square method of statistical analysis was employed to determine the significance of the change in responses. No change was considered as significant unless P (probability) measured .05 or less.

Teachers in experimental schools evidenced no significant change in responses to fourteen of the twenty questions in Part II of the questionnaire. In the six questions where significant changes in response were indicated, teachers:

1. Perceived themselves as being increasingly familiar with the written philosophy and objectives of their high school.
2. Felt there was increased discussion and agreement by the faculty regarding the philosophy and objectives of their high school program.
3. Attached increasing importance to the need for their high school to employ a written, carefully formulated, comprehensive philosophy of education with objectives.

4. Indicated that they increasingly employed written course objectives for the courses they teach.
5. Felt there was an increase in their ability to assess the quality of the total educational program in their high school.
6. Attached increasing importance to the effect of their knowledge of the total educational program on the quality of their teaching performance.

No significant change in responses was evidenced by teachers in control schools.

In identifying the most satisfactory characteristics of the Evaluative Criteria self-study, respondents referred to their increased knowledge of the school program, the general values of self-evaluation, the favorable effect of self-evaluation on their teaching performance, and increased faculty cooperation.

In identifying the least satisfactory characteristics of the Evaluative Criteria self-study, respondents referred to procedures employed for the self-evaluation, characteristics of the Evaluative Criteria, and procedures employed by the visiting committee.

In the six questions where statistically significant changes in response did occur, these changes appear to be

much lower in degree than the literature would lead one to expect. Among the twenty-eight choices listed in the six questions, the median percentage of teachers who changed their response was 5 percent. Thus, limited evidence is presented in support of the Evaluative Criteria as a stimulus for school improvement in the eleven experimental schools of this study. One explanation for the degree of evidence might be the fact that the procedures employed for completion of the self-study varied from those recommended in the manual of the Evaluative Criteria. Responses to questionnaire items seem to indicate that both the instrument itself and the methods employed for its use affected the outcome of this study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express a special debt of gratitude to Dr. Lester W. Anderson and Dr. Kent W. Leach for their guidance and helpful criticisms in serving as co-chairmen of this study.

Gratitude is also expressed to Dr. George S. Hayden, Dr. Kenneth E Vance, and Dr. Frank B. Womer for their interest and suggestions. The advice of Mr. N. Kishor Wahi regarding the tabulation of data by computer is sincerely appreciated.

Sincere thanks go to the principal and teachers in each of the fifteen respondent schools of this study.

The support of my wife throughout the course of this study is greatly appreciated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . . ii

LIST OF TABLES . . . . . vii

Chapter

I. THE PROBLEM. . . . . 1

Statement of the Problem
School philosophy and objectives
Course objectives and courses of study
Curriculum planning
Teacher knowledge of the school program
Self-evaluation of teaching performance
Background of the Problem
The theory of evaluation
The Evaluative Criteria - A description
The Evaluative Criteria - A brief history
The Evaluative Criteria - Changes in editions
The Evaluative Criteria - Extent of usage
Methods for evaluation of high schools
Employment of standards
Judgments of visiting committees
Standardized tests
Success of graduates and non-graduates
Judgments of parents and pupils
Self-evaluation employing the Evaluative Criteria
Procedure
Selection of respondent schools
The experimental group
The control group
Selection of teachers
The questionnaires
The control group
The experimental group
Delimitations

Chapter Page

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE RELATIVE TO THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE EVALUATIVE CRITERIA.. 47

Adequacy of Selected Procedures
Reactions of Teachers
Reactions of Administrators
Relationship between Evaluative Criteria Ratings and External Measures
School Improvements
Summary

III. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA..... 68

School Philosophy and Objectives
Teachers' familiarity with philosophy and objectives
Faculty discussion and agreement regarding philosophy and objectives
Importance of philosophy and objectives
Course Objectives and Courses of Study
Employment and adequacy of course objectives
Importance of course objectives
Employment and adequacy of courses of study
Importance of courses of study
Curriculum Planning
Extent and effect of departmental curriculum planning
Role of the classroom teacher in curriculum determination
Teacher opportunity to contribute to curriculum development and the extent of their participation
Need for changes in the curriculum
Teacher Knowledge of the School Program
Teachers' ability to assess the quality of the educational program
Teachers' knowledge of the total educational program and its effect on the quality of their teaching performance

Teachers' judgments of the balance in educational opportunities provided for college-bound and terminal students
Teachers' ratings of the quality of their high school
Teachers' judgments of the quality of subject departments, programs, and the school building
Teachers' identifications of the strengths and weaknesses of their high school's educational program
Teachers' knowledge of the courses offered in their departments
Self-Evaluation of Teaching Performance
Frequency of teacher self-evaluation
Judgments of teachers with regard to their teaching performance
Teachers' Judgments Concerning the Effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria
Judgments of teachers regarding the most satisfactory characteristics of the Evaluative Criteria self-study
Increased knowledge of the school program
General values of self-evaluation
Effect of self-evaluation on individual teaching performance
Effect of self-evaluation on faculty cooperation
Judgments of teachers regarding the least satisfactory characteristics of the Evaluative Criteria self-study
Procedures employed for the self-study
The self-evaluation instrument (the Evaluative Criteria)
The visiting committee
Teachers' attitudes toward self-evaluation before the Evaluative Criteria was begun and after it was completed
Awareness of teachers regarding the aims and purposes of the self-study

Chapter Page

Organization for the self-study
Amount of information teachers received about results of other committee studies
Judgments of teachers with regard to the proportion between time and effort expended on the Evaluative Criteria and the benefits obtained
Teachers' judgments concerning the helpfulness of the Evaluative Criteria
Previous experience of teachers with Evaluative Criteria
Teachers' recommendations regarding repetition of Evaluative Criteria self-study

IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 138

Summary
Purpose of study
Procedure
Delimitations
Findings
School philosophy and objectives
Course objectives and courses of study
Curriculum planning
Teacher knowledge of the school program
Self-evaluation of teaching performance
Opinions of 383 teachers in eleven experimental schools regarding the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria self-study
Conclusions
Recommendations

APPENDIX . . . . . 154

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . 180

LIST OF TABLES


| Table | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Basic Data Concerning the Fifteen Michigan High Schools Included in the Study . . . . | 157 |
| 2. | Questionnaire Administration Dates, Released Time Granted to Experimental Schools for Self-Study, and Total Time Spent by Experimental Schools on Evaluative Criteria . . . . . | 160 |
| 3. | Number and Percent of Teacher Respondents . . | 162 |
| 4. | Judgments of Teachers about Their Familiarity with the Philosophy and Objectives of Their School . . . . . | 72 |
| 5. | Judgments of Teachers about the Extent of Faculty Discussion and Agreement Regarding Their School's Philosophy and Objectives . | 74 |
| 6. | Judgments of Teachers Concerning the Importance of a Statement of Philosophy and Objectives . . . . . | 76 |
| 7. | Judgments of Teachers with Regard to Employment and Adequacy of Course Objectives . . | 79 |
| 8. | Judgments of Teachers Concerning the Importance of Course Objectives . . . . . | 80 |
| 9. | Judgments of Teachers with Regard to Employment and Adequacy of Courses of Study . . | 82 |
| 10. | Judgments of Teachers Concerning the Importance of Courses of Study. . . . . | 83 |
| 11. | Judgments of Teachers Concerning the Extent and Effect of Departmental Curriculum Planning. . . . . | 85 |

Table | Page


12. Judgments of Teachers with Regard to the Role of the Classroom Teacher in Curriculum Determination . . . . . 87

13. Judgments of Teachers with Regard to the Opportunity They Have to Participate in Curriculum Development and the Extent of Their Participation . . . . . 88

14. Judgments of Teachers Concerning the Faculty's Attitude toward the Need for Curriculum Change . . . . . 90

15. Judgments of Teachers with Regard to Their Ability to Assess the Quality of the Educational Program . . . . . 92

16. Judgments of Teachers with Regard to How the Quality of Their Teaching Performance is Affected by Their Knowledge of the Total Educational Program. . . . . 95

17. Judgments of Teachers Concerning the Balance in Educational Opportunities Provided for College-Bound and Terminal Students. . 96

18. Judgments of Teachers Regarding the Quality of Their High School . . . . . 97

19. Judgments of 383 Teachers in Eleven Experimental Schools Regarding the Quality of Each Subject Department or Program . . . . 100

20. Judgments of 131 Teachers in Four Control Schools Regarding the Quality of Each Subject Department or Program. . . . . 102

21. Teachers' Identifications of Strengths and Weaknesses in the Educational Program of Their School. . . . . 105

Table Page

22. Judgments of Teachers with Regard to Their Knowledge of the Courses Offered in Their Departments . . . . . 107

23. Teachers' Judgments Concerning How Often They Evaluate Their Teaching Performance . 109

24. Judgments of 383 Teachers in Eleven Experimental Schools with Regard to Their Teaching Performance . . . . . 111

25. Judgments of 131 Teachers in Four Control Schools with Regard to Their Teaching Performance. . . . . 112

26. Judgments of Teachers Concerning Their Attitude toward Self-Evaluation Before Beginning and After Completing the Evaluative Criteria . . . . . 127

27. Teachers' Judgments Regarding Their Awareness of the Aims and Purposes of Their Self-Study . . . . . 129

28. Judgments of Teachers with Regard to Their School's Degree of Organization for the Self-Study . . . . . 131

29. Teachers' Judgments Concerning the Amount of Information They Received about the Results of Other Evaluative Criteria Committee Studies. . . . . 132

30. Judgments of Teachers Concerning the Helpfulness of the Evaluative Criteria . . 135

# CHAPTER I

# THE PROBLEM

## Statement of the Problem

This research attempts to determine the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria, 1960 Edition, an instrument employed for the purpose of aiding high school faculties in conducting a self-evaluation of their educational programs. Teachers' perceptions were obtained in an effort to answer the following questions with respect to outcomes of the use of the Evaluative Criteria:

School philosophy and objectives

1. Do faculty members become more familiar with the written philosophy and objectives of their high school?
2. Is there increased discussion and agreement by the faculty regarding the philosophy and specific objectives of their high school program?
3. Do faculty members attach increasing importance to the need for their high school to employ a written, carefully formulated, comprehensive philosophy of

education with specific objectives?

Course objectives and courses of study

4. Is there an increase in the number of teachers who employ a written course of study and specific objectives for the courses they teach?
5. Is there an increase in the number of teachers who feel that their written courses of study and specific course objectives are clearly formulated and comprehensive?
6. Do teachers attach a greater degree of importance to the need for a written course of study, including specific objectives, for the courses they teach?

Curriculum planning

7. Do teachers in subject area departments increasingly discuss possible ways to improve the effectiveness of their department?
8. Do the discussions referred to in question seven exert an increasing influence on the curriculum of the departments?
9. Do teachers attach increasing importance to the role of the classroom teacher in determination of the curriculum?

10. Do teachers feel there are increased opportunities to participate in curriculum development?
11. Is there an increase in the number of teachers who participate in curriculum development?
12. Is there an increase in the number of faculty members who feel there is a need for making changes in the curriculum of their high school?

Teacher knowledge of the school program

13. Do teachers become more knowledgeable regarding the total high school program, both within and outside of their teaching areas, particularly in relation to its strengths and weaknesses?
14. In regard to their knowledge of the high school educational program, do teachers attach increasing importance to its effect on the quality of their teaching performance?

Self-evaluation of teaching performance

15. Do individual teachers increasingly employ self-evaluation of their own teaching performance?

## Background of the Problem

### The theory of evaluation

Hagen and Thorndike state that "evaluation in education signifies describing something in terms of selected attributes and judging the degree of acceptability or suitability of that which has been described."[1] The "something" that is to be described and judged may be any aspect of the educational scene, but it is typically (a) a total school program, (b) a curricular procedure, (c) an individual or a group of individuals. They go on to state that the process of evaluating involves three distinct aspects:

1. Selecting the attributes that are important for judging the worth of the specimen to be evaluated.
2. Developing and applying procedures that will describe these attributes truly and accurately.
3. Synthesizing the evidence yielded by these procedures into a final judgment of worth.

Evaluation of a school's program of studies and educational activities is a crucial process for ensuring the progressive and enlightened development of the people it

---

[1] Elizabeth P. Hagen and Robert L. Thorndike, "Evaluation," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (Third Edition; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1960), p. 482.

serves. Goals are often too readily set and aims too ambitiously expressed without providing for a systematic, scientific examination of the methods utilized to achieve these ends. Education is a complex process involving the selection of ideas (concepts, values, skills) and the planning of experiences designed to foster mastery of these ideas in the people subjected to the educational process. Choices must be made in planning an educational program and the effectiveness of the program must also be studied. Thus, for a sound educational program, evaluation is inevitable. The choice of the evaluative method is of crucial importance.

## The Evaluative Criteria -- A description

The Evaluative Criteria, published by the National Study of Secondary School Evaluation (known as the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards before 1959), employs the method of self-evaluation. Members of the entire high school staff, by organizing into a maximum of twenty-eight separate committees, critically examine and evaluate all operational phases of their high school.[1] Some schools choose to involve members of the Board of

---

[1] See Appendix, pages 155-56, for the Table of Contents of the Evaluative Criteria.

Education and parents and pupils of the school district as well as staff members.

The Evaluative Criteria includes sections which require a statement of the philosophy and objectives of a given school (Section B) and data concerning the characteristics of the youth and community to be served by the school (Section C). These two sections provide the pivotal points of the self-evaluation in the sense that their results should be kept in mind by the evaluators when the subsequent sections are being checked and evaluated. Persons making evaluations should ask "how well do the educational practices in this school conform to the philosophy and objectives of the school?" and "how well does our educational program meet the needs of our students and the community?"

Checklist items and evaluations are found in subsequent sections. The checklists consist of provisions, conditions, or characteristics found in good secondary schools. The checklist items provide a means for portraying the program, facilities, and practices of the school, and the evaluations provide a means for rendering judgments on the effectiveness of the school's operation. Jessen, Executive Secretary of the National Study of Secondary School

Evaluation until July 1, 1960, states that "those judgments are all the more likely to be correct, since the evaluation items follow immediately after the checklist items and are usually on the same page with them."[1] The evaluation items are generally in question form and usually begin with how effective, how adequate, how extensive, how up-to-date, how accessible, or some similar interrogation. The evaluator is asked to respond on a five-point scale for both checklist and evaluation items.

The Evaluative Criteria provides a variety of other devices by which a given school may catalogue its equipment and practices--reports, records, comments, statements on outcomes or special characteristics, and improvements planned or in progress. The intent is to provide the means and directions for a comprehensive inventory of what a school is trying to do, what facilities it has, and how effectively it uses its facilities.

## The Evaluative Criteria -- A brief history

Although no one person or agency was responsible for starting, organizing, and carrying on the extensive project

---

[1] Carl A. Jessen, "Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards After Twenty-One Years," The North Central Association Quarterly, XXX (October, 1955), p. 221.

which was originally known as the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards, Carrothers[1] admits that he was somewhat responsible for the real "kickoff." The first organized effort toward a systematic approach to school evaluation occurred in April, 1933, in Chicago, Illinois, at the Annual Meeting of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, one of six regional associations.[2] Twenty state chairmen of the above association were designated as a committee to see whether a start could be made. Five men were selected as the active committee with Carrothers as chairman. Carrothers agreed to set aside space in the offices of the Bureau of Cooperation with Educational Institutions (now called the Bureau of School Services), of which he was the director, at The University of Michigan. The primary objective of this committee was to produce an instrument and techniques for its application which would not only give a better basis for regional accrediting associations to judge the quality of schools than had previously been available, but, in carrying out the

---

[1] George E. Carrothers, "Early Beginnings of the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards," The North Central Association Quarterly, XXIX (October, 1954), p. 180.

[2] Ibid., pp. 180-81.

self-evaluation process, would also increase the likelihood that school improvement would occur.

The Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards came into being in August, 1933.[1] Representatives of four of the six regional associations of colleges and secondary schools appointed:

1. A General Committee of twenty-one representatives from all of the six regional associations -- the North Central Association, New England Association, Middle States Association, Southern Association, Northwest Association, and Western Association -- plus six advisory members (Carrothers served as chairman of this committee for the first seventeen years of its existence). Today, administration of the National Study is still vested in the General Committee.
2. An Executive Committee of nine members with Grizzell, University of Pennsylvania, as chairman.
3. An Administrative Committee of three members with Roemer of Peabody College as chairman.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 182.

The chairmen of the General Committee and the Executive Committee served with Roemer as the Administrative Committee, of which Jessen was secretary.

The procedures of the above committees involved the formulation of a rather elaborate set of tentative Evaluative Criteria, a self-testing program for each school, an intensive survey of 200 selected schools by educational specialists, a reformulation of the Evaluative Criteria on the basis of try-out results with these schools, and the final adoption of a revised plan of accrediting.[1]

A General Report[2] was published in 1939 and the first edition of the Evaluative Criteria appeared in 1940. The original publications of the Cooperative Study were the product of a six year period of research and experimentation at an expenditure of over $200,000 for this period.[3] During the period from the summer of 1935 to the autumn of 1939,

---

[1]Calvin O. Davis, A History of the North Central Association (Ann Arbor, Michigan: 1945), p. 74.

[2]Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards, Evaluation of Secondary Schools: General Report (Menosha, Wis.: George Banta Publishing Co., 1939).

[3]Editor's Note in article by Carl A. Jessen, "The Revised Evaluative Criteria," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXIV (October, 1950), p. 70.

the Evaluative Criteria was revised six times. No two of the six revisions were identical although several had only minor variations.[1]

The Evaluative Criteria -- Changes in Editions

Subsequent revised editions were published in 1950 and 1960. The 1950 Edition of the Evaluative Criteria, while holding fast to fundamentals such as self-evaluation, guiding principles, and checklist and evaluation items, was notably different from the 1940 Edition. Not one page of the original 1940 Edition was salvaged for reproduction in the 1950 Edition.[2] Nothing was retained except as it had proved itself useful in evaluations during the years from 1940 to 1947. The revision program lasted two and one-half years and cost approximately $40,000 plus donated time of probably as great or greater value.[3]

At a meeting of the General Committee of the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards held in October, 1954, it was decided that the pattern of the 1960 Evaluative Criteria

---

[1] Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards, loc. cit., p. 64.

[2] Jessen, loc. cit., p. 222.

[3] Carl A. Jessen, "The Revised Evaluative Criteria," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXIV (October, 1950), p. 74.

would not be radically changed from that followed in the 1950 Edition. It was emphasized that research findings, the experience of committee members and others who had used the earlier editions, and the continued and increasing popularity of the materials as demonstrated by sales--all sustained the viewpoint that no fundamental change should be made in the pattern of evaluation.[1]

Early in the fall of 1955, forty-seven national organizations were asked to help with the revision by appointing a committee to examine the appropriate section of the 1950 Edition of the Evaluative Criteria and make any recommendations which would improve the materials. This procedure was used because it was thought that the specialists in these organizations would be more familiar with developments in their fields of special interest and would be able to evaluate research, literature, or criticism in these fields more effectively than those not so well qualified.

The revision program, which resulted in the 1960 Edition of the Evaluative Criteria, utilized persons who had

---

[1]Carl A. Jessen, "Revision of the Evaluative Criteria," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLII (May, 1958), p. 2.

both extensive and intensive experience with its content and application. Included among these persons were state chairmen of regional accrediting associations, personnel from schools which were evaluated, chairmen of visiting committees which evaluated schools, and professors of education who conducted teacher education courses on evaluation. Thus, Jessen describes the Evaluative Criteria as a "product of many men and many minds."[1]

Currently, revision of the 1960 Edition is in progress and will result in a revised edition for 1970.

## The Evaluative Criteria - Extent of usage

The Evaluative Criteria has been used by thousands of high schools across the country and tens of thousands of teachers and principals.[2] For many years, three of the regional accrediting associations, namely the North Central Association, the Southern Association, and the Middle States Association have required that secondary schools applying for initial accreditation by these organizations undergo a self-evaluation of their secondary school programs, employing the Evaluative Criteria.

---

[1]Jessen, loc. cit., p. 5. [2]Carrothers, op. cit., p. 178.

It has also been used in many foreign countries. In 1957, Matthews[1] reported that an Arabic edition had been developed and tried out in Egypt. A modified edition has been used in schools in India and adapted translations in Cuba and Japan.[2]

In several states, instruments for evaluating elementary schools are now being used extensively. The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools has developed checklists for evaluating elementary schools which bear a close similarity to the Evaluative Criteria.[3] Another self-evaluative instrument for elementary schools which is very similar to the Evaluative Criteria is entitled Criteria For Evaluation Of Catholic Elementary Schools,[4] published in 1965.

---

[1]Roderic D. Matthews, "What Are Effective Ways of Evaluating the Secondary School?" The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLI (April, 1957), p. 21.

[2]National Study of Secondary School Evaluation, Evaluative Criteria (1960 Edition; Washington, D.C.: 1960), p. 3.

[3]Morgan R. Owens, "Report on the Use of the Evaluative Criteria," The North Central Association Quarterly, XXVII (October, 1952), p. 234.

[4]Elementary School Department of the National Catholic Educational Association, Criteria Committee, Criteria For Evaluation Of Catholic Elementary Schools (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1965).

In the spring and summer of 1962, the Evaluative Criteria for Junior High Schools[1] was developed to meet an increasing demand for materials more directly related to the junior high school. This newly developed, self-evaluative instrument reveals a striking similarity in basic organization and procedures to that of the 1960 Edition of the Evaluative Criteria.

Sales of the 1950 Edition of the Evaluative Criteria exceeded $100,000 within two years after its appearance.[2] Although no figures are available presently for the sales of the 1960 Edition, current indications point to the fact that its usage is rapidly increasing. Until recently, the Middle States Association made more extensive use of this self-evaluative instrument than any of the other regional associations, since they were the first to require that each member school undergo a complete evaluation periodically.[3] However, a significant increase in its use was automatically assured by the fact that, beginning in September, 1965, the North Central Association, which services a nineteen state

---

[1] National Study of Secondary School Evaluation, Evaluative Criteria for Junior High Schools (Washington, D.C.: 1963).

[2] Carl A. Jessen, "The Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards: Twentieth Birthday," School and Society, LXXVIII (October 31, 1953), p. 141.

[3] Owens, loc. cit.

area, required that all 3,730 of its member secondary schools undergo a self-evaluation at least once every seven years. These schools were instructed to use the Evaluative Criteria or some other instrument approved by the Secondary School Commission of the North Central Association.[1]

It is expected that few North Central Association member schools will employ an instrument other than the Evaluative Criteria for the following reasons:

1. The North Central Association, through the work of individuals affiliated with its member secondary schools and colleges, played a primary role in the development of the original 1940 Edition and subsequent 1950 and 1960 Editions of the Evaluative Criteria.
2. This association has employed the Evaluative Criteria extensively in the past.
3. Schools wishing to employ a different self-evaluative instrument must first obtain approval of the Secondary School Commission of the North Central Association.[2]

---

[1] North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Policies and Criteria for the Approval of Secondary Schools, Policy III4, p. 2.

[2] Ibid.

4. Few other self-evaluative instruments exist and none of these enjoys a degree of popularity comparable to that of the Evaluative Criteria.

Although it was initially designed to serve primarily a selective function for admission of new member schools to the regional accrediting associations and still serves this purpose, the Evaluative Criteria is now used and will likely continue to be used more extensively as a means of self-improvement for high school programs.

## Methods for evaluation of high schools

### Employment of standards

For many years, regional accrediting associations had used standards, primarily quantitative in nature, as the only basis for judging the educational quality of member schools and those wishing to apply for membership. These standards specified such items as the minimum preparation required in subject matter for classroom teachers, the minimum amount of money to be spent annually for libraries, and the minimum number of units to be required for graduation. However, these associations increasingly recognized these limitations of emphasizing adherence to

standards as a sole means of judging the quality of an educational program:[1]

1. Standards tended to become mechanical rather than vital--to stress the letter and overlook the spirit of education.
2. Standards tended to become rigid, lacking the desirable flexibility to make them suited to different types and sizes of schools with varied problems and objectives.
3. They tended to become deadening rather than stimulating--to encourage uniformity rather than diversity--to retard rather than to promote pioneering and adventurous experimentation.
4. Standards failed to take into account some of the more modern viewpoints in education, particularly as concerns the marked individual differences among pupils and the desirability of developing educational programs to meet their individual needs.
5. They were narrowly academic rather than broadly comprehensive.

---

[1]Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards, Evaluation of Secondary Schools - Supplementary Reprints (Washington, D.C.: 1939), p. 6.

6. Both the standards and the methods by which they had been applied were based to a considerable extent on untested assumptions and opinions without sufficient evaluation by scientific procedures.

Having experienced the above limitations, the regional accrediting associations revised their standards and charged the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards with the responsibility of establishing additional means for measuring the quality of secondary school programs and providing directions for their improvement. Particularly since 1939, the standards have been revised extensively and are no longer employed as a sole means of judging the quality of an educational program; it seems likely that these two factors are primarily responsible for the reduced criticism of the employment of standards since that date.

Beginning in 1936, the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards applied a combination of five evaluative factors to 200 carefully chosen schools, both public and private, in all parts of these United States.[1] These five

---

[1] Walter C. Eells, "Combination of Evaluative Factors and Their Use in Judging and Stimulating Schools," Evaluation of Secondary Schools - Supplementary Reprints, Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards, (Washington, D.C.: 1939), p. 18.

factors were:

1. Judgments of visiting committees on the school as a whole.
2. Growth in student knowledge as measured by standardized tests.
3. Measurement of the success of both graduates and non-graduates of the school.
4. Judgments of parents and pupils.
5. Scores on a self-evaluation employing the Evaluative Criteria.

Judgments of visiting committees

Visiting committees, consisting of three experienced educators on each committee, were assigned to one of four geographical areas throughout the United States. From two to seven days, depending upon the size of the school, were required for visiting and studying each of the 200 schools. Administrators of the schools visited felt that decided benefits resulted from these evaluations.[1] This method is still employed today in combination with a self-evaluation

---

[1]Walter C. Eells, "Can Experts Judge Secondary Schools?" School Executive, LVII (December, 1937), p. 149.

by members of the school staff, employing the Evaluative Criteria. The principal unfavorable criticisms that were received from administrators were based upon a frequently expressed feeling that the time which could be spent in any one school by a visiting committee was too short for a complete evaluation and for the greatest helpfulness to the school. However, the visiting committee members themselves "felt that they had been able to secure a fairly satisfactory basis for an evaluation, although they could doubtless have helped the individual schools more if they could have taken time to discuss fully their impressions and evaluations with the administrator and staff and to make appropriate recommendations for improvement in the individual schools."[1] Eells concludes that the method of committee visitation is a necessary and important method.

Standardized tests

In the fall of 1936 and the spring of 1937, the Cooperative Study conducted a testing program involving more than 17,000 pupils in 200 secondary schools in the

---

[1] Ibid.

United States.[1] Its primary purpose was to serve as one of the independent measures against which the evaluations which comprise the Evaluative Criteria were to be checked; the testing program was used as one factor in checking the validity of the criteria and in helping to determine which of the many items in the criteria were most significant in distinguishing between better and poorer schools. However, the possibility was kept in mind that testing of the growth in pupil knowledge, if properly conducted, might be used as one of the methods of accreditation in judging the quality of a secondary school.

The primary problem encountered with this method was the great variation between the growth of different pupils as measured by their tests and scales. Differences in growth appeared to be due to five distinguishable factors:[2]

1. Differences in the scholastic ability of the pupils.
2. Differences in amounts of preparation of the pupils before the first testing.
3. Differences in the type and number of courses the pupils took between the first and second testing.

---

[1] Kenneth W. Eells, "The Testing Program of the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards," Evaluation of Secondary Schools - Supplementary Reprints, Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards, (Washington, D.C.: 1939), p. 2.

[2] Ibid.

4. Differences in the position on the first test scale from which the measured growth occurred.
5. Differences in the quality of the teaching and other school experiences with which the pupil had been in contact between the first and second testing.

As a result, the Cooperative Study recommended that standard test procedures not be used for accreditation purposes in determining the quality of a secondary school program. However, it encouraged schools to use tests of ability, achievement, and attitudes for local diagnostic and guidance purposes.[1]

The above reference to the experience of the Cooperative Study in attempting to establish a positive relationship between school quality and growth in pupil knowledge is not meant to imply that any other effort with a similar purpose, regardless of its nature, would experience similar results.

Success of graduates and non-graduates

In an attempt to measure the quality of a school by the degree of success of its products, the Cooperative Study

---

[1]Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards, How to Evaluate a Secondary School. (1940 Edition; Washington, D.C.), p. 65.

divided the follow-up of former pupils into two major studies. One of these dealt with the success of those who continued in school after graduation from high school and the other with the success of those, both graduates and non-graduates, for whom the high school was the last school attended.[1]

Evaluation was made of the students' success in college as measured by the average scholarship mark of 13,000 graduates from 200 cooperating schools, the number being about equally divided between those who were graduated in 1932 and 1936. However, the four factors listed below greatly complicated any attempt to measure the degree of excellence of a high school by the records of its graduates in college:[2]

1. The great variance in student ability.
2. A high school that sends its graduates largely to institutions maintaining high scholarship standards must expect to have a record of college success below that secured by a high school whose graduates attend institutions with lower requirements.

---

[1] Carl A. Jessen, "Success of the Product of the School," Evaluation of Secondary Schools - Supplementary Reprints, Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards, (Washington, D.C.: 1939), p. 9.

[2] Ibid.

3. Scholarship marks in college admittedly is a subjective measure which varies greatly from institution to institution.
4. Even if one could adequately measure college success, one would still have a very incomplete measure of the product of secondary schools since normally not more than 45 percent of the high school graduates continue their formal education beyond high school.

An even greater problem was encountered in finding defensible measures of success of those students for whom high school was the last school attended.

The Cooperative Study recommended that, for local use, schools make follow-up studies of the subsequent careers and success, both academic and non-academic, of all graduates and former pupils, for those who go on to higher educational institutions as well as for those who do not. However, these studies were not required as part of the regular evaluative procedures in connection with the Evaluative Criteria.[1]

---

[1] Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards, loc. cit.

Judgments of parents and pupils

The Cooperative Study considered the judgments of parents and pupils regarding the quality of their school as of sufficient importance to use them as two possible factors in the measurement of the school. In 1937, judgments were obtained from 17,000 pupils on guidance, pupil activity, and other phases of school life; judgments were obtained from 7,000 parents of seniors concerning twelve different aspects of the secondary schools attended by their sons and daughters.[1]

Analysis of the data revealed that this method of attempting to measure the quality of a school has inherent difficulties. Misunderstanding, ignorance, and trivial causes are responsible for a very large fraction of the unfavorable criticisms made of schools. Also, personal traits and personal relationships, which involve emotional forces, influence the likes and dislikes of both pupils and parents.[2]

---

[1] M. L. Altstetter, "Judgments of Parents and Pupils," Evaluation of Secondary Schools - Supplementary Reprints, Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards, (Washington, D.C.: 1939), p. 13.

[2] Ibid.

On the basis of their experience with this proposed method of evaluation, the Cooperative Study recommended that this method be employed by schools for the additional light these judgments may throw on local problems and methods of improvement, but that pupil and parent judgment not be required as part of the regular evaluative procedures in connection with the Evaluative Criteria.[1]

## Self-evaluation employing the Evaluative Criteria

The idea of an institutional self-study is not new. W. H. Cowley[2] of Stanford University cites a self-study of the organization of Yale University in 1701. Numerous grants by the Ford Fund for the Advancement of Education and other foundations have provided the incentive for many colleges and universities to engage in extensive self-examination. At the secondary school level, much of the impetus for extensive self-evaluation has been supplied by the six regional associations.

The process of self-evaluation is not employed solely as a means of avoiding the inherent difficulties associated

---

[1] Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards, loc. cit.

[2] Paul L. Dressel and Associates, Evaluation in Higher Education (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961), p. 393.

with other evaluation methods. Numerous articles have been written which claim specific educational benefits that result to schools which have undergone the self-evaluative process, employing the Evaluative Criteria. Following is a summarization of the school improvements most commonly claimed for the self-evaluation process, employing the Evaluative Critera, as found in the literature:

1. It provides an impetus for critical self-analysis and self-improvement. It motivates school faculties to examine themselves and their school programs carefully, to recognize educational shortcomings and needs, and to see ways and means of bringing about improvement.[1]
2. It helps to filter out and crystallize dissatisfactions which eventually give rise to curriculum improvement and needed organizational and administrative changes.[2]
3. The Evaluative Criteria challenges school faculties to seek improvement through experimentation.[3]

---

[1]Donald C. Manlove, "Self-Study and Visitation for All Member Schools," The North Central Association Quarterly, XXXIX (Winter, 1965), p. 235.

[2]Ibid. [3]Ibid.

4. It creates an "esprit de corps" that makes the seeking of improvement permeate the entire administration and staff. Each teacher is increasingly aware of the fact that he has a stake in determining the school curriculum.[1]

5. It provides a foundation for future planning and growth.[2]

6. Teachers gain an increased knowledge of the overall program of the school.[3]

7. It results in increased acquisition of needed physical facilities and personnel.[4]

8. Teachers increasingly employ self-evaluation in regard to their own teaching performance. As a result, improvements in teaching methods and procedures are evident.[5]

9. Schools which have employed the Evaluative Criteria

---

[1] Ibid., p. 236. [2] Ibid.

[3] Laurence E. Ely, "Teachers' Reactions to School Evaluations Using Evaluative Criteria," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLIII (December, 1959), p. 42.

[4] Ibid.

[5] John Edward Ricart Jr., "A Survey of Actions Taken on Recommendations Resulting from the Evaluations of the Pittsburgh Public Secondary Schools" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1956).

become increasingly conscious of the need for adaptation, addition, extension, and improvement of the program of studies.[1]

10. It stimulates a professional conversation among the faculty.[2]

11. Generally, a more cooperative attitude among staff members is developed by the self-evaluation.[3]

12. Individual teachers gain a clearer understanding of the educational problems in areas other than their particular teaching field.[4]

However, as an instrument for self-evaluation, the Evaluative Criteria has also been subjected to the following criticisms:

1. The checklists for evaluating instruction tend to equate matters of great importance with many which

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Evaluation Guide for Secondary Schools, p. 3.

[3] Roderic D. Matthews, "Reactions of Administrators After Evaluation With Materials Developed by the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLII (May, 1958), p. 22.

[4] Ibid.

are of lesser importance or even inconsequential.[1]

2. Questions have been raised concerning the necessity for its length. Manlove, in a personal letter addressed to the researcher, stated that "it is evident from reactions which I have gotten personally and also from the reactions I have received from various surveys that the Evaluative Criteria is, in some instances, perhaps too bulky."[2]

3. Doubt has been expressed regarding the validity of the Evaluative Criteria ratings as measures of the general quality of a school's program. Edwards[3] found low correlations between the ratings of visiting committees on the Evaluative Criteria and per-pupil cost.

4. Some of the items in the Evaluative Criteria have been characterized as ambiguous.[4]

---

[1]James R. Squire, "Evaluating High School English Programs," The North Central Association Quarterly, XL (Winter, 1966), p. 253.

[2]Letter from Donald C. Manlove, State Chairman, Indiana State Committee, North Central Association, May 9, 1966.

[3]Charles W. Edwards, "Evaluative Criteria -- Let's Improve Our Use of It," The North Central Association Quarterly, XXXIX (Winter, 1965), p. 240.

[4]Matthews, loc. cit., p. 25.

5. Evaluators have commented about the difficulty of judging their own work without bias.[1]

The judgments of the principals of the 200 schools, of seventy-five visiting committeemen, and of twelve members of the Executive Committee and professional staff of the Cooperative Study were used to suggest what weights should be given to each evaluative factor in securing a final, composite quality ranking of all the schools. The weights suggested were as follows:[2]

1. Scores on the Evaluative Criteria ..... 40%
2. Judgments of visiting committees on school as a whole . . . ..... 20%
3. Growth as measured by standardized tests..... 20%
4. Success of the product of the school..... 10%
   Pupils later entering college
   Pupils not entering college
5. Judgments of pupils..... 6%
   Judgments of parents..... 4%

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Walter C. Eells, "Combination of Evaluative Factors and Their Use in Judging and Stimulating Schools," loc. cit., p. 19.

As noted in the preceding paragraphs, items 3, 4, and 5 above were not incorporated as a part of the regular evaluative procedure employing the Evaluative Criteria. The Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards interpreted the self-evaluation employing the Evaluative Criteria and the judgment of a visiting committee as being more accurate measurements of the quality of a secondary school program. These two factors are still emphasized as being of primary importance.

In view of the great expenditures in terms of time, effort, and money devoted to the Evaluative Criteria since the first 1940 Edition, it is submitted that an attempt to determine its effectiveness as a stimulus for school improvement is of crucial importance. The stated benefits of the required self-evaluative process would seem necessary, at least to a large degree, to justify the above expenditures.

No study of this type, using personnel in Michigan schools, has ever been attempted.

## Procedure

A total of fifteen Michigan high schools served as respondents for this study. Eleven of these schools, those which completed a self-evaluation of their educational

programs employing the Evaluative Criteria, 1960 Edition, during the 1966-67 school year, constitute the experimental group of this study. The remaining four schools, those which have not completed the Evaluative Criteria for at least the past ten years, constitute the control group. Two written questionnaires were administered to select classroom teachers in each school in both the experimental and control groups. By comparing differences in response between teachers in the experimental schools with teachers in control schools, an effort was made to determine the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria as a stimulus for school improvement.

## Selection of respondent schools

### The experimental group

During the 1966-67 school year, forty-three high schools in Michigan, all members of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, completed a self-evaluation of their high school programs, employing the Evaluative Criteria, 1960 Edition. Eleven of these forty-three schools were selected to represent the experimental group. Of the forty-three schools, only eleven met the following criteria employed for selection:

1. Respondent schools must be public rather than private or parochial schools. It was felt that organizational procedures in private and parochial schools, particularly as they relate to curriculum planning, oftentimes differ significantly from those of public schools.
2. In school districts having more than one high school which completed the Evaluative Criteria during the 1966-67 school year, only one of the schools was selected. It was felt that two or more high schools in the same school district would reveal a greater similarity in operational procedures than individual schools in separate districts, thus tending to produce more similar findings regarding the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria.
3. High schools selected were either those which did not begin their self-evaluation prior to September, 1966, or those which did no more than orient their teaching staffs to the nature of the Evaluative Criteria. It was felt that, in schools which had progressed beyond the orientation stage, teachers participating in the self-evaluation may have already

been influenced by the Evaluative Criteria so as to respond differently to questions regarding the educational program of their school.

Each of the eleven experimental schools was placed into one of four divisions. Schools within each division were matched as closely as possible in terms of student enrollment in the high school grades and the number of classroom teachers who were eligible to complete the questionnaires. It was felt that these two factors particularly could influence the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria and the nature of the responses to the items contained in the written questionnaires. The number of high schools in each school district, the grade organization of each high school, and the percentage of new teachers in each high school were felt to be less significant regarding their possible influence on the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria. However, information on the above three factors is included in the division assignment of schools.[1]

Each of the first three divisions consists of three high schools. Division I schools employed 64-71 teachers

---

[1]See Appendix, Table 1, pages 157-59, for division assignments and basic data concerning the eleven Michigan high schools which constitute the experimental group in this study.

and enrolled 2060-2165 students; those in division II employed 44-58 teachers and enrolled 1604-1755 students; division III schools employed 35-46 teachers and enrolled 903-1159 students; the two high schools in division IV employed 29-33 teachers and enrolled 745-894 students. The above numbers of teachers include only those who taught at least three classes on a regular basis and those who taught at least one semester during the previous school year, 1965-66. Furthermore, teachers of special education were excluded.

The control group

Four Michigan high schools were chosen to represent the control group of this study. Each of these four schools served as the control school in one of the four divisions of experimental schools.[1]

It was felt that four control schools was an adequate number for the purposes of this study. Criteria employed for their selection were as follows:

1. Schools selected were either those which had never

---

[1]See Appendix, Table 1, pages 157-59, for basic data concerning the four Michigan high schools which constitute the control group in this study.

employed the Evaluative Criteria or those in which the principal did not know whether his school had ever employed this self-evaluative instrument.

2. Schools which planned to undertake an extensive curriculum study or effect basic changes in their educational program during the 1966-67 school year were eliminated. Only those schools which anticipated a "normal" year in the above sense were considered.
3. The control schools approximated as closely as possible the mean student enrollment and the mean number of classroom teachers eligible to complete the questionnaires for the experimental schools in each of their four divisions.

Selection of teachers

The researcher administered two written questionnaires to select classroom teachers in each of the fifteen respondent schools. The following criteria were employed for teacher selection:

1. Teachers were those persons who taught at least three classroom periods on a regular basis. This was felt to be necessary in order to maximize

their experience.

2. The questionnaires were not administered to those persons who taught classes only in the area of special education, since the Evaluative Criteria makes no reference to this field.
3. Teachers were those who had a minimum of one semester's teaching experience in the school during the previous school year. Teachers with less than the above amount of teaching experience in their respective schools were considered to be unqualified to answer many of the items contained in the questionnaires.
4. Teachers in the experimental group were those who served on at least one of the section committees of the Evaluative Criteria.

## The questionnaires

### The control group

The researcher administered the same questionnaire on two separate occasions to eligible classroom teachers in each of the four high schools representing the control group.[1]

---

[1] See Parts I and II of the questionnaire on pages 165-75 of the Appendix.

The first administration occurred between September 19 and October 5 of 1966 and the second between March 6 and May 4 of 1967.[1]

Part I, labeled "General Information," contained five questions (numbered one through five) related primarily to the educational background of the respondent. These questions served a twofold purpose: (1) to identify the two questionnaires completed by each teacher, (2) to determine what relationship existed between the responses to subsequent questions and the educational background of the respondent.

Part II contained twenty-one questions (numbered six through twenty-six). The general purpose of these questions was to obtain information regarding the teachers' impressions of the educational program in their school. Questions six through eight relate to the school's philosophy and objectives; questions nine through twelve are concerned with specific course objectives and courses of study; questions thirteen through eighteen and question twenty (a total of seven questions) deal with the teachers' knowledge of the school program; question twenty-one relates to the effectiveness of subject area departments; questions twenty-two

---

[1]See Appendix, Table 2, pages 160-61, for administration dates of questionnaires for control schools.

through twenty-four are concerned with the role of the classroom teachers in curriculum development; questions twenty-five and twenty-six deal with the extent to which teachers engage in self-evaluation of their teaching performance.

Total differences in the teachers' responses to the items in Part II of the questionnaire were determined for individual control schools and these schools as a group. The chi-square method of statistical analysis was applied to determine the significance of the change in responses for all teachers in the four control schools, as presented in Chapter III.

The experimental group

Between September 1 and October 11 of 1966, the researcher administered a questionnaire to eligible classroom teachers in each of the eleven experimental schools. This questionnaire was identical to the one employed for teachers in the control schools. The earliest possible dates were selected since it seemed imperative that teachers in the experimental schools should not have made much progress, if any, with their self-evaluation. If more than minimal progress had already been made in an experimental school, it was felt that the Evaluative Criteria and its process of

self-evaluation may have already influenced teachers' opinions regarding their educational programs, thus possibly causing them to respond differently to some of the questionnaire items.

A second questionnaire was administered to teachers in the experimental schools before the termination of the 1966-67 school year and after each school had completed the Evaluative Criteria.[1] The complete evaluation of a high school, as recommended by the National Study of Secondary School Evaluation, also requires the services of a visiting committee. The purpose of the visiting committee, composed of experienced educators, is to provide a check on the self-evaluation carried out by the school staff.[2] In ten of the eleven schools in the experimental group, the second questionnaire was not administered until after a visiting committee, which varied in size from eleven to twenty-two members, spent one and one-half days in each of the schools, observing the total high school educational program. One of the experimental schools, school H, was not examined by

---

[1] See Appendix, Table 2, pages 160-61, for administration dates of questionnaires for experimental schools.

[2] National Study of Secondary School Evaluation, Evaluative Criteria, loc. cit., p. 9.

a visiting committee since this high school will be discontinued at the conclusion of the 1968-69 school year.

The only difference between the first and second questionnaires was that the second contained an additional section labeled Part III.[1] Questions in Part III had the specific purpose of soliciting teachers' opinions concerning the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria as it was employed in their school. No reference was made to the Evaluative Criteria in Parts I and II.

Total differences in the teachers' responses to the items in Part II of the questionnaire were determined for individual experimental schools and for all of the eleven experimental schools. The chi-square method of statistical analysis was applied to determine the significance of the change in responses by all teachers in the eleven experimental schools. By comparing these differences in response between teachers in experimental schools with teachers in control schools, an attempt was made to determine the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria as a stimulus for school improvement.

---

[1] See Appendix, pages 176-79, for a copy of Part III of the questionnaire.

Opinions of teachers in the experimental group regarding the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria, as obtained from responses to questions in Part III of the questionnaire, were compared with its effectiveness as determined by differences in response between the items contained in Part II.

On June 1, 1966, the questionnaire containing Parts I, II, and III was administered on a trial basis to thirteen classroom teachers in a Michigan high school. Teachers in this particular school had just completed a self-evaluation of their educational program, employing the Evaluative Criteria. As a result of this trial experience, the following changes were made in the questionnaire:

1. One sentence on the introductory sheet stated that the results of this study, for those who wished to receive them, would be made available at a later date. This sentence was eliminated.
2. Applying to questions one through three, a brief statement was added relative to the differentiation in meaning between a school's statement of philosophy and statement of objectives.

Although principals were given some general information concerning the purpose of this study, teachers were told

only that it was concerned with their impressions of the educational program of their school. Teachers were not informed that a second questionnaire was to be administered until shortly before the scheduled date of its administration. Furthermore, since the author continually works with the Evaluative Criteria in his position as Assistant State Chairman of the Michigan State Committee of the North Central Association, he was introduced only by name. It was felt that adherence to these three procedures would increase the likelihood of more valid teacher responses, minimizing the possibility that teachers might give what they felt to be the expected response.

## Delimitations

This study was limited to the investigation of the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria, 1960 Edition, as a stimulus for school improvement in eleven Michigan high schools. These schools do not constitute a representative sample of public high schools in Michigan. Therefore, results of this study should be interpreted only in relation to high schools included in this study and other Michigan schools which may be similar to those included in this report, both in regard to the nature of the schools and the methods

employed for completion of the self-evaluation employing the Evaluative Criteria.

## CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE RELATIVE TO THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

The products of education reflect the ultimate objectives of the educational enterprise. Inherent difficulties associated with attempts to measure the products of education, as previously referred to in Chapter I, have undoubtedly contributed toward the increasing tendency to evaluate the structure of the school system and the processes going on within it by means of a self-evaluative instrument such as the Evaluative Criteria. These evaluations involve assumptions that certain educational structures or processes will produce the desired end products.

Hagen and Thorndike[1] state that the trend toward self-evaluation may produce desirable educational outcomes in terms of sensitizing school personnel to deficiencies in their present procedures and encouraging them to make innovations and improvements. However, they further state that "concentration upon procedures to be developed or applied by local personnel seems unlikely to result in the development of technically superior evaluation instruments."[2]

---

[1] Hagen and Thorndike, op. cit., p. 485. [2] Ibid.

Noting the increased usage of the Evaluative Criteria, Edwards[1] suggests that it may be appropriate at this time to raise questions about its effectiveness. What is the function of the Evaluative Criteria? Can its use be improved? Since the original study in the 1930's, no major attempt has been made to validate the use of the Evaluative Criteria as an instrument for rating schools.

A review of the literature relative to the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria revealed that topics can be grouped as follows:

1. The adequacy of selected procedures developed for administering the Evaluative Criteria.
2. Teachers' reactions to school evaluations employing the Evaluative Criteria.
3. Administrators' reactions to school evaluations employing the Evaluative Criteria.
4. The degree of relationship between Evaluative Criteria ratings of selected aspects of a secondary school and ratings of these same aspects secured from measures external to the Evaluative Criteria.
5. School improvements that resulted from employment of the Evaluative Criteria.

---

[1]Edwards, loc. cit., p. 238.

## Adequacy of Selected Procedures

In 1959 Martin[1] mailed a questionnaire to staff members who had participated in self-evaluations of their high school educational programs in Oregon. The primary purpose of his research was to determine teachers' impressions of the adequacy of selected procedures developed for administering the Evaluative Criteria self-study in Oregon high schools.

After analyzing returns from 679 staff members (85 percent of the returns were usable), Martin indicated the following:

1. The self-evaluation procedures were considered adequate by 79.5 percent of the school staff respondents.
2. The self-evaluation procedure considered least adequate was in regard to the orientation of the school staff. It was indicated that the period of orientation of the school staff should be increased.
3. Approximately 80 percent of the respondents indicated that the self-evaluation contributed to a better understanding of the total school program.

---

[1]Clyde Melvin Martin, "The Adequacy of Selected Procedures Developed for Administering the Evaluative Criteria Study in Oregon," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Oregon State College, 1959).

4. Agreement with the statement that significant improvements in the school program had resulted from the self-evaluation employing the Evaluative Criteria was indicated by 62.3 percent of the school staff members; 11.6 percent indicated disagreement and approximately 23 percent were undecided.
5. Approximately 70 percent of the school staff respondents indicated that the Evaluative Criteria should be recommended to other school staffs. Only 7 percent would not recommend its use.

## Reactions of Teachers

In 1954-55 Ely[1] obtained opinions of teachers regarding the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria as it was applied in the self-evaluation of their respective schools. A written questionnaire was administered by the researcher to 613 teachers in eighteen public high schools in New Jersey.

His findings were as follows:

1. Approximately 80 percent of the teachers believed that the self-evaluation resulted in benefits to them as teachers. The most frequently mentioned benefits were self-evaluation and self-analysis, increased knowledge of the total school program, and encouragement for self-improvement.

---

[1]Ely, op. cit., pp. 38-43.

2. Approximately 88 percent of the teachers felt that it resulted in definite benefits to their schools. The most frequently mentioned benefits to the schools were acquisition of needed physical facilities, addition of needed personnel, and an increased awareness of school needs by school board members and citizens in the community.
3. Very few teachers identified undesirable effects of the self-evaluation either on the teacher or on the school.

## Reactions of Administrators

In 1957, by means of a written questionnaire, Matthews[1] obtained the reactions of principals, supervising principals, or superintendents of 183 high schools whose teaching staffs had completed a self-evaluation of their high school program, employing the Evaluative Criteria. Each school was accredited by one of five regional accrediting associations represented in the sample; twenty returns were from schools accredited by the New England Association, fifty-eight from the Middle

---

[1] Matthews, loc. cit., pp. 7-27.

States Association, thirty-six from the North Central Association, fifty-four from the Southern Association, and fifteen from the Northwest Association.

One of the questions made reference to how the teaching staff felt about the evaluation. Following this question were two identical checklists, one headed "before" and the other "after." Respondents were asked to check one of five words: "antagonistic," "lukewarm," "skeptical," "favorable," and "enthusiastic." Two or more words were checked on a few questionnaires.

Staff attitudes were characterized as "antagonistic" before the evaluation by 4 percent of the respondents and after the evaluation by 1 percent; 26 percent checked "lukewarm" before and 6 percent after; 25 percent checked "skeptical" before and 11 percent after; 45 percent checked "favorable" before and 62 percent after; 13 percent checked "enthusiastic" before and 21 percent after. An analysis to show the number and extent of the shifts in attitude was not made, but Matthews concluded it was clear that the trend was toward more favorable attitudes following the experience of an evaluation if those who responded to the questionnaire accurately described the attitudes of the teaching staffs of the schools.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 21.

Matthews reported that a similar shift occured in 1948, although at that time a three point list was used -- "favorable," "unfavorable," and "undecided." The shifts were from 40 percent "favorable" to 92 percent, 30 percent "unfavorable" to 3 percent, and 30 percent "undecided" to 5 percent.[1]

In his 1957 research project, Matthews also asked respondents to name results of the evaluation, either achieved or in process, by identifying steps taken to improve the work of the school. This statement was followed by a list of twenty items which could be checked. Several blank spaces were provided for listing results other than those specified.

In the case of 60 percent of those who returned questionnaires, it was checked that "teachers developed self-challenging attitudes"; 48 percent, "better guidance programs"; 44 percent, "in-service training program established" and "certain undesirable practices discontinued"; 43 percent, "improved use of the library"; 40 percent, "more professional books and magazines in teachers' library"; 30 percent, "better home-room programs" and "follow-up study of drop outs undertaken"; 26 percent, "follow-up study of graduates undertaken"; 25 percent, "more cooperation between staff

---

[1] Ibid., p.22.

and pupils"; 24 percent, "faculty committee given school time for curriculum studies"; 23 percent, "more emphasis on needs of academic pupils"; 21 percent, "more opportunities for teachers to visit other schools," "more opportunity for teachers to attend professional conferences," and "departments re-organized"; 20 percent checked the item "plans for a new building."

In addition to the above indications of improvement resulting from completion of the Evaluative Criteria self-study, many of the respondents described other outgrowths of the experience. Examples are: "Curriculum revision undertaken -- more emphasis on the brighter student"; "teachers made aware of the need for constant re-evaluation"; "closer feeling among faculty who worked together on this"; "generally, a more cooperative attitude developed by self-evaluation"; "clearer understanding by individual teachers of the educational problems in areas other than their particular field" and many others.

In another section of this same questionnaire, respondents were asked: "In your judgment (a) what was the most satisfactory characteristic of this method of evaluating a school? and (b) what was the least satisfactory characteristic of this method of evaluating a school?" Of the total

of 183 schools, 161 respondents answered part (a) and 126 answered part (b).

The ideas common in the "most satisfactory characteristics" were the staff members' increased understanding of the entire school program and their greater appreciation of the quality and nature of what other staff members were doing. Some spoke highly of the improved quality of cooperation among the staff while others thought that many were stimulated to do better than previously.[1]

Of the 126 schools which described the weaknesses of the self-evaluation, a number felt that too much time was required of the faculty for the evaluation in terms of results achieved. Comments were made about ambiguity in the Evaluative Criteria items, the artificial atmosphere in which the evaluation was conducted, and the difficulty of judging one's work without bias.[2]

The above study supports a statement by Jessen that "the school thus evaluated goes through a process which can be, and usually is, highly stimulating and inspiring. Unsolicited letters frequently come to the Cooperative Study from educators who express their satisfaction and enthusiasm for the values which have come to their schools and to them

---

[1] Ibid., p. 23. [2] Ibid., p. 25.

personally from participation in one or more evaluations."[1]

## Relationship between Evaluative Criteria Ratings and External Measures

In an attempt to determine the relationships between Evaluative Criteria ratings and other measures of effectiveness of selected high schools, Edwards[2] studied eighteen Iowa high schools that had employed the Evaluative Criteria during 1960-64 and had been evaluated by a visiting committee of the North Central Association. Four factors external to the Evaluative Criteria were employed as measures of effectiveness of these eighteen high schools: cost per pupil, grade-point averages of graduates engaged in post-high school training, opinions and ratings of their high school programs by those graduates who did not continue their formal education, and test results. All of these factors were then correlated with the ratings made by visiting committees on the Evaluative Criteria items.

---

[1] Jessen, "Revision of the Evaluative Criteria," loc. cit., p. 1.

[2] Charles W. Edwards, "Relationships Between Evaluative Criteria Ratings and Other Measures of Effectiveness of Selected Iowa High Schools," Epsilon Bulletin, Phi Delta Kappa, College of Education, The University of Iowa, XXXIX (1965), pp. 83-84.

Edwards summarizes his results as follows:

1. North Central Association visiting committee evaluations and the high school cost per pupil

   The cost per pupil for the year the school was rated was secured for each school. These costs were adjusted for fluctuating factors and 1963 was employed as the base year.

   The correlation between the composite evaluations of the visiting committee on the Evaluative Criteria and the high school cost per pupil was not large enough to be retained at the .05 level of significance. Although this correlation was positive and larger than correlations obtained for the other three factors, it was not large enough to retain the hypothesis that there was a positive relationship between these two methods of rating schools.

2. Post-high school grade-point average of graduates and North Central Association visiting committee evaluations

   There were no significant correlations at the .05 level between visiting committee ratings on the Evaluative Criteria and the grade-point average of graduates in their first grading period of post-high

school education. Separate analyses were made for (a) those attending colleges and universities, (b) those attending other types of post-high school institutions, (c) the composite of all students in (a) and (b) above.

3. North Central Association visiting committee evaluations and ratings made by graduates not continuing their formal education

There were four phases of the educational program for which the visiting committees' evaluations on the Evaluative Criteria and the ratings made in a written questionnaire completed by graduates not continuing their formal education correlated higher than the 0.47 considered necessary for retention of the hypothesis. These four factors and the correlations were:

(a) the activity program -- 0.59

(b) the social studies program -- 0.49

(c) the social studies physical facilities -- 0.58

(d) the mathematics physical facilities -- 0.56

4. Iowa Tests of Educational Development results and North Central Association visiting committee evaluations

Each school had employed the Iowa Tests of Educational Development. None of the correlations between visiting committee ratings on the Evaluative Criteria and the above test results was large enough to retain the hypothesis that a significant positive relationship exists between them. All were rejected at the .05 level of significance.

Edwards states that long experience in the field plus follow-up studies in schools that have employed the Evaluative Criteria in a self-study procedure have demonstrated that it has value as a guide to local faculties in studying the structure and process of a local educational program. However, he concludes that if the product of the schools is also an important criterion in judging the quality of a school program, then the present study and the earlier study by the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards indicate that the Evaluative Criteria does not function as an instrument for evaluating student achievement. Having observed the results of his study, Edwards concluded that the Evaluative Criteria is not sufficient to evaluate the quality of a total high school program. "There is no way of knowing if the fault lies with the instrument or the method employed

in its use. This is an area in which we need further study."[1]

One must seriously question the conclusions of Edwards. As previously mentioned in Chapter I, the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards experienced numerous difficulties in attempting to evaluate the quality of high schools by such methods as growth in student knowledge as measured by standardized tests, judgments of pupils, and college grade-point averages of high school graduates. Edwards assumes that the above measures are indeed accurate measures of school quality and since the Evaluative Criteria ratings do not correlate significantly with any of them, it is insufficient as an indicator of school quality. Furthermore, neither the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards nor the National Study of Secondary School Evaluation has ever suggested the usage of the Evaluative Criteria as an instrument for evaluating student achievement.

Edwards makes reference to only one study that tends to support any of the four factors he employed as quality indices of the eighteen high schools. Mort and Cornell[2]

---

[1]Edwards, "Evaluative Criteria--Let's Improve Our Use of It," loc. cit., p. 240.

[2]Paul R. Mort and Francis G. Cornell, American Schools in Transition (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1941).

found a positive correlation between quality of schools and cost per pupil.

## School Improvements

During 1951-52, Cope[1] made a follow-up study of improvements that resulted from the use of the Evaluative Criteria in fifteen public secondary schools in Tennessee. Each of the schools completed its self-evaluation at least twelve months prior to Cope's study. Schools were selected on the basis of criteria covering such factors as size of school, geographic distribution, and the type of community.

Objectives of the Evaluative Criteria, previously agreed upon by a State Planning Committee numbering approximately 100 educators, were accompanied by a checklist which was administered to a total of 218 teachers in the fifteen secondary schools. Teachers were asked to indicate the extent to which each objective had been achieved by checking one of the following phrases: "great extent," "some extent," or "little extent."

According to 43 percent of the teachers, the self-evaluation provided a qualitative measurement of the school

---

[1]Quill E. Cope, "After Evaluation -- How Much Improvement?" The Clearing House, XXVII (April, 1953), pp. 451-53.

program to a "great extent"; 12 percent said it was of little value in this respect. Thirty-six percent of the teachers thought that their school was provided with an impartial analysis of their educational program and that suggestions for improvement were made to a "great extent"; 14 percent thought it was of little value in this respect.

The teachers felt that the evaluation program was not successful in promoting better community relations. Only 5 percent of the teachers believed that coordination of school-community effort resulted to a "great extent"; 38 percent felt that the self-evaluation produced little change from this aspect.

Only nine teachers (4 percent) reported that there was greater improvement in community understanding of the school programs while 41 percent said there was very little improvement. Twenty-nine teachers (13 percent) reported great improvement in community support of their educational programs; seventy-eight teachers (36 percent) said the self-evaluation was of little value in this respect.

Only fourteen teachers (6 percent) felt that the self-evaluation was of great value in closing the gap between theory and practice in education; eighty-six teachers (39 percent) said it was of little value in this respect.

Cope believes that this report of teachers' opinions appears to point out three significant implications for self-evaluation programs involving the usage of the Evaluative Criteria.[1] They are:

1. The procedures outlined in the Evaluative Criteria can be of great value in appraising a school program.
2. The procedures followed in these fifteen schools were not highly successful in developing improved school-community relations.
3. The schools did not follow up the findings developed from the self-evaluation; many teachers indicated that the gap between educational theory and practice was not being closed.

In an article specifically intended as a reply to Cope's implications, Devitt[2] points out that the use of the Evaluative Criteria may fail to develop better school-community relations and may fail to close the gap between educational theory and practice in the school program. However, he states that these two weaknesses are not inherent in the instrument itself but may arise from the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 452.

[2] Joseph J. Devitt, "After Evaluation -- Improvement!" The Clearing House, XXVIII (January, 1954), pp. 263-65.

procedures employed in the study. "It seems obvious that if the school conducts the study entirely behind closed doors and takes no steps to acquaint the community with the project, there will be little or no public relations value in the work."[1]

Regarding the problem of failure to improve school-community relations, Devitt relates how four Maine high schools worked to get adequate publicity for their self-evaluation programs and directly involved community members in the study. Relative to failure to put the recommendations resulting from the self-evaluation into practice, he indicates that this is simply a matter between the faculty and its conscience. "If the teachers and the administrators don't put many of the recommendations into practice, nobody else is going to do it for them."[2]

These four Maine secondary schools employed the Evaluative Criteria during the 1951-52 school year. One year later, the Maine State Department of Education conducted a follow-up study to discover the extent to which the gap between educational theory and practice had been closed in these schools.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 263. [2] Ibid.

In May, 1953, opinions of the teachers concerning the status of the recommendations made by Evaluative Criteria committees were as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Total number of recommendations made in the four schools | ..... | 791 |
| Total number judged to be invalid | ..... | 23 (3%) |
| Total number on which action was postponed | ..... | 338 (43%) |
| Total number in process of being completed | ..... | 322 (41%) |
| Total number that had been carried out | ..... | 108 (13%) |

On the basis of the above evidence, Devitt concluded that it is possible, through the use of the Evaluative Criteria, to close appreciably the gap between educational theory and practice.

Ricart[1] interviewed principals of twelve Pittsburgh public secondary schools whose faculties had completed the Evaluative Criteria during periods ranging from December, 1946, to April, 1951. As a result of his study, Ricart concluded that:

1. The self-evaluations were an effective force in stimulating the schools toward a program of continuous self-improvement.

---

[1]Ricart, loc. cit.

2. The schools expressed confidence in the self-evaluation procedure.
3. Improvements in teaching methods were evident.
4. Many imperative alterations, expansions, and remodelings of rooms or portions of the school plant were accomplished.
5. The schools became conscious of the need for adaptation, addition, extension, and improvement of the program of studies.

## Summary

This chapter refers to seven studies which attempted to determine the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria. Three of the studies (Ely, Matthews, and Ricart) solicited opinions of teachers or principals regarding its effectiveness. Cope and Devitt both dealt with a follow-up study of improvements which resulted from usage of the Evaluative Criteria. Martin's study was restricted primarily to teachers' impressions of the adequacy of selected procedures developed for administering the Evaluative Criteria. Edwards attempted to determine the relationship between Evaluative Criteria ratings and other measures of effectiveness of selected high schools.

With the exception of the research by Edwards, the above studies made direct reference to the Evaluative Criteria and obtained opinions of participants in the self-study regarding its effectiveness. Part III of the questionnaire employed in this research utilizes a similar approach. However, twenty questions contained in Part II make no reference to the Evaluative Criteria. Select teachers who participated in the self-study responded to the same twenty questions before the Evaluative Criteria was begun and after it was completed. Differences in teacher response were noted in an attempt to provide further indications of the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria as a stimulus for school improvement.

# CHAPTER III

## PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

In an attempt to answer the fifteen questions presented in Chapter I under Statement of the Problem, this research obtained teachers' perceptions relative to the following five areas of the educational programs in their schools: (1) school philosophy and objectives, (2) course objectives and courses of study, (3) curriculum planning, (4) teacher knowledge of the school program, (5) self-evaluation of teaching performance. Furthermore, teachers in the eleven experimental schools indicated their opinions concerning the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria as it was employed in their school.

Column subheadings of most tables presented in this chapter contain the terms "first questionnaire" and "second questionnaire" for both experimental and control schools. Questions one through twenty-six were identical in both the first and second questionnaires for teachers in both experimental and control schools. The terms "first" and "second" are used only to indicate different dates of administration.[1]

---

[1] See Appendix, Table 2, pages 160-61, for questionnaire administration dates.

A total of 514 teachers (71.1 percent of those eligible) in fifteen Michigan high schools completed both questionnaires. Of this number, 383 teachers (273 males and 146 females) in eleven high schools constitute the experimental group and 131 teachers (72 males and 59 females) in four high schools constitute the control group.[1]

The frequency and percentage of responses to each question were obtained for teachers in each of the fifteen respondent schools, for the 383 teachers in the experimental group, and for the 131 teachers in the control group. Tables in this chapter include responses for all teachers in the experimental group and all teachers in the control group; they do not include separate data indicating responses in each school, since these data would include only a limited number of respondents (among the fifteen respondent schools, the mean number of teachers who completed both written questionnaires was thirty-four).

The chi-square method of statistical analysis was employed to compare the change in responses by teachers in the experimental group with the change in responses by teachers in the control group. No change was considered as

---

[1]See Appendix, Table 3, pages 162-63, for the number of respondents in each high school.

significant unless P measured .05 or less. Corrections were made for frequencies below five by combining the frequencies in adjacent cells.

## School Philosophy and Objectives

Questions six, seven, and eight of the questionnaire were concerned with the written philosophy and objectives employed by each respondent school.

### Teachers' familiarity with philosophy and objectives

The manual of the Evaluative Criteria[1] states that Section B, "Philosophy and Objectives," is one of the two basic sections upon which an evaluation rests. It further states that the committee assigned to complete this section should seek help from other members of the teaching staff and present its report to the entire faculty at least one year before the school is to be evaluated by a visiting committee.

Question six obtained teachers' judgments about their familiarity with the written philosophy and objectives employed in their school. Its purpose was to determine if

---

[1] National Study of Secondary School Evaluation, loc. cit., p. 8.

teachers in experimental schools perceived themselves as being more familiar with the philosophy and objectives of their school after the Evaluative Criteria was completed than prior to participating in the evaluation. Respondents were asked to check one of six statements in describing their degree of familiarity with the written philosophy and objectives of their school. The statement of philosophy was defined as a document which expresses in general terms the ideals a school attempts to realize in its practices; objectives were defined as statements which describe in specific terms how a school is trying to achieve its stated philosophy.

For each of the six choices given, the number and percentage of teachers' responses in the eleven experimental schools and the four control schools are indicated in Table 4.

For all teachers in experimental schools, the change in responses between the first and second questionnaires was significant (Chi-square 67.576; P less than .01). Little change occurred among responses to statements (a), (c), and (d). Statements (b) and (f) reflected the greatest change in responses.

Statement (b), "I do not know whether our school has a written statement of philosophy and objectives," was checked by eighty-one teachers (21 percent) in the first questionnaire

TABLE 4.--Judgments of teachers about their familiarity with the philosophy and objectives of their school

| Familiarity with written philosophy and objectives | Experimental schools | | | | Control schools | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| a. Our school does not have a written statement of philosophy and objectives. | 24 | 6 | 12 | 3 | 13 | 10 | 19 | 14 |
| b. I do not know whether our school has a written statement of philosophy and objectives. | 81 | 21 | 16 | 4 | 40 | 32 | 34 | 26 |
| c. Our school does have a written statement of philosophy and objectives but I am unaware of its content. | 22 | 6 | 26 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 6 |
| d. I am only vaguely familiar with its content. | 62 | 16 | 57 | 15 | 16 | 13 | 27 | 21 |
| e. I am generally familiar with its content. | 135 | 36 | 161 | 42 | 42 | 33 | 35 | 27 |
| f. I am well aware of its content. | 56 | 15 | 109 | 29 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 6 |
| Total | 380 | 100 | 381 | 100 | 125 | 100 | 131 | 100 |

Chi-square: Experimental 67.576; Control 5.047

and only sixteen teachers (4 percent) in the second questionnaire. Statement (f), "I am well aware of its content," was checked by fifty-six teachers (15 percent) in the first questionnaire and 109 teachers (29 percent) in the second questionnaire.

For all teachers in control schools, there was no significant change in responses.

Faculty discussion and agreement regarding philosophy and objectives

Table 5 presents responses to question seven in which teachers were asked to check one of five statements which was most characteristic of the extent to which the faculty had discussed and agreed upon its written philosophy and specific objectives.

For teachers in experimental schools, the change in responses between the first and second questionnaires was significant (Chi-square 68.936; P less than .01). Statement (e), "as a faculty, we have reached concurrence on a written philosophy and a written list of objectives," was checked by only thirty-five teachers (9 percent) in the first questionnaire and by 115 teachers (30 percent) in the second questionnaire. Statements (a) and (b) also reflected some change in responses, although less than that indicated in statement (e). Statement (a), "we have done little, if anything, as a faculty in getting together and thinking through what we are really trying to accomplish in our school," was checked by eighty-three teachers (22 percent) in the first questionnaire and only forty-two teachers (11 percent)

TABLE 5.--Judgments of teachers about the extent of faculty discussion and agreement regarding their school's philosophy and objectives

| Extent of faculty discussion and agreement regarding philosophy and objectives | Experimental schools | | | | Control schools | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| a. We have done little, if anything, as a faculty in getting together and thinking through what we are really trying to accomplish in our school. | 83 | 22 | 42 | 11 | 40 | 31 | 43 | 33 |
| b. We have discussed to a certain extent our philosophy and objectives but they are really too vague to be of much value. | 84 | 22 | 45 | 12 | 31 | 24 | 26 | 20 |
| c. We seem to be in pretty general agreement on our philosophy but our objectives need to be more definite if they are to be of much help to us in our daily work. | 94 | 25 | 97 | 26 | 22 | 17 | 30 | 23 |
| d. We have numerous discussions about the things we are trying to accomplish and are generally in agreement on major points in our philosophy and objectives. | 82 | 22 | 79 | 21 | 23 | 18 | 15 | 12 |
| e. As a faculty, we have reached concurrence on a written philosophy and a written list of objectives. | 35 | 9 | 115 | 30 | 12 | 10 | 15 | 12 |
| Total | 378 | 100 | 378 | 100 | 128 | 100 | 129 | 100 |

Chi-square: Experimental 68.936; Control 3.573

in the second questionnaire. Statement (b), "we have discussed to a certain extent what might be called our philosophy and objectives but they are really too vague to be of much value," was checked by eighty-four teachers (22 percent) in the first questionnaire and only forty-five teachers (12 percent) in the second questionnaire. Little change occurred among responses to statements (c) and (d).

No significant change in responses was evidenced by teachers in control schools.

Importance of philosophy and objectives

Question eight asked teachers to check one of four statements regarding how important it is for their school to have, in writing, a carefully formulated, comprehensive philosophy of education, including objectives. Results are summarized in Table 6.

For teachers in experimental schools, the change in responses between the first and second questionnaires was significant (Chi-square 9.763; P at .05 level). Little or no change occurred in the number of teachers who felt that a written philosophy, including objectives, was "of no importance" or "of little importance." However, there was some increase in the number of respondents who checked "of much

TABLE 6.--Judgments of teachers concerning the importance of a statement of philosophy and objectives

| Importance of philosophy and objectives | Experimental schools | | | | Control schools | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Of no importance | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| Of little importance | 41 | 11 | 30 | 8 | 13 | 10 | 10 | 8 |
| Of some importance | 176 | 46 | 144 | 38 | 54 | 42 | 59 | 46 |
| Of much importance | 161 | 42 | 203 | 53 | 58 | 45 | 56 | 43 |
| Total | 383 | 100 | 382 | 100 | 129 | 100 | 129 | 100 |

Chi-square: Experimental 9.763; Control .298

importance," accompanied by a decrease in the number of respondents who checked "of some importance." One hundred sixty-one teachers (42 percent) checked "of much importance" in the first questionnaire, compared with 203 teachers (53 percent) in the second questionnaire; "of some importance" was checked by 176 teachers (46 percent) in the first questionnaire and 144 teachers (38 percent) in the second questionnaire.

No significant change in responses was evidenced by teachers in control schools.

In seven of the eleven experimental schools (schools A, C, D, F, G, I, and K), the committee assigned to complete

Section B, "Philosophy and Objectives," did not report to the faculty, as recommended by the manual of the Evaluative Criteria (this information was obtained from the principals of experimental schools). Although in each of the above three questions, teachers in experimental schools evidenced more change in responses than teachers in control schools, it is possible that the difference in responses would have been greater if each Philosophy and Objectives Committee had reported to the faculty.

## Course Objectives and Courses of Study

In subsections D-1 through D-19 of the Evaluative Criteria, committees of teachers evaluate each subject area offered in the curriculum.[1] A part of each of these subsections is entitled "Instructional Activities"; included among statements relative to instructional activities are references to careful planning and preparation for instruction and the direction of instruction toward clearly formulated, comprehensive objectives. Checklists are provided for teachers to rate the instructional activities of their department; "the checklist items are designed to make it possible for the staff of the school to describe clearly what it is doing."[2]

---

[1] See Appendix, pages 155-56, for Table of Contents of the Evaluative Criteria.

[2] National Study of Secondary School Evaluation, loc. cit., p. 4.

Questions nine through twelve of the questionnaire obtained teachers' perceptions relative to their employment of course objectives and courses of study; respondents were also asked to identify the adequacy and importance of their course objectives and courses of study.

Employment and adequacy of course objectives

Question nine obtained teachers' judgments concerning their employment and the adequacy of their written course objectives. Objectives were briefly defined as statements which set forth in specific terms the aims, goals, or purposes of instruction. Respondents were asked to check one of the five statements shown in Table 7.

There was no significant change in responses by teachers in control schools.

The change in responses by teachers in experimental schools was significant (Chi-square 13.463; P less than .01). Little change occurred among responses to statements (b), (c), and (e). Statements (a) and (d) reflected some change in responses.

Statement (a), "I have no written objectives for any of my courses," was checked by eighty-six teachers (23 percent) in the first questionnaire and only fifty-two teachers (14 percent) in the second questionnaire.

TABLE 7.--Judgments of teachers with regard to employment and adequacy of course objectives

| Employment and adequacy of course objectives | Experimental schools | | | | Control schools | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| a. I have no written objectives for any of my courses. | 86 | 23 | 52 | 14 | 31 | 24 | 32 | 24 |
| b. I have written objectives for some of my courses but they are in need of revision to become more helpful for my teaching. | 57 | 15 | 47 | 12 | 18 | 14 | 15 | 12 |
| c. I have written objectives for some of my courses; they are clearly formulated and comprehensive. | 46 | 12 | 49 | 13 | 19 | 15 | 20 | 15 |
| d. I have written objectives for all of my courses; however, some revision is needed to make them more helpful for my teaching. | 132 | 34 | 165 | 43 | 36 | 28 | 45 | 35 |
| e. I have written objectives for all of my courses; all of them are clearly formulated and comprehensive. | 62 | 16 | 69 | 18 | 25 | 19 | 18 | 14 |
| Total | 383 | 100 | 382 | 100 | 129 | 100 | 130 | 100 |

Chi-square: Experimental 13.463; Control 2.569

Statement (d), "I have written objectives for all of my courses; however, some revision is needed to make them more helpful for my teaching," was checked by 132 teachers

(34 percent) in the first questionnaire and 165 teachers (43 percent) in the second questionnaire.

Importance of course objectives

Question ten asked teachers what degree of importance they attach to the need for them to employ clearly formulated, comprehensive, written objectives for each of the courses they teach. Respondents were asked to check one of four statements ("none," "little," "some," or "much") as illustrated in Table 8.

TABLE 8.--Judgments of teachers concerning the importance of course objectives

| Importance of course objectives | Experimental schools | | | | Control schools | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Questionnaire First | | Second | | First | | Second | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| None | 29 | 8 | 25 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 5 |
| Little | 50 | 13 | 36 | 9 | 15 | 12 | 12 | 9 |
| Some | 149 | 39 | 149 | 39 | 54 | 41 | 60 | 46 |
| Much | 153 | 40 | 170 | 45 | 55 | 42 | 52 | 40 |
| Total | 381 | 100 | 380 | 100 | 130 | 100 | 131 | 100 |

Chi-Square: Experimental 3.448; Control .838

No significant change in responses was evidenced by teachers in either experimental or control schools concerning the importance of course objectives.

Employment and adequacy of courses of study

The manual of the Evaluative Criteria contains the statement that "all members of the teaching staff should be examining their courses of study to see if they are up to date."[1]

Question eleven obtained teachers' judgments concerning their employment and the adequacy of their written courses of study. The terms "course outline" and "course syllabus" were identified as synonymous with "course of study." Respondents were asked to check one of the five statements shown in Table 9.

No significant change in responses was indicated by teachers in either experimental or control schools with regard to their employment and the adequacy of their written courses of study.

Importance of courses of study

To identify the degree of importance which teachers

---

[1] Ibid., p. 8.

TABLE 9.--Judgments of teachers with regard to employment and adequacy of courses of study

| Employment and adequacy of courses of study | Experimental schools | | | | Control schools | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| a. I have no written course of study for any of my courses. | 63 | 16 | 51 | 14 | 29 | 22 | 34 | 26 |
| b. I have written courses of study for some of my courses but they are in need of revision to become more helpful for my teaching. | 66 | 17 | 58 | 15 | 19 | 15 | 11 | 9 |
| c. I have written courses of study for some of my courses; they are clearly formulated and comprehensive. | 55 | 14 | 54 | 14 | 18 | 14 | 17 | 13 |
| d. I have written courses of study for all of my courses; however, some revision is needed to make them more helpful for my teaching. | 132 | 35 | 137 | 36 | 39 | 30 | 48 | 37 |
| e. I have written courses of study for all of my courses; all of them are clearly formulated and comprehensive. | 67 | 18 | 78 | 21 | 25 | 19 | 20 | 15 |
| Total | 383 | 100 | 378 | 100 | 130 | 100 | 130 | 100 |

Chi-square: Experimental 2.683; Control 4.046

attach to the need to employ clearly formulated, comprehensive, written courses of study, respondents were asked to check either "none," "little," "some," or "much" in question

twelve. Teachers' responses are summarized in Table 10.

TABLE 10.--Judgments of teachers concerning the importance of courses of study

| Importance of courses of study | Experimental schools | | | | Control schools | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| None | 16 | 4 | 13 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| Little | 49 | 13 | 34 | 9 | 13 | 10 | 10 | 8 |
| Some | 151 | 39 | 155 | 41 | 60 | 46 | 68 | 52 |
| Much | 167 | 44 | 181 | 47 | 54 | 41 | 49 | 37 |
| Total | 383 | 100 | 383 | 100 | 131 | 100 | 131 | 100 |

Chi-square: Experimental 3.636; Control 1.134

With regard to teachers' interpretations of the importance of written courses of study, no significant change in responses was evidenced by teachers in either experimental or control schools.

## Curriculum Planning

Many sections of the Evaluative Criteria contain checklist items and evaluations in which teacher committees evaluate various aspects of curriculum planning. Questions twenty-one through twenty-four of the questionnaire obtained teachers

perceptions concerning (1) the extent and effect of departmental curriculum planning, (2) the role of the classroom teacher in determining the curriculum, (3) the opportunity provided teachers to participate in curriculum development and the extent of their participation, (4) the need for changes in the curriculum.

## Extent and effect of departmental curriculum planning

Question twenty-one asked teachers to check one of five statements which came closest to describing the extent and effect of departmental curriculum planning. Teachers' responses are summarized in Table 11.

No significant change in responses was indicated by teachers in either experimental or control schools.

## Role of the classroom teacher in curriculum determination

It is claimed that each teacher who has participated in the Evaluative Criteria self-study is increasingly aware of the fact that he has a stake in determining the school curriculum.[1]

To identify teachers' judgments regarding the role of the classroom teacher in the determination of the curriculum,

---

[1]Donald C. Manlove, op. cit., p. 236.

TABLE 11.--Judgments of teachers concerning the extent and effect of departmental curriculum planning

| Extent and effect of departmental curriculum planning | Experimental schools | | | | Control schools | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| a. Each teacher in my department operates independently and is generally unaware of what occurs outside his own classroom. We never engage in any discussions concerning the above item. | 8 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 11 | 8 | 9 | 7 |
| b. On occasion certain teachers within my department will discuss how we might improve its effectiveness but customarily, such discussions never proceed farther than on an individual basis. | 58 | 16 | 53 | 14 | 36 | 27 | 34 | 26 |
| c. Department members discuss this as a group but ideas expressed are seldom translated into improvements in educational practices. | 48 | 13 | 44 | 11 | 10 | 8 | 14 | 11 |
| d. We often engage in discussions about how our department might improve and the results of these discussions have had some influence on the curriculum in our department. | 151 | 40 | 160 | 42 | 44 | 34 | 52 | 40 |
| e. We often engage in discussions about this and the results of these discussions have had a significant influence on the curriculum in our department. | 108 | 29 | 116 | 31 | 30 | 23 | 20 | 16 |
| Total | 373 | 100 | 379 | 100 | 131 | 100 | 129 | 100 |

Chi-square: Experimental 1.209; Control 3.575

question twenty-two asked respondents to check one of the five statements listed in Table 12.

Statement (a) was not checked by any of the respondents and only a limited number checked statement (b); thus, chi-square was not employed with these data.

Examination of the data in Table 12 reveals that there was very little change in responses by teachers in both experimental and control schools. Statements (b), (c), and (d) include various degrees of limitation on the participation of teachers in determination of the curriculum; these three statements accounted for 28 percent of the responses of teachers in the experimental schools in the first questionnaire and 27 percent in the second questionnaire.

Teacher opportunity to contribute to curriculum development and the extent of their participation

In question twenty-three, teachers were asked to characterize both the opportunity they have to contribute to curriculum development and the extent of their participation. Respondents were asked to check one of the five statements listed in Table 13.

No significant change in responses was indicated by teachers in either experimental or control schools.

TABLE 12.--Judgments of teachers with regard to the role of the classroom teacher in curriculum determination

| Role of classroom teacher in curriculum determination | Experimental schools | | | | Control schools | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Questionnaire First | | Second | | First | | Second | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| a. Determination of the curriculum should be left exclusively to the Board of Education and the administration; classroom teachers have no role to play in its determination. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| b. When curriculum changes are proposed, teachers should be allowed to express their opinion concerning the wisdom of the proposed changes; however, they should not play an active role in the planning process. | 3 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| c. Certain teachers, including department heads, should play a primary role in curriculum planning, working directly with the school administration. However, participation should be limited primarily to the more experienced and knowledgeable teachers. | 41 | 11 | 40 | 11 | 14 | 11 | 13 | 10 |
| d. Those teachers who wish to do so should be allowed to play an active role in curriculum determination. However, all teachers should not be expected to participate. | 60 | 16 | 57 | 15 | 16 | 12 | 20 | 16 |
| e. Every teacher should be involved in some way in the determination of the curriculum. Each teacher should consider it his personal responsibility to play some role in its development. | 274 | 72 | 280 | 73 | 98 | 75 | 93 | 72 |
| Total | 378 | 100 | 382 | 100 | 130 | 100 | 129 | 100 |

TABLE 13.--Judgments of teachers with regard to the opportunity they have to participate in curriculum development and the extent of their participation

| Opportunity for participation in curriculum development and extent of participation | Experimental schools | | | | Control schools | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Questionnaire | | | | Questionnaire | | | |
| | First | | Second | | First | | Second | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| a. Classroom teachers are given little or no opportunity to play any role in curriculum development. Decisions are "handed down" by the Board of Education and administration. | 30 | 8 | 17 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
| b. Some teachers, including department heads, are sometimes asked about the advisability of curriculum changes proposed by the administration. However, they seldom, if ever, play an active role in the planning process. | 45 | 12 | 46 | 12 | 16 | 13 | 23 | 18 |
| c. Some teachers, including department heads, play an active role in curriculum planning. However, a majority of the regular classroom teachers do not participate to any extent in curriculum planning. | 98 | 26 | 101 | 27 | 51 | 40 | 45 | 35 |
| d. Ample opportunity is given to any classroom teacher to play an active role in curriculum planning. Customarily, however, certain teachers prefer not to become involved in matters of this type. | 120 | 32 | 122 | 32 | 41 | 32 | 35 | 27 |
| e. Ample opportunity is given to any classroom teacher to play an active role in curriculum planning. All or nearly all of our teachers play an active role in curriculum development. | 85 | 22 | 93 | 25 | 11 | 9 | 21 | 16 |
| Total | 378 | 100 | 379 | 100 | 127 | 100 | 129 | 100 |

Chi-square: Experimental 3.996; Control 5.961

Need for changes in the curriculum

In question twenty-four, teachers were asked to identify the attitude of the faculty regarding the need for making changes in the high school curriculum. Responses to each of the five statements presented in this question are summarized in Table 14.

No significant change in responses was evidenced by teachers in either experimental or control schools.

## Teacher Knowledge of the School Program

A major portion of the Evaluative Criteria self-study involves the assignment of subcommittees to evaluate carefully each subject area of the curriculum. The manual of the Evaluative Criteria contains the statement that "the total program of the school can be better understood by all members of the staff as a result of the work of these subcommittees."[1] In the studies completed by Martin[2] and Ely[3], respondents indicated that participants in the Evaluative Criteria self-study gain an increased knowledge of the school program. Respondents to the study by Matthews[4] felt that teachers acquire a clearer understanding of the educational problems in areas other than their particular teaching field. Results

---

[1]National Study of Secondary School Evaluation, loc. cit.
[2]Martin, loc. cit. [3]Ely, loc. cit. [4]Matthews, loc. cit.

TABLE 14.--Judgments of teachers concerning the faculty's attitude toward the need for curriculum change

| Need for curriculum change | Experimental schools | | | | Control schools | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| a. Our faculty does not feel there is a need for changing our curriculum. | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| b. Some faculty members feel there is a need for changing certain curriculum areas, but this need for change is felt only by faculty members who are teaching in these areas. | 70 | 19 | 59 | 16 | 23 | 19 | 22 | 18 |
| c. Some faculty members feel there is a need for changing certain areas of the curriculum, even those outside their teaching areas. | 160 | 43 | 133 | 35 | 51 | 41 | 48 | 38 |
| d. Most faculty members feel there is a need for changing certain areas of the curriculum, even those outside their teaching areas. | 102 | 27 | 129 | 34 | 33 | 27 | 38 | 30 |
| e. All or nearly all of our faculty members feel there is a need for changing certain curriculum areas, regardless of where these changes are needed. | 36 | 10 | 51 | 14 | 12 | 10 | 15 | 12 |
| Total | 372 | 100 | 376 | 100 | 123 | 100 | 126 | 100 |

Chi-square: Experimental 9.166; Control .876

of each of the above three studies were previously discussed in Chapter II.

Seven questions in the questionnaire (numbers thirteen through eighteen and number twenty) were included in an attempt to determine the change in teachers' perceptions regarding their knowledge of the school program. These seven questions obtained teachers' judgments relative to:

1. Their ability to assess the quality of the educational program.
2. Their knowledge of the total educational program and its effect on the quality of their teaching performance.
3. The balance in educational opportunities provided for college-bound and terminal students.
4. The quality of their high school, in general.
5. Their evaluations of the quality of subject departments, programs, and the school building.
6. The strengths and weaknesses of the educational program.
7. Their knowledge of the courses offered in their department.

Teachers' ability to assess the quality of the educational program

Question thirteen asked respondents to check one of four statements which best described their ability to assess

the quality of the total educational program in their high school. Responses of the teachers are summarized in Table 15.

TABLE 15.--Judgments of teachers with regard to their ability to assess the quality of the educational program

| Ability to assess quality of educational program | Experimental schools | | | | Control schools | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| a. My knowledge of the total educational program is so limited that I could not make a quality assessment of it. | 7 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 |
| b. Although I am familiar with some aspects of our total educational program, my lack of knowledge about many other areas would make me hesitant to make an assessment of its overall quality. | 93 | 24 | 57 | 15 | 31 | 24 | 32 | 24 |
| c. Although I am familiar with most aspects of our total educational program, my lack of knowledge about some other areas would reduce the accuracy of my quality assessment. | 216 | 57 | 233 | 61 | 70 | 54 | 74 | 57 |
| d. I feel myself to be well-informed about the total high school program and thus capable of making an accurate assessment of its overall quality. | 66 | 17 | 89 | 23 | 27 | 21 | 21 | 16 |
| Total | 382 | 100 | 383 | 100 | 130 | 100 | 131 | 100 |

Chi-square: Experimental 13.507; Control 1.557

The change in responses by teachers in experimental schools was significant (Chi-square 13.507; P less than .01).

Statement (b) reflected more change in responses than statements (a), (c), and (d). The number of teachers who checked statement (b), "Although I am familiar with some aspects of our total educational program, my lack of knowledge about many other areas would make me hesitant to make an assessment of its overall quality," was reduced from ninety-three teachers (24 percent) in the first questionnaire to fifty-seven teachers (15 percent) in the second questionnaire.

There was an increase in the number of teachers who checked statements (c) and (d). Statement (d), "I feel myself to be well-informed about the total high school program and thus capable of making an accurate assessment of its overall quality," was checked by sixty-six teachers (17 percent) in the first questionnaire, compared with eighty-nine teachers (23 percent) in the second questionnaire. Statement (c), "Although I am familiar with most aspects of our total educational program, my lack of knowledge about some other areas would reduce the accuracy of my quality assessment," was checked by 216 teachers (57 percent) in the first

questionnaire compared with 233 teachers (61 percent) in the second questionnaire.

Little change occurred among responses to statement (a).

There was no significant change in responses by teachers in control groups.

Teachers' knowledge of the total educational program and its effect on the quality of their teaching performance

Teachers were asked to identify how the quality of their teaching performance was affected by their knowledge of the total educational program in their high school. Responses to each of the five statements listed in question fourteen are summarized in Table 16.

Teachers in control schools indicated no significant change in responses. However, the change in responses by teachers in experimental schools was significant (Chi-square 12.100; P less than .01).

In experimental schools, little change was reflected in the number of teachers who checked "none" or "much." However, the number of teachers who checked "some" increased from 179 teachers (47 percent) in the first questionnaire to 221 teachers (58 percent) in the second questionnaire. The number of teachers who checked "little" was reduced;

eighty-four teachers (22 percent) checked "little" in the first questionnaire compared with fifty-six teachers (15 percent) in the second questionnaire.

TABLE 16.--Judgments of teachers with regard to how the quality of their teaching performance is affected by their knowledge of the total educational program

| Effect on teaching performance | Experimental schools | | | | Control schools | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| None | 30 | 8 | 20 | 5 | 16 | 12 | 13 | 10 |
| Little | 84 | 22 | 56 | 15 | 18 | 14 | 17 | 13 |
| Some | 179 | 47 | 221 | 58 | 62 | 48 | 71 | 54 |
| Much | 90 | 23 | 86 | 22 | 34 | 26 | 30 | 23 |
| Total | 383 | 100 | 383 | 100 | 130 | 100 | 131 | 100 |

Chi-square: Experimental 12.100; Control 1.199

## Teachers' judgments of the balance in educational opportunities provided for college-bound and terminal students

Question fifteen asked respondents whether the educational program in their school provided more opportunities, in general, for the college-bound students, the terminal students, or whether their program was equally balanced in providing opportunities for both of the above groups.

Teachers' responses are summarized in Table 17.

TABLE 17.--Judgments of teachers concerning the balance in educational opportunities provided for college-bound and terminal students

| Educational opportunities are greater for..... | Experimental schools | | | | Control schools | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| College-bound students | 135 | 35 | 165 | 43 | 76 | 58 | 74 | 58 |
| Those students not going to college | 46 | 12 | 48 | 13 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 6 |
| Our program appears to be equally balanced in providing opportunities for college-bound and terminal students | 200 | 53 | 168 | 44 | 49 | 38 | 46 | 36 |
| Total | 381 | 100 | 381 | 100 | 130 | 100 | 128 | 100 |

Chi-square: Experimental 5.824; Control .843

No significant change in responses was evidenced by teachers in either experimental or control schools.

## Teachers' ratings of the quality of their high school

Teachers were asked to rate the quality of their high school as compared with their understanding of the quality of other Michigan high schools. Table 18 summarizes responses to each of the five degrees of quality listed in question sixteen.

TABLE 18.--Judgments of teachers regarding the quality of their high school

| Degree of quality | Experimental schools | | | | Control schools | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Lowest quality (0-20%) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Below average (20-40%) | 15 | 4 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| Average quality (40-60%) | 78 | 21 | 98 | 26 | 23 | 18 | 33 | 25 |
| Above average (60-80%) | 223 | 60 | 209 | 55 | 73 | 56 | 71 | 55 |
| Highest quality (80-100%) | 58 | 15 | 61 | 16 | 33 | 26 | 24 | 18 |
| Total | 374 | 100 | 379 | 100 | 129 | 100 | 131 | 100 |

Since much of the literature predicts that teachers who participate in the Evaluative Criteria self-study increase their knowledge of the school program, question sixteen was included to see if teachers in experimental schools would reflect greater changes in their assessment of the quality of their school than teachers in control schools.

Chi-square was not employed with these data because of the "0" frequencies indicated.

Examination of the data in Table 18 reveals that teachers in experimental schools, as well as teachers in

control schools, reflected little change in their responses regarding the quality of their high school. Teachers in experimental schools reflected a slight increase in "average quality" ratings, accompanied by a slight decrease in "above average" quality ratings. "Average quality" ratings were indicated by seventy-eight teachers (21 percent) in the first questionnaire and ninety-eight teachers (26 percent) in the second questionnaire. "Above average" quality ratings were indicated by 223 teachers (60 percent) in the first questionnaire and 209 teachers (55 percent) in the second questionnaire.

Teachers in control schools reflected an increase in "average quality" ratings almost identical to that of teachers in experimental schools. The slight increase in "average quality" ratings by teachers in control schools was accompanied by a slight decrease in "highest quality" ratings.

Responses to the remaining quality ratings changed very little for teachers in both experimental and control schools.

Teachers' judgments of the quality of subject departments, programs, and the school building

In question seventeen, teachers in each of the fifteen

respondent schools were asked to evaluate the quality of each subject department, the student activity program, the library, guidance services, health services, and the school building. Respondents were instructed to check one of the following seven statements: "not offered," "don't know," "poor," "fair," "good," "very good," or "excellent."

Responses of the 383 teachers in the eleven experimental schools are presented in Table 19; responses of the 131 teachers in the four control schools are presented in Table 20. Numbers not enclosed in parentheses represent teacher responses in the first questionnaire; numbers enclosed in parentheses represent teacher responses in the second questionnaire. "No response" columns are included to indicate the number of teachers who did not check any of the seven statements referred to above.

In both tables, no analysis was made of the change in responses to areas (a) agriculture, (d) distributive education, (e) driver education, (h) health education, (q) vocational education, (r) student activity program, and (u) health services. In each of the above areas, the combined frequencies of the "no response" and "not offered" columns in experimental and/or control schools were so high as to preclude a meaningful comparison of the change in teacher responses.

TABLE 19.--Judgments of 383 teachers in eleven experimental schools regarding the quality of each subject department or program

| Area | No response | Not offered | Don't know | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Agriculture | 40* (34)** | 295 (297) | 27 (23) | 1 (4) | 2 (2) | 6 (8) | 8 (13) | 4 (2) |
| b. Art | 12 (3) | 0 (0) | 37 (24) | 6 (1) | 31 (29) | 109 (112) | 110 (126) | 78 (88) |
| c. Business Education | 7 (1) | 0 (1) | 22 (15) | 1 (1) | 21 (17) | 129 (131) | 153 (160) | 50 (57) |
| d. Distributive Education | 52 (37) | 47 (44) | 115 (84) | 6 (7) | 15 (23) | 67 (94) | 58 (64) | 23 (30) |
| e. Driver Education | 16 (15) | 36 (50) | 49 (36) | 2 (2) | 17 (17) | 89 (89) | 113 (115) | 61 (59) |
| f. English | 8 (4) | 0 (0) | 12 (5) | 7 (4) | 38 (33) | 120 (117) | 132 (151) | 66 (69) |
| g. Foreign Language | 10 (4) | 1 (0) | 30 (14) | 9 (10) | 42 (41) | 129 (129) | 120 (132) | 42 (53) |
| h. Health Education | 16 (13) | 31 (33) | 84 (71) | 24 (30) | 56 (72) | 86 (83) | 56 (57) | 30 (24) |
| i. Home Economics | 15 (6) | 0 (0) | 33 (29) | 6 (4) | 35 (40) | 131 (133) | 119 (118) | 44 (53) |
| j. Industrial Arts | 9 (3) | 1 (1) | 31 (20) | 6 (11) | 35 (43) | 113 (114) | 121 (129) | 67 (62) |
| k. Mathematics | 7 (2) | 0 (1) | 19 (13) | 2 (2) | 24 (21) | 102 (104) | 142 (157) | 87 (83) |

*Frequency of responses in first questionnaire

**Frequency of responses in second questionnaire

TABLE 19--Continued

| Area | No response | Not offered | Don't know | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| l. Music | 11 (3) | 0 (0) | 7 (6) | 4 (3) | 18 (22) | 93 (89) | 146 (164) | 104 (96) |
| m. Physical Education (Boys) | 13 (2) | 0 (1) | 33 (22) | 12 (18) | 47 (51) | 108 (124) | 109 (110) | 61 (55) |
| n. Physical Education (Girls) | 13 (3) | 0 (1) | 38 (24) | 17 (26) | 53 (60) | 117 (125) | 95 (99) | 50 (45) |
| o. Science | 11 (4) | 0 (0) | 17 (16) | 3 (1) | 22 (21) | 120 (117) | 135 (159) | 75 (65) |
| p. Social Studies | 14 (7) | 0 (0) | 20 (10) | 3 (2) | 34 (33) | 135 (135) | 132 (154) | 45 (42) |
| q. Vocational Education | 25 (19) | 25 (31) | 63 (44) | 18 (31) | 43 (43) | 90 (88) | 84 (96) | 35 (31) |
| r. Student Activity Program | 17 (13) | 6 (7) | 16 (18) | 28 (38) | 84 (90) | 115 (131) | 85 (65) | 32 (21) |
| s. Library | 9 (2) | 1 (1) | 13 (13) | 40 (43) | 61 (76) | 112 (102) | 88 (96) | 59 (50) |
| t. Guidance Services | 10 (4) | 0 (0) | 7 (5) | 31 (35) | 88 (93) | 122 (133) | 91 (84) | 34 (29) |
| u. Health Services | 10 (10) | 24 (39) | 41 (35) | 49 (43) | 83 (89) | 99 (114) | 60 (41) | 17 (12) |
| v. School Building | 9 (2) | 2 (1) | 4 (10) | 72 (97) | 103 (98) | 114 (99) | 56 (59) | 23 (17) |

TABLE 20.--Judgments of 131 teachers in four control schools regarding the quality of each subject department or program

| Area | No response | Not offered | Don't know | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Agriculture | 8* (9)** | 74 (77) | 19 (24) | 8 (6) | 9 (5) | 8 (9) | 4 (1) | 1 (0) |
| b. Art | 2 (3) | 0 (0) | 14 (8) | 3 (5) | 9 (7) | 34 (43) | 41 (42) | 28 (23) |
| c. Business Education | 3 (3) | 0 (0) | 3 (6) | 1 (0) | 11 (9) | 38 (39) | 49 (54) | 26 (20) |
| d. Distributive Education | 9 (8) | 5 (6) | 35 (22) | 1 (0) | 7 (14) | 26 (33) | 30 (35) | 18 (13) |
| e. Driver Education | 2 (2) | 0 (1) | 19 (12) | 4 (4) | 7 (12) | 33 (45) | 43 (37) | 23 (18) |
| f. English | 2 (2) | 1 (0) | 0 (2) | 2 (1) | 7 (10) | 38 (46) | 59 (54) | 22 (16) |
| g. Foreign Language | 2 (4) | 1 (0) | 12 (6) | 6 (1) | 11 (13) | 37 (42) | 43 (50) | 19 (15) |
| h. Health Education | 7 (6) | 9 (13) | 29 (19) | 13 (11) | 20 (28) | 31 (26) | 17 (25) | 5 (3) |
| i. Home Economics | 4 (3) | 0 (0) | 19 (13) | 1 (0) | 11 (7) | 32 (47) | 45 (46) | 19 (15) |
| j. Industrial Arts | 3 (3) | 0 (0) | 16 (13) | 8 (9) | 19 (15) | 34 (41) | 33 (34) | 18 (16) |
| k. Mathematics | 4 (2) | 0 (0) | 8 (6) | 0 (0) | 4 (6) | 37 (42) | 54 (57) | 24 (18) |

*Frequency of responses in first questionnaire

**Frequency of responses in second questionnaire

TABLE 20--Continued

| Area | No response | Not offered | Don't know | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| l. Music | 3 (2) | 0 (0) | 4 (4) | 0 (0) | 5 (3) | 35 (27) | 47 (52) | 37 (43) |
| m. Physical Education(Boys) | 2 (3) | 0 (0) | 19 (10) | 8 (4) | 14 (17) | 43 (53) | 35 (36) | 10 (8) |
| n. Physical Education(Girls) | 4 (3) | 0 (0) | 23 (11) | 9 (8) | 14 (12) | 38 (49) | 32 (37) | 11 (11) |
| o. Science | 3 (2) | 0 (0) | 11 (6) | 0 (0) | 5 (3) | 32 (42) | 61 (58) | 19 (20) |
| p. Social Studies | 4 (1) | 0 (0) | 14 (5) | 2 (3) | 15 (22) | 45 (55) | 42 (38) | 9 (7) |
| q. Vocational Education | 5 (4) | 9 (7) | 23 (16) | 9 (10) | 14 (23) | 41 (33) | 19 (27) | 11 (11) |
| r. Student Activity Program | 8 (6) | 4 (3) | 14 (6) | 9 (15) | 30 (34) | 33 (44) | 21 (18) | 12 (5) |
| s. Library | 6 (3) | 0 (0) | 6 (1) | 15 (15) | 20 (27) | 44 (48) | 25 (28) | 15 (9) |
| t. Guidance Services | 2 (1) | 0 (0) | 4 (4) | 15 (17) | 37 (33) | 40 (45) | 24 (25) | 9 (6) |
| u. Health Services | 5 (5) | 2 (4) | 17 (8) | 29 (27) | 33 (44) | 31 (30) | 9 (11) | 5 (2) |
| v. School Building | 2 (3) | 0 (0) | 3 (2) | 5 (6) | 25 (34) | 47 (61) | 37 (23) | 12 (2) |

Excluding the frequencies which appear in the "no response" and "not offered" columns, the chi-square test was applied to determine the significance of the change in responses to each of the remaining areas in Tables 19 and 20. With one exception, there was no significant change in response by teachers in either experimental or control schools. For teachers in control schools, the change in responses to area (v), "school building," was significant at the .05 level (Chi-square 11.223), even though teachers in all of the respondent schools experienced no major building changes or additions during the course of this study.

Teachers' identifications of the strengths and weaknesses of their high school's educational program

Question eighteen asked teachers to identify briefly two major strengths and two major weaknesses of the educational programs in their high schools. Respondents were instructed to include any part of the high school program.

When a teacher made similar commendations or criticisms of certain specific areas of the educational program in both questionnaires, these were considered as the "same" strength or the "same" weakness. For example, if a respondent indicated "an experienced faculty" as a strength on the first

questionnaire and "good teaching staff" as a strength on the second, these strengths were identified as being the "same." In the same manner, a weakness identified as "poor physical facilities" on the first questionnaire and "overcrowded building" on the second was considered as being the "same."

TABLE 21.--Teachers' identifications of strengths and weaknesses in the educational program of their school

| | Experimental schools (383 teachers) | | Control schools (131 teachers) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Questionnaire | | Questionnaire | |
| | First | Second | First | Second |
| Total number of strengths indicated on questionnaires[a] | 659 | 641 | 226 | 226 |
| Total number of weaknesses indicated on questionnaires[b] | 643 | 654 | 225 | 238 |
| Number of "different" strengths on the second questionnaire | .. | 363 | .. | 125 |
| Percent of "different" strengths on the second questionnaire | .. | 56.6 | .. | 55.3 |
| Number of "different" weaknesses on the second questionnaire | .. | 440 | .. | 163 |
| Percent of "different" weaknesses on the second questionnaire | .. | 67.3 | .. | 68.5 |

a. A cumulative total of the number of strengths listed by each teacher

b. A cumulative total of the number of weaknesses listed by each teacher

The data in Table 21 reveal that teachers in control schools indicated nearly the same percentage of "different" strengths on the second questionnaire as teachers in experimental schools; in like manner, teachers in control schools indicated nearly the same percentage of "different" weaknesses on the second questionnaire as teachers in experimental schools.

### Teachers' knowledge of the courses offered in their departments

Teachers were asked to check one of the four statements in question twenty which came closest to describing their knowledge (particularly the strengths and weaknesses) of the courses offered in their departments (their content, their objectives, their relationship to each other). Responses to this question are summarized in Table 22.

No significant change in responses was indicated by teachers in either experimental or control schools.

## Self-Evaluation of Teaching Performance

Manlove[1] believes that the Evaluative Criteria self-study motivates faculty members to examine themselves carefully and to strive for self-improvement. Ricart[2], in his research, concluded that teachers increasingly employed

---

[1]Manlove, op. cit., p. 235. [2]Ricart, loc. cit.

TABLE 22.--Judgments of teachers with regard to their knowledge of the courses offered in their departments

| Teacher knowledge of courses offered | Experimental schools | | | | Control schools | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Questionnaire | | | | Questionnaire | | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| a. My knowledge is limited almost exclusively to what goes on in my own classroom; thus, I could not make a valid judgment about their strengths and weaknesses. | 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| b. I have some knowledge of the courses offered in my department but considerably more is needed to improve my judgment of their strengths and weaknesses. | 31 | 8 | 21 | 6 | 12 | 9 | 17 | 13 |
| c. I am quite familiar with certain courses in my department but lack information about others that is needed to make an accurate assessment of their strengths and weaknesses. | 119 | 31 | 119 | 31 | 43 | 33 | 38 | 29 |
| d. I am very familiar with the courses offered in my department and feel capable of making an accurate evaluation of their strengths and weaknesses. | 225 | 59 | 241 | 63 | 69 | 53 | 72 | 55 |
| Total | 382 | 100 | 382 | 100 | 131 | 100 | 131 | 100 |

Chi-square: Experimental 6.974; Control 2.052

self-evaluation in regard to their own teaching performance and, as a result, improvements in teaching methods and procedures were evident.

Question twenty-five obtained teachers' judgments with regard to how often they engage in self-evaluation of their teaching performance. In question twenty-six, teachers were asked to judge various aspects of their teaching performance.

Frequency of teacher self-evaluation

Question twenty-five asked teachers: "During this school year, how often did you find yourself engaged in thought about your own teaching performance? (its effectiveness, how you might improve it, possible changes in approach, etc. -- in other words, a self-evaluation of your teaching)." Respondents were asked to check one of the five statements listed in Table 23.

Chi-square was not used with these data, since almost no teachers checked the "never" and "rarely" frequencies.

Examination of the data reveals that very little change in responses occurred among teachers in both experimental and control schools. In experimental schools, there was a slight decrease in the number of teachers who perceived themselves as engaging in self-evaluation "very often." In the first

TABLE 23.--Teachers' judgments concerning how often they evaluate their teaching performance

| Frequency of teacher self-evaluation | Experimental schools | | | | Control schools | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | | Questionnaire First | | Questionnaire Second | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Never | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rarely | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Occasionally | 34 | 9 | 37 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 6 |
| Quite often | 152 | 40 | 166 | 43 | 60 | 46 | 63 | 48 |
| Very often | 193 | 51 | 177 | 46 | 59 | 46 | 59 | 45 |
| Total | 380 | 100 | 383 | 100 | 129 | 100 | 131 | 100 |

questionnaire, 193 teachers (51 percent) indicated they evaluate their teaching performance "very often"; in the second questionnaire, 177 teachers (46 percent) indicated they evaluate their teaching performance "very often."

## Judgments of teachers with regard to their teaching performance

In question twenty-six, each respondent was asked to evaluate his teaching performance by checking one of six ratings for each of the nine teaching practices shown in Tables 24 and 25. Participants in the self-study evaluate themselves with regard to these teaching practices in various

sections of the Evaluative Criteria, particularly in Section K,[1] which is completed by each staff member.

Table 24 summarizes responses of the 383 teachers in the eleven experimental schools on both the first and second questionnaires (numbers in parentheses represent responses to the second questionnaire); in like manner, Table 25 summarizes responses of the 131 teachers in the four control schools. "No response" columns are included in each of the above tables to indicate the number of teachers who did not check any of the six column headings from "not relevant" to "excellent."

In each of the nine teaching practices listed in Tables 24 and 25, there was no significant change in responses by teachers in either experimental or control schools.

## Teachers' Judgments Concerning the Effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria

The questionnaire completed by the 383 teachers in the eleven experimental schools after they had concluded their self-study differed from the first questionnaire only in that it contained eleven additional questions (numbered twenty-seven through thirty-seven) in Part III.[2] Each of

---

[1] National Study of Secondary School Evaluation, loc. cit., p. 348.

[2] See Appendix, pages 176-79, for Part III of the questionnaire.

TABLE 24.--Judgments of 383 teachers in eleven experimental schools with regard to their teaching performance

| Teaching practices | No response | Not relevant | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Your use of information contained in the cumulative records of each of your students | 13* (5)** | 32 (30) | 82 (75) | 130 (129) | 88 (97) | 30 (39) | 8 (8) |
| b. Your knowledge of the nature of the local community | 9 (2) | 9 (3) | 9 (6) | 58 (50) | 131 (144) | 103 (121) | 64 (57) |
| c. Use of audio-visual aids | 13 (7) | 13 (9) | 37 (33) | 88 (101) | 106 (110) | 80 (89) | 46 (34) |
| d. Your planning for instruction | 10 (3) | 1 (1) | 0 (4) | 26 (25) | 128 (122) | 157 (165) | 61 (63) |
| e. The provision you make in instruction for the individual differences of students | 11 (2) | 1 (1) | 13 (11) | 67 (68) | 134 (142) | 103 (100) | 54 (59) |
| f. Use of community resources | 12 (3) | 49 (36) | 84 (82) | 101 (117) | 80 (90) | 38 (41) | 19 (14) |
| g. Use of a variety of classroom instructional materials | 11 (2) | 8 (3) | 3 (8) | 56 (57) | 120 (123) | 121 (128) | 64 (62) |
| h. Your knowledge of current practices and developments in your teaching field | 9 (2) | 0 (0) | 0 (2) | 35 (33) | 110 (119) | 132 (124) | 97 (103) |
| i. The coordination of instruction with other teachers in your department | 9 (3) | 12 (11) | 26 (24) | 44 (54) | 114 (115) | 111 (112) | 67 (64) |

*Responses in the first questionnaire.

**Responses in the second questionnaire.

TABLE 25.--Judgments of 131 teachers in four control schools with regard to their teaching performance

| Teaching practices | No response | Not relevant | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Your use of information contained in the cumulative records of each of your students | 6* (4)** | 15 (4) | 27 (29) | 35 (45) | 30 (34) | 14 (11) | 4 (4) |
| b. Your knowledge of the nature of the local community | 3 (3) | 3 (6) | 2 (2) | 16 (17) | 47 (56) | 37 (30) | 23 (17) |
| c. Use of audio-visual aids | 4 (2) | 5 (4) | 15 (13) | 37 (34) | 38 (43) | 26 (28) | 6 (7) |
| d. Your planning for instruction | 2 (2) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 4 (9) | 59 (65) | 47 (38) | 18 (17) |
| e. The provision you make in instruction for the individual differences of students | 4 (3) | 0 (1) | 5 (4) | 29 (28) | 44 (54) | 30 (28) | 19 (13) |
| f. Use of community resources | 3 (3) | 13 (12) | 20 (28) | 49 (43) | 27 (30) | 14 (10) | 5 (5) |
| g. Use of a variety of classroom instructional materials | 3 (3) | 6 (4) | 4 (5) | 25 (23) | 36 (44) | 39 (35) | 18 (17) |
| h. Your knowledge of current practices and developments in your teaching field | 2 (2) | 1 (0) | 0 (1) | 11 (18) | 46 (46) | 41 (41) | 30 (23) |
| i. The coordination of instruction with other teachers in your department | 2 (2) | 5 (4) | 11 (8) | 21 (30) | 40 (43) | 34 (29) | 18 (15) |

*Responses in the first questionnaire.

**Responses in the second questionnaire.

these eleven questions made specific reference to the Evaluative Criteria. With the exception of question twenty-seven (which was included only to insure that each teacher had served on at least one of the section committees), the purpose of these questions was to obtain teachers' judgments concerning the effectiveness of their self-evaluation with regard to the following:

1. The most satisfactory characteristics of the Evaluative Criteria self-study.
2. The least satisfactory characteristics of the Evaluative Criteria self-study.
3. Their attitudes toward self-evaluation before the Evaluative Criteria was begun and after it was completed.
4. Their awareness regarding the aims and purposes of the self-study.
5. The degree of organization for the self-study.
6. The amount of information received about the results of other committee studies.
7. The proportion between the time and effort expended on the Evaluative Criteria and the benefits obtained.
8. The degree of helpfulness of the Evaluative Criteria.
9. Their previous experience with the Evaluative Criteria.

10. Their recommendations regarding repetition of the Evaluative Criteria self-study at some future date.

Responses to the questions in Part III of the questionnaire are presented and discussed below.

## Judgments of teachers regarding the most satisfactory characteristics of the Evaluative Criteria self-study

In question thirty-six, teachers were asked to express their judgments with regard to the most satisfactory characteristics of the self-evaluation employing the Evaluative Criteria. Of the 383 teachers in the experimental group, 268 (70 percent) identified a total of 302 characteristics as being the most satisfactory. No responses were received from 115 teachers (30 percent).

Of the 302 most satisfactory characteristics received, 277 (91.7 percent) have been grouped into one of four categories: increased knowledge of the school program, the general values of self-evaluation, the effect of self-evaluation on individual teaching performance, and the effect of self-evaluation on faculty cooperation. The remaining 8.3 percent of characteristics identified as being the most satisfactory occurred so infrequently and are so varied in nature that no mention will be made of them.

Increased knowledge of the school program

Teachers in the experimental schools made 133 comments (44 percent of the 302 received) with regard to the increased knowledge they had acquired about the overall school program or the department in which they teach.

Ninety-four of these 133 comments referred to the overall school program. Typical responses and their numbers were: "This self-evaluation pointed out weaknesses in our school program" (33); "it gave me a clear picture of our problem areas and strengths" (23); "it increased my awareness of the objectives and accomplishments of other departments" (17); "we became more aware of the needs, aims and objectives of the total school program" (15); and "it increased my knowledge of the school program" (6).

Thirty-six comments were similar to the statement that "I became more aware of the strengths and weaknesses of my department."

If the comments of these teachers can be interpreted as being correct, then they support one of the most commonly claimed advantages of the Evaluative Criteria self-study. Respondents to Ely's study stated that they had acquired "an increased knowledge of the school program."[1] In the

---

[1]Ely, loc. cit.

study by Matthews, "increased knowledge of the school program"[1] was mentioned more frequently than any of the other benefits.

However, responses to seven questions in this study (previously referred to on pages 89-106) supplied only limited evidence that teachers in the eleven experimental schools gained an increased knowledge of the school program. A significant change in responses was indicated in only two of these seven questions.

General values of self-evaluation

Of the 302 comments which identified the most satisfactory characteristics of the Evaluative Criteria, sixty-seven (22.2 percent) referred to the general values of the practice of self-evaluation. Thirty-eight comments included such a statement as "the Evaluative Criteria provides a convenient means for taking a critical look at our educational program." Statements such as "self-evaluation does us good" or "this required evaluation was beneficial" were indicated in nineteen comments. Six comments such as "self-evaluation helps us to institute improvement in our school program" were included.

---

[1] Matthews, loc. cit.

In examining the claimed advantages of the self-evaluation process, one commonly finds praiseworthy comments relative to the general values of the practice of self-evaluation and particularly the convenience of the Evaluative Criteria in providing a means for critical examination of the educational program. Respondents to the studies by Ely,[1] Matthews,[2] and Cope[3] replied in similar fashion to those of this study in identifying the values of the self-evaluation process.

Effect on self-evaluation on individual teaching performance

Fifty-one comments (16.9 percent of the 302 received) were related to the effect of self-evaluation on the performance of the teacher in the classroom. Thirty-nine of the fifty-one comments can be characterized as "one gains insight regarding his teaching performance since a critical self-evaluation is required." Typical remaining comments (and the number of each) were: "It provided an opportunity for one to take a good look at himself and his role in education" (4); "it resulted in the improvement of my teaching practices" (4); "this self-evaluation made me aware of

---

[1]Ely, loc. cit. [2]Matthews, loc. cit. [3]Cope, loc. cit.

my responsibility to do a better job" (3); and "I gained knowledge about what other faculty members think makes a good teacher" (1).

Favorable responses to the effect of self-evaluation on individual teaching performances were also indicated in the studies by Ely[1] and Matthews.[2]

However, comments by certain respondents in this study relative to the favorable effect on self-evaluation on their teaching performance do not seem to be supported by the changes in responses of teachers to questions twenty-five and twenty-six (previously discussed on pages 106-12). Question twenty-five obtained teachers' judgments with regard to how often they engage in self-evaluation of their teaching performance. In question twenty-six, teachers were asked to judge various aspects of their teaching performance. No significant change in responses was evidenced in either question.

Effect of self-evaluation
on faculty cooperation

Twenty-six comments (8.6 percent of the 302 received) referred to the favorable effects of self-evaluation in

---

[1]Ely, loc. cit. [2]Matthews, loc. cit.

promoting cooperation among the teachers. Twenty of these twenty-six comments included such statements as "our self-evaluation gave our teachers an opportunity to think and work together to accomplish set goals." Three additional comments referred specifically to "the fostering of a co-operative attitude among teachers."

Respondents to the study by Matthews also referred to improved faculty relationships with such statements as "closer feeling among faculty who worked on this" and "generally, a more cooperative attitude developed by self-evaluation."[1]

## Judgments of teachers regarding the least satisfactory characteristics of the Evaluative Criteria self-study

Question thirty-six also asked teachers to express their judgment with regard to the least satisfactory characteristics of the self-evaluation employing the Evaluative Criteria. Of the 383 teachers in the experimental group, 200 (52.2 percent) identified a total of 215 characteristics as being the least satisfactory. No responses were received from 183 teachers (47.8 percent).

---

[1] Matthews, loc. cit.

The least satisfactory characteristics identified by respondents have been grouped into one of three areas: procedures employed for the self-study, the self-evaluation instrument (the Evaluative Criteria), and the visiting committee. These three areas include 96.4 percent of the 215 least satisfactory characteristics received; the remaining 3.7 percent of the least satisfactory characteristics occurred so infrequently that they are not mentioned here.

## Procedures employed for the self-study

Dissatisfaction with various procedures employed for completion of the self-study was indicated in ninety-six comments (44.7 percent of the total 215 comments received). "Lack of time for completion of the self-study" was indicated by thirty-four respondents in nine of the eleven experimental schools. In these nine schools, the number of respondents in each school who indicated "lack of time" as the least satisfactory characteristic ranged from one respondent in each of three schools to eight respondents in school G (eight out of twenty-eight respondents or 28.6 percent). This particular comment represented 15.8 percent of the total 215 comments received.

The manual of the Evaluative Criteria[1] suggests a minimum period of one year for completing the self-study and two years or more for larger schools (a "large" school is not defined). According to information obtained from principals of the eleven experimental schools, seven schools completed their self-study in six to eleven months, two in twelve months, one in fifteen months, and one in sixteen months.[2] Since the time spent on the Evaluative Criteria by most of the experimental schools was less than that recommended by the National Study of Secondary School Evaluation, it appears likely that most "lack of time" comments were justifiable.

Thirty-two comments (14.9 percent) expressed doubt concerning what application would be made of the findings of the self-evaluation. These respondents questioned whether the needed improvements emphasized in the self-study would be undertaken; they were critical of administrative procedures in their school system rather than the Evaluative Criteria.

Seventeen comments (7.9 percent) referred to a lack of communication between various committees which were

---

[1] National Study of Secondary School Evaluation, loc. cit., pp. 7-8.

[2] See Appendix, Table 2, pages 160-61, for the length of time spent on the Evaluative Criteria by each experimental school.

established for the self-study. Nine comments indicated there was not enough exchange of committee information and eight comments stated there was no exchange of information between committees.

The manual of the Evaluative Criteria states that one of the responsibilities of each committee involves "reporting the results to the entire faculty for modification or approval."[1] The publication entitled Evaluation Guide for Secondary Schools also emphasizes that "consideration should be given to the reports made by each work committee by all the faculty."[2]

The principal of each experimental school was asked if the various committees formed for the self-study reported their results to any other faculty group. No committee evaluations were reported in six of the eleven experimental schools (schools A, C, D, G, I, and K). In two experimental schools, H and J, each committee reported their results to the entire faculty for discussion and eventual approval. In schools E, B, and F, only the following committees reported their results: subject area committees reported to the entire faculty in school E, the Philosophy and Objectives

---

[1] National Study of Secondary School Evaluation, loc. cit.

[2] North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Evaluation Guide for Secondary Schools, p. 9.

Committee reported to the entire faculty in school B, and each committee reported only to the Steering Committee in school F.

Ineffective participation in the self-study by certain teachers was indicated as the least satisfactory characteristic in eight comments (3.7 percent). Most of these respondents criticized their fellow teachers for assuming a superficial attitude towards the self-evaluation process or failing to participate actively in committee assignments.

### The self-evaluation instrument (the Evaluative Criteria)

Criticisms of the Evaluative Criteria as an instrument for self-evaluation were indicated in ninety-three comments (43.3 percent of the 215 least satisfactory characteristics received).

Of these ninety-three comments, sixty were critical of select aspects of the Evaluative Criteria. Twenty-one comments characterized some of the vocabulary as "ambiguous" and fifteen as "trivial" or "redundant." Seven comments indicated that Form K for individual staff members was longer than necessary or not needed. Five comments indicated that some of the statements which accompany checklist items were not relevant to the educational area being examined.

Thirty-three of the ninety-three comments which were critical of the Evaluative Criteria mentioned "time" as the least satisfactory characteristic. Twenty comments expressed the feeling of respondents that "this study took a great deal of time" and thirteen stated that "it took too much time in proportion to the benefits we will receive from this study."

Some respondents to the study by Matthews[1] also referred to ambiguity in the vocabulary of the Evaluative Criteria and the excessive time required of the faculty in terms of results achieved. Regarding ambiguity in the vocabulary, the manual of the Evaluative Criteria includes the statement that "it is probably too much to expect...that there will be a uniform interpretation of all items in this edition. Those with different backgrounds, experience, and interest will interpret the same statements differently."[2]

The visiting committee

Ten of the eleven experimental schools were visited by visiting committees which spent one and one-half days in the schools for the purpose of providing a check on the

---

[1] Matthews, loc. cit.

[2] National Study of Secondary School Evaluation, loc. cit., p. 5.

self-evaluation carried out by each school staff. Educators from other North Central Association member schools in Michigan served on these committees which varied in size from eleven to twenty-two members.

Of the 215 comments which identified the least satisfactory characteristics of the Evaluative Criteria self-study, eighteen (8.4 percent) were critical of the procedures employed by the visiting committee. Eleven of these eighteen comments expressed opinions of the respondents that the visit was too short for visiting team members to provide an accurate evaluation. Six comments referred to a lack of knowledgeable persons in certain of the curriculum areas being examined.

Eighteen responses identified the visiting committee with the least satisfactory characteristics of the Evaluative Criteria self-study (8.4 percent of the 215 received), whereas five responses identified the visiting committee with the most satisfactory characteristics (1.7 percent of the 302 received). Due to the small number of responses received, no definite tendencies can be noted relative to the teachers' perceptions of the visiting committee. However, more "least satisfactory" than "most satisfactory" comments about the visiting committee were indicated. A majority of the

eighteen comments identified as least satisfactory made reference to the shortness of the visit. Each visit lasted one and one-half days, whereas the manual of the Evaluative Criteria states that "even in schools of small or medium size, it is recommended that a committee...spend three days for the visit."[1] The Michigan State Committee of the North Central Association decided recently that, beginning in the school year 1967-68, visiting committees shall spend a minimum of two full days in each school.

### Teachers' attitudes toward self-evaluation before the Evaluative Criteria was begun and after it was completed

In question twenty-eight, respondents were asked: "After you were aware that you would be participating in a self-evaluation of your school, employing the Evaluative Criteria, and before you began participating in it, what was your personal attitude towards this self-evaluation?" Respondents were asked to check one of five attitudes: "antagonistic," "indifferent," "favorable," "very favorable," or "enthusiastic."

These same five attitudes were included in question twenty-nine, which asked each teacher to identify his attitude

---

[1] Ibid., p. 10.

towards the self-evaluation after the Evaluative Criteria was completed.

Responses of teachers to both of the above questions are summarized in Table 26.

TABLE 26.--Judgments of teachers concerning their attitude toward self-evaluation before beginning and after completing the Evaluative Criteria

| Attitude | Before | | After | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Antagonistic | 12 | 3 | 9 | 2 |
| Indifferent | 96 | 25 | 57 | 15 |
| Favorable | 174 | 46 | 179 | 47 |
| Very favorable | 69 | 18 | 104 | 28 |
| Enthusiastic | 29 | 8 | 29 | 8 |
| Total | 380 | 100 | 378 | 100 |

Chi-square = 17.511

The change in teachers' responses was significant (Chi-square 17.511; P less than .01). There was a decrease in the number of teachers who felt "indifferent" towards the self-evaluation, accompanied by an increase in the number of teachers who felt "very favorable" towards it. Ninety-six teachers (25 percent) identified their attitude as "indifferent" before beginning the Evaluative Criteria

and fifty-seven teachers (15 percent) after completing it. Sixty-nine teachers (18 percent) identified their attitude as "very favorable" before beginning the Evaluative Criteria and 104 teachers (28 percent) after completing it.

There was little change in the number of teachers who identified their attitude as "antagonistic" or "favorable" and no change in the number of teachers who identified their attitude as "enthusiastic."

Two studies by Matthews[1] also identified the change in teachers' attitudes toward the Evaluative Criteria; respondents in both studies indicated definite trends toward more favorable attitudes.

## Awareness of teachers regarding aims and purposes of the self-study

Teachers in the eleven experimental schools were asked to identify their degree of awareness regarding the aims and purposes of their school's self-study before it was begun. The four statements listed in question thirty are presented in Table 27 under "Degree of awareness."

It seems important to this study that 38 percent of the respondents felt that the information they received

---

[1] Matthews, loc. cit.

TABLE 27.--Teachers' judgments regarding their awareness of the aims and purposes of their self-study

| Degree of awareness | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| a. The only purpose I recognized was that it was "required" by an outside agency. No mention was made of how this self-study might be of benefit to us as teachers and to our school. | 53 | 14 |
| b. Brief mention was made that this self-study would provide us with helpful information. However, more specific and detailed information about the nature of the Evaluative Criteria and how it could benefit us would have helped. | 90 | 24 |
| c. I feel that adequate information regarding its aims and purposes was given before the study was underway. | 164 | 43 |
| d. My orientation regarding its aims and purposes was excellent; the nature of the processes involved in self-study and the specific nature of the measuring instrument, the Evaluative Criteria, were clearly explained. | 73 | 19 |
| Total | 380 | 100 |

regarding the aims and purposes of their self-study was inadequate (38 percent was obtained by adding 14 percent in statement (a) and 24 percent in statement (b) ). In each of the eleven experimental schools, the percentage of teachers who checked one of the first two statements in Table 27 ranged from 16 percent of thirty respondents in school F to 60

percent of thirty respondents in school H.

The manual of the Evaluative Criteria states that "it may be desirable, where there has been little experience with evaluations, to invite a qualified person to discuss the evaluation with the faculty. The values, procedures, problems, and materials can be considered in such a discussion."[1]

Many of the teachers in the eleven experimental schools had little or no experience with previous self-evaluations. Although three schools completed the same self-study in the preceding five year period, the principals of five schools could not recall ever having completed the Evaluative Criteria. Responses to question thirty-five indicated that only 8 percent of 380 respondents had participated in a self-evaluation employing the Evaluative Criteria at another high school during the past five years. If the teacher responses shown in Table 27 accurately express their degree of awareness regarding the aims and purposes of the Evaluative Criteria, there was a definite need for improved orientation to the self-study.

---

[1]National Study of Secondary School Evaluation, loc. cit., p. 8.

Organization for the self-study

Question thirty-one asked teachers to characterize their school's degree of organization for the self-study by checking one of the five statements shown in Table 28.

TABLE 28.--Judgments of teachers with regard to their school's degree of organization for the self-study

| Degree of Organization | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Poor | 8 | 2 |
| Fair | 34 | 9 |
| Good | 109 | 29 |
| Very good | 128 | 33 |
| Excellent | 102 | 27 |
| Total | 381 | 100 |

It should be stated that 339 of 381 respondents (89 percent) judged their school's degree of organization for the self-study as "good," "very good," or "excellent." Furthermore, when teachers were asked in question thirty-six to state the least satisfactory characteristics of their self-evaluation employing the Evaluative Criteria, only two of 215 comments referred to the lack of effective organization for the self-study.

## Amount of information teachers received about results of other committee studies

In question thirty-two, respondents were asked: "Which one of the statements listed below best describes your opinion concerning the amount of information you received about the results of committee studies other than the ones on which you served?" The number and percent of responses to each of six judgments are revealed in Table 29.

TABLE 29.-- Teachers' judgments concerning the amount of information they received about the results of other Evaluative Criteria committee studies

| Judgment | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| a. I do not feel it was necessary for me to receive information about the results of other committee studies. | 16 | 4 |
| b. No information was received, thus seriously reducing possible benefits of this self-evaluation. | 56 | 15 |
| c. A little information was received but not nearly enough. | 59 | 16 |
| d. Some information was received but more would have been helpful. | 93 | 24 |
| e. Enough information was received. | 148 | 39 |
| f. More information than was necessary was received. | 7 | 2 |
| Total | 379 | 100 |

It seems important that 208 of 379 respondents (55 percent) felt there was a lack of information provided them concerning the results of other committee studies (the above number was obtained by adding the number of respondents to judgments (b), (c), and (d) in Table 29); also, only 39 percent agreed with the opinion that "enough information was received" and 15 percent checked the opinion that "no information was received."

Of the eleven experimental schools, the highest percentage of teachers in one school who agreed with the opinion that "enough information was received" was 67 percent of forty-three respondents in school E; the lowest percentage was 7 percent of twenty-seven respondents in school G. In school E, subject area committees reported to the entire faculty; no committee findings were reported in school G (methods of committee reporting employed by each experimental school were previously identified on page 122). Although a sizable percentage of respondents felt there was a lack of information provided them concerning the results of other committee studies, this does not appear to be unexpected since committees in six of the eleven experimental schools did not report their findings to any other faculty groups or individuals.

Judgments of teachers with regard to the proportion between time and effort expended on the Evaluative Criteria and the benefits obtained

Question thirty-three asked teachers whether the amount of time and effort expended in completion of the Evaluative Criteria was justified in terms of the benefits obtained.

Of 356 respondents (93 percent of the 383 teachers in experimental schools), 207 (58 percent) checked "yes" and 149 (42 percent) checked "no." Of the eleven experimental schools, the highest percentage of teachers in one school who checked "no" was 64 percent of twenty-five respondents in school G; the lowest percentage was 23 percent of twenty-six respondents in school K. In four of the eleven experimental schools, 50 percent or more of the teachers indicated that the amount of time and effort expended in completion of the Evaluative Criteria was disproportionate to the benefits obtained.

It seems important to this study that 42 percent of the respondents to this question felt that an imbalance existed between the benefits obtained from their self-study and the time and effort expended on it. It appears likely that some of the respondents to this question were not confining their criticisms to the Evaluative Criteria itself,

if at all. As previously indicated in a discussion of responses to question thirty-six, in which teachers were asked to identify the "least satisfactory characteristics" of their self-study, 44.7 percent of the 215 responses were critical of the procedures employed for the self-study, whereas 43.3 percent criticized the instrument employed for self-evaluation. There is no way of determining the degree of criticism directed at the Evaluative Criteria itself in an analysis of responses to this question.

## Teachers' judgments concerning the helpfulness of the Evaluative Criteria

In question thirty-four, teachers were asked to judge the degree of helpfulness of the Evaluative Criteria in its totality. Responses are summarized in Table 30.

TABLE 30.--Judgments of teachers concerning the helpfulness of the Evaluative Criteria

| Degree of helpfulness | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Harmful | 0 | 0 |
| Of no help | 7 | 2 |
| Of little help | 70 | 19 |
| Of some help | 214 | 58 |
| Of much help | 79 | 21 |
| Total | 370 | 100 |

Since 293 of 370 respondents (79 percent) felt that the Evaluative Criteria was of "some" or "much" help, teachers' perceptions of the degree of helpfulness of this self-evaluation instrument tended to be favorable. However, only nine more respondents indicated it was "of much help" than "of little help."

Previous experience of teachers with Evaluative Criteria

Question thirty-five asked teachers if they participated in a self-evaluation which employed the Evaluative Criteria at another high school during the past five years. Of 380 respondents, twenty-nine (8 percent) checked "yes" and 351 (92 percent) checked "no." Since principals of five experimental schools could not recall ever having completed the Evaluative Criteria and two additional schools had not undertaken this self-study for at least nine years, it seems likely that a sizable majority of the respondents to the questionnaire had no previous experience with the Evaluative Criteria.

Teachers' recommendations regarding repetition of Evaluative Criteria self-study

Question thirty-seven asked teachers if they would

recommend that their school use the Evaluative Criteria again at some future date. Of 358 respondents (twenty-five teachers did not answer this question), 287 (80 percent) checked "yes" and seventy-one (20 percent) checked "no." A few of the twenty-five teachers who did not respond to this question indicated that they would have to await the outcomes of their self-evaluation before answering.

The four to one ratio of "yes" to "no" responses seems to indicate that, in spite of criticisms of some teachers directed toward the instrument itself and the processes employed for its completion, a sizable majority felt that enough benefit resulted to them and their school to recommend that the Evaluative Criteria self-study be repeated at some future date.

# CHAPTER IV

# SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## SUMMARY

### Purpose of study

This study attempted to determine the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria, 1960 Edition, as a stimulus for school improvement in eleven Michigan high schools which recently employed this instrument in a self-evaluation of their entire high school programs. Those teachers who served on at least one of the section committees of the Evaluative Criteria were asked to state their perceptions relative to (1) the statement of school philosophy and objectives, (2) course objectives and courses of study, (3) curriculum planning, (4) knowledge of the school program, (5) self-evaluation of teaching performance. Furthermore, these teachers were asked to judge the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria as it was employed in their schools.

### Procedure

Two written questionnaires were completed by 514

teachers in fifteen Michigan high schools. Of these 514 respondents, 383 teachers in eleven high schools which completed the Evaluative Criteria served as the experimental group; 131 teachers in four high schools which had not completed the Evaluative Criteria for at least ten years served as the control group. For teachers in experimental schools, the first questionnaire was administered before the Evaluative Criteria self-study was begun; the second questionnaire was administered after the Evaluative Criteria was completed. For teachers in control schools, questionnaire administration dates approximated those of teachers in experimental schools.

Parts I and II of both questionnaires were identical for teachers in both experimental and control schools. None of the questions in Part I and II made reference to the Evaluative Criteria. The change in questionnaire responses by teachers in experimental schools was compared with the change in responses by teachers in control schools in an attempt to determine the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria as a stimulus for school improvement. The chi-square method of statistical analysis was employed to determine the significance of the change in responses.

The second questionnaire for teachers in experimental schools contained an additional section, Part III, which obtained teachers' judgments regarding the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria as it was employed in their school.

## Delimitations

This study was limited to an investigation of the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria, 1960 Edition, as a stimulus for school improvement in eleven Michigan high schools. These schools do not constitute a representative sample of public high schools in Michigan. Therefore, findings of this study should be interpreted only in relation to high schools included in this study and other Michigan schools which may be similar to those included in this report, both in regard to the nature of the schools and the methods employed for completion of the self-evaluation employing the Evaluative Criteria.

## Findings

The findings stated below are based on teachers' perceptions as indicated by their responses to the written questionnaires.

School philosophy and objectives

1. Teachers in experimental schools perceived themselves as increasingly familiar with the written philosophy and objectives of their high school, as evidenced by significant changes in responses to the second questionnaire (Chi-square 67.576; P less than .01). Teachers in control schools indicated no significant change in responses.
2. Teachers in experimental schools felt there was increased discussion and agreement by the faculty regarding the philosophy and specific objectives of their high school program, as evidenced by a significant change in responses (Chi-square 68.936; P less than .01). Teachers in control schools indicated no significant change in responses.
3. Teachers in experimental schools attached increasing importance to the need for their high school to employ a written, carefully formulated, comprehensive philosophy of education with specific objectives, as evidenced by their significant change in responses (Chi-square 9.763; P at .05 level). Teachers in control schools indicated no significant change in responses.

Course objectives and courses of study

1. Teachers in experimental schools increasingly employed written course objectives for the courses they teach, as evidenced by the significant change in their responses in the second questionnaire (Chi-square 13.463; P less than .01). Teachers in control schools evidenced no significant change in responses.
2. Regarding the importance of the need for teachers to employ clearly formulated, comprehensive written objectives for the courses they teach, no significant change in responses was indicated by teachers in either experimental or control schools.
3. Teachers in neither experimental nor control schools evidenced a significant change in responses concerning their employment and the adequacy of their written courses of study.
4. No significant change in responses was indicated by teachers in either experimental or control schools with regard to the degree of importance they attach to the need for clearly formulated, comprehensive, written courses of study for the courses they teach.

Curriculum planning

1. Regarding the extent and effect of departmental curriculum planning, no significant change in responses was evidenced by teachers in either experimental or control schools.
2. Teachers in both experimental and control schools indicated very little change in responses regarding the role of the classroom teacher in curriculum determination.
3. Concerning the opportunity teachers have to contribute to curriculum development and the extent of their participation, no significant change in responses was evidenced by teachers in either experimental or control schools.
4. When asked to identify the attitude of the faculty regarding the need for making changes in the high school curriculum, teachers in both experimental and control schools indicated no significant change in responses.

Teacher knowledge of the school program

1. Teachers in experimental schools felt there was an increase in their ability to assess the quality of

the total educational program in their high school, as evidenced by a significant change in responses to the second questionnaire (Chi-square 13.507; P less than .01). No significant change in responses was indicated by teachers in control schools.

2. Teachers in experimental schools attached increasing importance to the effect of their knowledge of the total educational program on the quality of their teaching performance, as indicated by their significant change in responses (Chi-square 12.100; P less than .01). Teachers in control schools evidenced no significant change in responses.
3. No significant change in responses was indicated by teachers in either experimental or control schools regarding the balance in educational opportunities provided for college-bound and terminal students.
4. When respondents were asked to rate the quality of their school as compared with their understanding of the quality of other Michigan high schools, teachers in both experimental and control schools evidenced little change in responses.

5. With regard to their evaluations of the quality of each subject department, program, and the school building, teachers in both experimental and control schools evidenced no significant change in responses with one exception; teachers in control schools evidenced a significant change in responses concerning the quality of the school building (Chi-square 11.223; P at .05 level).
6. When asked to identify two major strengths and two major weaknesses of the total educational program in their high school, teachers in experimental and control schools indicated approximately the same percentage of "different" strengths and "different" weaknesses in the second questionnaire.
7. In describing their knowledge of the courses offered in their department, teachers in both experimental and control schools evidenced no significant change in responses.

Self-evaluation of teaching performance

1. Very little change in responses was indicated by teachers in both experimental and control schools

with regard to how often they engage in self-evaluation of their teaching performance.

2. When teachers were asked to rate themselves relative to nine teaching practices, no significant change in responses was evidenced by teachers in either experimental or control schools.

Opinions of 383 teachers in eleven experimental schools regarding the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria self-study

1. In identifying the most satisfactory characteristics of the Evaluative Criteria self-study, respondents referred to their increased knowledge of the school program, the general values of self-evaluation, the favorable effect of self-evaluation on their teaching performance, and increased faculty cooperation.
2. In identifying the least satisfactory characteristics of the Evaluative Criteria self-study, respondents referred to procedures employed for the self-evaluation, characteristics of the measuring instrument (the Evaluative Criteria), and procedures employed by the visiting committee.
3. There was no significant change in teachers' responses which identified their attitude toward

the self-study before the Evaluative Criteria was begun and after it was completed.

4. Approximately 38 percent of the teachers felt that their awareness regarding the aims and purposes of the self-study was inadequate.
5. Approximately 89 percent of the teachers characterized their school's degree of organization for the self-study as "good," "very good," or "excellent."
6. Approximately 55 percent of the teachers felt that they did not receive enough information about the results of other section committee studies.
7. With regard to the amount of time and effort devoted to the Evaluative Criteria self-study, 54 percent of the teachers felt that the time and effort involved was justified by the benefits obtained, 39 percent felt that the time and effort involved was disproportionate to the benefits obtained, and 7 percent did not answer this question.
8. Approximately 58 percent of the teachers felt that the Evaluative Criteria self-study was "of some help," 21 percent "of much help," and 19 percent "of little help."

9. When teachers were asked if they would recommend that their school use the Evaluative Criteria again at some future date, 75 percent answered "yes," 19 percent answered "no," and 6 percent did not respond.

## Conclusions

Teachers in experimental schools evidenced a significant change in responses to six of twenty questions in Part II of the questionnaire. Teachers in experimental schools:

1. Perceived themselves as increasingly familiar with the written philosophy and objectives of their high school.
2. Felt there was increased discussion and agreement by the faculty regarding the philosophy and specific objectives of their high school program.
3. Attached increasing importance to the need for their high school to employ a written, carefully formulated, comprehensive philosophy of education with specific objectives.
4. Increasingly employed written course objectives for the courses they teach.

5. Felt there was an increase in their ability to assess the quality of the total educational program in their high school.
6. Attached increasing importance to the effect of their knowledge of the total educational program on the quality of their teaching performance.

Even where statistically significant changes in response did occur, these changes appear to be much lower than the literature would lead one to believe. Among the twenty-eight choices listed in the six questions referred to above, the median percentage of teachers who changed their response was 5 percent; the highest percentage of teachers who changed their response was 21 percent.

Thus, if the questionnaires accurately measured teachers' judgments relative to the five areas of the educational program included in this study, and if the teachers' judgments can be interpreted as correct, then little evidence is presented in support of the Evaluative Criteria as a stimulus for school improvement in the eleven experimental schools of this study.

However, it must be reemphasized that, in the experimental schools of this study, the procedures employed for

completion of the self-study varied from those recommended in the manual of the Evaluative Criteria as follows:

1. The manual states that one of the responsibilities of each committee involves "reporting the results to the entire faculty for modification or approval."[1] Of the eleven experimental schools, only schools H and J followed this procedure. In three schools, only the following committees reported their results: subject area subcommittees reported to the entire faculty in school E, the Philosophy and Objectives Committee reported to the entire faculty in school B, and each committee reported only to the Steering Committee in school F. In the six remaining experimental schools, no committee evaluations were reported to any other faculty groups or individuals.
2. The manual[2] suggests a minimum period of one year for completing the self-study and two years or more for larger schools (a "large" school is not defined). Of the eleven experimental schools, seven

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., pp. 7-8.

completed their self-study in six to eleven months, two in twelve months, one in fifteen months, and one in sixteen months.

3. In schools which have had little experience with evaluations, the manual states that "it may be desirable...to invite a qualified person to discuss the evaluation with the faculty. The values, procedures, problems, and materials can be considered in such a discussion."[1]

Although a majority of the eleven experimental schools had little or no previous experience with the self-evaluation process, no qualified person discussed evaluation with the faculties. Responses to question thirty revealed that 143 teachers (38 percent) felt that the information they received regarding the aims and purposes of their self-study was inadequate.

In question thirty-six, of 215 comments in which respondents stated what they felt to be the least satisfactory characteristics of the Evaluative Criteria self-study, ninety-six (44.7 percent) were critical of procedures employed for the self-study and ninety-three (43.3

---

[1] Ibid., p. 8.

percent) criticized the instrument employed for self-study, the Evaluative Criteria. Responses to this question and other questions seem to indicate that both the instrument itself and the methods employed for its use affected the outcome of this study.

## Recommendations

1. It is believed that the experimental schools of this study employed procedures for completion of the Evaluative Criteria which are characteristic of many high schools in Michigan. For this reason, it seems imperative that these schools be instructed to read carefully the manual of the Evaluative Criteria, noting particularly the recommendations regarding the reporting of committee results to the entire faculty and the time recommended for the self-study.
2. More emphasis should be placed on the need for faculties to be aware of the aims and purposes of self-evaluation. In some schools, it appears that faculties view the self-study primarily as something which is required by an "outside" agency, having little awareness of the possible benefits

that may be derived from the self-evaluation process. Inviting a qualified person to discuss the evaluation with the faculty would seem to be especially helpful in both of the above recommendations, especially in those schools having little or no previous experience with evaluations.

3. More attempts should be made to determine the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria as a stimulus for school improvement. The literature revealed that an Iowa study[1] is the only major one involving this instrument since 1959. It would seem especially helpful if research were undertaken in schools which employ all the procedures for self-study that are recommended in the manual of the Evaluative Criteria.

4. Increased employment of other self-evaluative instruments such as "High School Evaluation Guide"[2] is recommended so comparisons can be made of their effectiveness with that of the Evaluative Criteria.

---

[1] Edwards, loc. cit.

[2] Gordon Cawelti, "High School Evaluation Guide." Commission on Secondary Schools, North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 5454 South Shore Drive, Chicago.

# APPENDIX

# EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

## Table of Contents


| | Section | Page |
|---|---|---|
| **BASIC INFORMATION** | | |
| **Manual** | A | 1 |
| Philosophy and Objectives | B | 25 |
| School and Community | C | 29 |
| **SCHOOL EVALUATION** | | |
| Educational Program | | |
| Program of Studies | D | 49 |
| Agriculture | D-1 | 61 |
| Art (Including Crafts) | D-2 | 69 |
| Business Education | D-3 | 77 |
| Core Program | D-4 | 85 |
| Distributive Education | D-5 | 93 |
| Driver Education | D-6 | 101 |
| English | D-7 | 109 |
| Foreign Languages | D-8 | 121 |
| Health Education | D-9 | 133 |
| Home Economics | D-10 | 141 |
| Industrial Arts | D-11 | 153 |

| | Section | Page |
|---|---|---|
| Mathematics | D-12 | 165 |
| Music | D-13 | 177 |
| Physical Education for Boys | D-14 | 185 |
| Physical Education for Girls | D-15 | 193 |
| Religion (for use by those schools which offer religion as a part of the program of studies) | D-16 | 201 |
| Science | D-17 | 209 |
| Social Studies | D-18 | 221 |
| Vocational Trade and Industrial Education | D-19 | 229 |
| Student Activity Program | E | 241 |
| Instructional Materials Services--Library and Audio-Visual | F | 257 |
| Guidance Services | G | 273 |
| Health Services | H | 289 |
| School Plant | I | 301 |
| School Staff and Administration | J | 317 |
| Individual Staff Member | K | 341 |
| **SUMMARY** | | |
| Statistical Summary of Evaluation | X | 349 |
| Graphic Summary | Y | 369 |

TABLE 1.--Basic data concerning the fifteen Michigan high schools included in the study

| School | Enrollment[a] | Number of teachers[b] | Number of high schools in school district | Grade organization | Percentage of new teachers[c] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Experimental schools | | | | | |
| Division I: | | | | | |
| A | 2165 (1)[d] | 64 (3) | 1 | 9-12 | 20 |
| B | 2141 (2) | 71 (1) | 2 | 10-12 | 18 |
| C | 2060 (3) | 65 (2) | 1 | 10-12 | 20 |
| Mean | 2122 | 67 | | | |
| Control school | | | | | |
| ABC | 2207 | 69 | 2 | 10-12 | 14 |

[a]Enrollment figures were obtained from the North Central Association Annual Report, 1966-67.

[b]The number of classroom teachers who teach at least three classes on a regular basis, excluding those teachers who conduct classes in special education and those teachers not employed by this school before the 1966-67 school year. Obtained from the 1966-67 classroom teaching schedules of each school.

[c]A new teacher is defined as a person not employed in the high school during the previous school year. These figures represent the median percentage of new teachers over a four year period from 1962-63 through 1965-66. Compilations were made from information contained in each school's Report to the Bureau of School Services, The University of Michigan.

[d]Figures in parentheses indicate the rank number for the factor in that column.

TABLE 1--Continued

| School | Enrollment | Number of teachers | Number of high schools in school district | Grade organization | Percentage of new teachers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Experimental schools Division II:** | | | | | |
| D | 1755 (4) | 44 (7) | 1 | 10-12 | 14 |
| E | 1622 (5) | 58 (4) | 4 | 10-12 | 15 |
| F | 1604 (6) | 46 (5) | 20 | 10-12 | 19 |
| Mean | 1660 | 49 | | | |
| **Control school** | | | | | |
| DEF | 1775 | 65 | 3 | 10-12 | 11 |
| **Experimental schools Division III:** | | | | | |
| G | 1159 (7) | 46 (5) | 4 | 10-12 | 9 |
| H | 931 (8) | 41 (8) | 3 | 10-12 | 22 |
| I | 903 (9) | 35 (9) | 1 | 10-12 | 13 |
| Mean | 998 | 41 | | | |
| **Control school** | | | | | |
| GHI | 1146 | 40 | 1 | 10-12 | 14 |

TABLE 1--Continued

| School | Enrollment | Number of teachers | Number of high schools in school district | Grade organization | Percentage of new teachers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Experimental schools** | | | | | |
| **Division IV:** | | | | | |
| J | 894 (10) | 33 (10) | 1 | 9-12 | 26 |
| K | 745 (11) | 29 (11) | 1 | 9-12 | 24 |
| Mean | 820 | 31 | | | |
| Control school | | | | | |
| JK | 775 | 17 | 1 | 9-12 | 20 |

TABLE 2.--Questionnaire administration dates, released time granted to experimental schools for self-study, and total time spent by experimental schools on Evaluative Criteria

| School | First questionnaire date | Second questionnaire date | Released time in days[a] | Total time in months[b] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Experimental schools Division I: | | | | |
| A | September 14 | May 24 | 0 | 15 |
| B | October 10 | May 1 | $2\frac{1}{2}$ | 6 |
| C | September 29 | May 8 | 2/3 | 8 |
| Control school | | | | |
| ABC | September 23 | May 4 | .. | .. |
| Experimental schools Division II: | | | | |
| D | September 20 | April 20 | 2 | 16 |
| E | September 6 | May 23 | 5/6 | 10 |
| F | October 11 | May 2 | 1 1/3 | 11 |
| Control school | | | | |
| DEF | October 3 | April 10 | .. | .. |

[a]Total time in days for which school was dismissed so the entire faculty could work on the Evaluative Criteria.

[b] Total time in months (while school was in session) spent on the Evaluative Criteria self-study.

TABLE 2--Continued

| School | First questionnaire date | Second questionnaire date | Released time in days | Total time in months |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Experimental schools Division III:** | | | | |
| G | September 13 | March 7 | 1 | 12 |
| H | September 26 | May 16 | 3 | 10 |
| I | September 12 | December 5 | 0 | 5 |
| Control school | | | | |
| GHI | October 5 | April 25 | .. | .. |
| **Experimental schools Division IV:** | | | | |
| J | September 1 | February 27 | $1\frac{1}{2}$ | 12 |
| K | September 21 | March 20 | 1 | 11 |
| Control school | | | | |
| JK | September 19 | March 6 | .. | .. |

TABLE 3.--Number and percent of teacher respondents

| School | Number of eligible teachers[a] | Number of teachers who completed both questionnaires | Percent of eligible teachers who completed both questionnaires |
|---|---|---|---|
| Experimental schools Division I: | | | |
| A | 64 | 43 | 67 |
| B | 71 | 59 | 83 |
| C | 65 | 44 | 68 |
| Control school | | | |
| ABC | 69 | 51 | 74 |
| Experimental schools Division II: | | | |
| D | 44 | 29 | 66 |
| E | 58 | 43 | 74 |
| F | 46 | 30 | 65 |
| Control school | | | |
| DEF | 65 | 45 | 69 |

[a]The number of teachers eligible to complete the questionnaires as determined by the criteria stated on pages 38-39 in Chapter I.

TABLE 3--Continued

| School | Number of eligible teachers | Number of teachers who completed both questionnaires | Percent of eligible teachers who completed both questionnaires |
|---|---|---|---|
| Experimental schools Division III: | | | |
| G | 46 | 28 | 61 |
| H | 41 | 31 | 76 |
| I | 35 | 28 | 80 |
| Control school | | | |
| GHI | 40 | 23 | 58 |
| Experimental schools | | | |
| J | 33 | 22 | 67 |
| K | 29 | 26 | 90 |
| Control school | | | |
| JK | 17 | 12 | 71 |

QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of the following questions is to obtain some general information regarding your impressions of the educational program of your high school.

Estimated completion time is approximately twenty minutes.

Please be sure to answer every item.

Please do not sign your name. No attempt will be made to identify any of the respondents nor will individual questionnaires and names of respondent schools be available to anyone except the researcher.

Your cooperation is sincerely appreciated.

## QUESTIONNAIRE

### Part I

### General Information

1. School_____

Instructions: For each question, please check (✓) the one statement which applies to you.

2. What sex are you?

_____(1) Female _____(2) Male

3. What is the highest college degree which you have received?

_____(1) None

_____(2) Baccalaureate degree (B.A., B.S., etc.)

_____(3) Master's degree

_____(4) Specialist degree

_____(5) Ph.D. or Ed.D.

_____(6) Other degree

4. How many years have you taught in this school? (do not count the current school year; count one-half year or more as one full year)

_____(1) One year

_____(2) Two to four years

_____(3) Five to nine years

_____(4) Ten to fourteen years

_____(5) Fifteen to nineteen years

_____(6) Twenty years or more

5. What is the total number of years you have taught?

_____(1) One year

_____(2) Two to four years

_____(3) Five to nine years

_____(4) Ten to fourteen years

_____(5) Fifteen to nineteen years

_____(6) Twenty years or more

## Part II

Unless instructed otherwise, please place a check ( ✓ ) beside the response for the one item which comes closest to describing your opinion or feelings. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that there are neither right, wrong, nor "expected" answers. Your HONEST OPINION is earnestly desired.

If you wish to add written comments to any of the checklist questions, feel free to use space in the margins.

Note: Questions 6-8 refer to your school's philosophy and objectives. The statement of philosophy expresses in general terms the ideals a school attempts to realize in its practices. The statement of objectives describes in specific terms how a school is trying to achieve its stated philosophy.

6. Which of the statements below best describes your degree of familiarity with the written philosophy and objectives of your school?

____(1) Our school does not have a written statement of philosophy and objectives.

____(2) I do not know whether our school has a written statement of philosophy and objectives.

____(3) Our school does have a written statement of philosophy and objectives but I am unaware of its content.

____(4) I am only vaguely familiar with its content.

____(5) I am generally familiar with its content.

____(6) I am well aware of its content.

7. Which of the following statements is most characteristic of the extent to which your faculty has discussed and agreed upon its philosophy and specific objectives?

____(1) We have done little, if anything, as a faculty in getting together and thinking through what we are really trying to accomplish in our school.

____(2) We have discussed to a certain extent what might be called our philosophy and objectives but they are really too vague to be of much value.

____(3) We seem to be in pretty general agreement on our philosophy but our objectives need to be more definite if they are to be of much help to us in our daily work.

____(4) We have numerous discussions about the things we are trying to accomplish and are generally in agreement on major points in our philosophy and objectives.

____(5) As a faculty, we have reached concurrence on a written philosophy and a written list of objectives.

8. In your opinion, how important is it for your school to have, in writing, a carefully formulated, comprehensive philosophy of education, including objectives?

____(1) Of no importance ____(3) Of some importance

____(2) Of little importance ____(4) Of much importance

9. To what degree do you employ written objectives for the courses you teach? (a statement which sets forth in specific terms the aims, goals, or purposes of your instruction)

____(1) I have no written objectives for <u>any</u> of my courses.

____(2) I have written objectives for <u>some</u> of my courses but they are in need of revision to become more helpful for my teaching.

____(3) I have written objectives for <u>some</u> of my courses; they are clearly formulated and comprehensive.

____(4) I have written objectives for <u>all</u> my courses; however, some revision is needed to make them more helpful for my teaching.

____(5) I have written objectives for <u>all</u> my courses; all of them are clearly formulated and comprehensive.

10. What degree of importance do you attach to the need for you, as a classroom teacher, to employ clearly formulated, comprehensive, written objectives for each of the courses you teach?

____(1) None ____(3) Some

____(2) Little ____(4) Much

11. Do you have a written course of study (course outline, course syllabus) for the courses you teach?

____(1) I have no written course of study for any of my courses.

____(2) I have written courses of study for some of my courses but they are in need of revision to become more helpful for my teaching.

____(3) I have written courses of study for some of my courses; they are clearly formulated and comprehensive.

____(4) I have written courses of study for all my courses; however, some revision is needed to make them more helpful for my teaching.

____(5) I have written courses of study for all of my courses; all of them are clearly formulated and comprehensive.

12. What degree of importance do you attach to the need for you, as a classroom teacher, to employ a clearly formulated, comprehensive written course of study for each of the courses you teach?

____(1) None ____(3) Some

____(2) Little ____(4) Much

13. Which of the statements listed below best describes your ability to assess the quality of the total educational program of your high school?

____(1) My knowledge of the total educational program is so limited that I could not make a quality assessment of it.

____(2) Although I am familiar with some aspects of our total educational program, my lack of knowledge about many other areas would make me hesitant to make an assessment of its over-all quality.

____(3) Although I am familiar with most aspects of our total educational program, my lack of knowledge about some other areas would reduce the accuracy of my quality assessment.

____(4) I feel myself to be well-informed about the total high school program and thus capable of making an accurate assessment of its overall quality.

14. In your opinion, what effect does your knowledge of the total educational program of your high school have on the quality of your teaching performance?

____(1) None ____(3) Some

____(2) Little ____(4) Much

15. At the high school level, I feel that our educational program seems to provide more opportunities in general for the:

____(1) College-bound students

____(2) Those students not going to college

____(3) Our program appears to be equally balanced in providing opportunities for college-bound and terminal students.

16. How would you rate the quality of your school, in general, as compared with other Michigan secondary schools?

____(1) Lowest quality (0-20%) ____(4) Above average (60-80%)

____(2) Below average (20-40%) ____(5) Highest quality (80-100%)

____(3) Average quality (40-60%)

17. Indicate your evaluation of the quality of each subject department or program.

| Area | (1) Not offered | (2) Don't know | (3) Poor | (4) Fair | (5) Good | (6) Very good | (7) Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Agriculture | | | | | | | |
| Art | | | | | | | |
| Business Education | | | | | | | |
| Distributive Education | | | | | | | |
| Driver Education | | | | | | | |
| English | | | | | | | |
| Foreign Language | | | | | | | |
| Health Education | | | | | | | |
| Home Economics | | | | | | | |
| Industrial Arts | | | | | | | |
| Mathematics | | | | | | | |
| Music | | | | | | | |
| Physical Education(boys) | | | | | | | |
| Physical Education(girls) | | | | | | | |
| Science | | | | | | | |
| Social Studies | | | | | | | |
| Vocational Education | | | | | | | |
| Student Activity Program | | | | | | | |
| Library | | | | | | | |
| Guidance Services | | | | | | | |
| Health Services | | | | | | | |
| School Building | | | | | | | |

18. Please briefly identify what you feel are two major strengths and two major weaknesses of the total educational program in this high school (include any part of your high school program).

Strengths:

1. _____

_____

_____

2. _____

_____

_____

Weaknesses:

1. _____

_____

_____

2. _____

_____

_____

Note: Questions 19-21 make reference to your own <u>teaching department</u> (English, social studies, etc.) If you teach in more than one department, include only that department which constitutes the major portion of your teaching assignment.

19. Please identify the number of teachers in your department.

_____(1) One

_____(2) Two

_____(3) Three-five

_____(4) Six-ten

_____(5) More than ten

20. Which of the statements listed below comes closest to describing your knowledge (particularly the strengths and weaknesses) of the courses offered in your department (their content, their objectives, their relationship to each other)?

____(1) My knowledge is limited almost exclusively to what goes on in my own classroom; thus, I could not make a valid judgment about their strengths and weaknesses.

____(2) I have some knowledge of the courses offered in my department but considerably more is needed to improve my judgment of their strengths and weaknesses.

____(3) I am quite familiar with certain courses in my department but lack information about others that is needed to make an accurate assessment of their strengths and weaknesses.

____(4) I am very familiar with the courses offered in my department and feel capable of making an accurate evaluation of their strengths and weaknesses.

21. Which of the statements below comes closest to describing the extent to which the teachers in your department discuss possible ways to improve the effectiveness of the department?

____(1) Each teacher in my department operates independently and is generally unaware of what occurs outside his own classroom. We never engage in any discussions concerning the above item.

____(2) On occasion certain teachers within my department will discuss how we might improve its effectiveness but, customarily, such discussions never proceed farther than on an individual basis.

____(3) Department members discuss this as a group but ideas expressed are seldom translated into improvements in educational practice.

____(4) We often engage in discussions about how our department might improve and the results of these discussions have had some influence on the curriculum in our department.

____(5) We often engage in discussions about this and the results of these discussions have had a significant influence on the curriculum in our department.

22. In your opinion, what should be the role of the classroom teacher in the determination of the curriculum?

____(1) Determination of the curriculum should be left exclusively to the Board of Education and the administration; classroom teachers have no role to play in its determination.

____(2) When curriculum changes are proposed, teachers should be allowed to express their opinion concerning the wisdom of the proposed changes; however, they should not play an active role in the planning process.

____(3) Certain teachers, including department heads, should play a primary role in curriculum planning, working directly with the school administration. However, participation should be limited primarily to the more experienced and knowledgeable teachers.

____(4) Those teachers who wish to do so should be allowed to play an active role in curriculum determination. However, all teachers should not be expected to participate.

____(5) Every teacher should be involved in some way in the determination of the curriculum. Each teacher should consider it his personal responsibility to play some role in its development.

23. In your school, how would you characterize the opportunity that classroom teachers have to contribute to curriculum development?

____(1) Classroom teachers are given little or no opportunity to play any role in curriculum development. Decisions are "handed down" by the Board of Education and administration.

____(2) Some teachers, including department heads, are sometimes asked about the advisability of curriculum changes proposed by the administration. However, they seldom, if ever, play an active role in the planning process.

____(3) Some teachers, including department heads, play an active role in curriculum planning. However, a majority of the regular classroom teachers do not participate to any extent in curriculum planning.

____(4) Ample opportunity is given to any classroom teacher to play an active role in curriculum planning. Customarily, however, certain teachers prefer not to become involved in matters of this type.

____(5) Ample opportunity is given to any classroom teacher to play an active role in curriculum planning. All or nearly all of our teachers play an active role in curriculum development.

24. To what degree does your faculty feel there is a need for making changes in the curriculum of your high school? (additions, deletions, etc.)

____(1) Our faculty does not feel there is a need for changing our curriculum.

____(2) Some faculty members feel there is a need for changing certain curriculum areas but this need for change is felt only by faculty members who are teaching in these areas.

____(3) Some faculty members feel there is a need for changing certain areas of the curriculum, even those outside their teaching areas.

____(4) Most faculty members feel there is a need for changing certain areas of the curriculum, even those outside their teaching areas.

____(5) All or nearly all of our faculty members feel there is a need for changing certain curriculum areas, regardless of where these changes are needed.

25. During this school year, how often did you find yourself engaged in thought about your own teaching performance? (its effectiveness, how you might improve it, possible changes in approach, etc. - in other words, a self-evaluation of your teaching)

____(1) Never

____(2) Rarely

____(3) Occasionally

____(4) Quite often

____(5) Very often

26. Please rate your teaching performance, checking one rating for each row. If you feel the item has no relevance to the evaluation of your teaching performance, place a check in the "Not Relevant" column.

| | (1) Not relevant | (2) Poor | (3) Fair | (4) Good | (5) Very good | (6) Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Your use of information contained in the cumulative records of each of your students | | | | | | |
| Your knowledge of the nature of the local community | | | | | | |
| Use of audio-visual aids | | | | | | |
| Your planning for instruction | | | | | | |
| The provision you make in instruction for the individual differences of students | | | | | | |
| Use of community resources | | | | | | |
| Use of a variety of classroom instructional materials | | | | | | |
| Your knowledge of current practices and developments in your teaching field | | | | | | |
| The coordination of instruction with other teachers in your department | | | | | | |

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

## QUESTIONNAIRE

### Part III

Your school recently completed a self-evaluation of your total high school program, employing the Evaluative Criteria. All questions in Part III refer to this specific instrument and/or the processes involved in its completion.

If you wish to add written comments to any of the checklist items, feel free to use space in the margins.

27. Please encircle the name or names of committees on which you served.

Steering Committee
Philosophy and Objectives
School and Community
Program of Studies
Agriculture
Art
Business Education
Distributive Education
Driver Education
English
Foreign Languages
Health Education
Home Economics
Industrial Arts
Mathematics
Music
Physical Education for Boys
Physical Education for Girls
Science
Social Studies
Vocational Trade and Industrial Education
Student Activity Program
Library and Audio-Visual
Guidance Services
Health Services
School Plant
School Staff and Administration
Statistical Summary of Evaluation
Graphic Summary

28. After you were aware that you would be participating in a self-evaluation of your school, employing the Evaluative Criteria, and before you began participating in it, what was your personal attitude toward this self-evaluation?

____(1) Antagonistic
____(2) Indifferent
____(3) Favorable
____(4) Very favorable
____(5) Enthusiastic

29. Now that your school has completed the Evaluative Criteria, what is your personal attitude towards this self-evaluation?

____(1) Antagonistic
____(2) Indifferent
____(3) Favorable
____(4) Very favorable
____(5) Enthusiastic

30. Before you began to participate in this self-study, what was your degree of awareness regarding its aims and purposes?

____(1) The only purpose I recognized was that it was "required" by an outside agency. No mention was made of how this self-study might be of benefit to us as teachers and to our school.

____(2) Brief mention was made that this self-study would provide us with helpful information. However, more specific and detailed information about the nature of the Evaluative Criteria and how it could benefit us would have helped.

____(3) I feel that adequate information regarding its aims and purposes was given before the study was underway.

____(4) My orientation regarding its aims and purposes was excellent; the nature of the processes involved in self-study and the specific nature of the measuring instrument, the Evaluative Criteria, were clearly explained.

31. How would you characterize your school's degree of organization for this self-study?

____(1) Poor
____(2) Fair
____(3) Good
____(4) Very good
____(5) Excellent

32. Which one of the statements listed below best describes your opinion concerning the amount of information you received about the results of committee studies other than the ones on which you served?

____(1) I do not feel it was necessary for me to receive information about the results of other committee studies.

____(2) No information was received, thus seriously reducing possible benefits of this self-evaluation.

____(3) A little information was received but not nearly enough.

____(4) Some information was received but more would have been helpful.

____(5) Enough information was received.

____(6) More information than was necessary was received.

33. In regard to the amount of time and effort devoted to the Evaluative Criteria, check either 1 or 2 below.

____(1) The amount of time and effort involved was justified by the benefits obtained.

____(2) The amount of time and effort involved was disproportionate to the benefits obtained.

34. In its totality, the Evaluative Criteria was:

____(1) Harmful

____(2) Of no help

____(3) Of little help

____(4) Of some help

____(5) Of much help

35. During the past five years, did you participate in a self-evaluation which employed the Evaluative Criteria at another high school?

____(1) Yes

____(2) No

36. In your judgment, what were the most satisfactory characteristics of this self-evaluation employing the Evaluative Criteria?

the least satisfactory?

37. Would you recommend that your school use the Evaluative Criteria again at some future date?

____(1) Yes ____(2) No

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altstetter, M.L. "Judgments of Parents and Pupils," Evaluation of Secondary Schools - Supplementary Reprints, Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards. Washington, D.C.: 1939, 13-18.

Carrothers, George E. "Early Beginnings of the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards," The North Central Association Quarterly, XXIX (October, 1954), 178-84.

Cawelti, Gordon. "High School Evaluation Guide."

Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards. Evaluation of Secondary Schools: General Report. Menosha, Wis.: George Banta Publishing Co., 1939.

Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards. Evaluation of Secondary Schools - Supplementary Reprints. Washington, D.C.: 1939.

Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards. How to Evaluate a Secondary School. 1940 Edition. Washington, D.C.

Cope, Quill E. "After Evaluation - How Much Improvement?" The Clearing House, XXVII (April, 1953), 451-53.

Davis, Calvin O. A History of the North Central Association. Ann Arbor, Mich., 1945. o.p.

Devitt, Joseph J. "After Evaluation - Improvement!" The Clearing House, XXVIII (January, 1954), 263-65.

Dressel, Paul L., and Associates. Evaluation in Higher Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961.

Edwards, Charles W. "Evaluative Criteria - Let's Improve Our Use of It," The North Central Association Quarterly, XXXIX (Winter, 1965), 238-41.

Edwards, Charles W. "Relationships Between Evaluative Criteria Ratings and Other Measures of Effectiveness of Selected Iowa High Schools," Epsilon Bulletin, Phi Delta Kappa, College of Education, The University of Iowa, XXXIX (1965), 83-84.

Eells, Kenneth W. "The Testing Program of the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards," Evaluation of Secondary Schools - Supplementary Reprints, Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards. Washington, D.C.: 1939, 2-6.

Eells, Walter C. "Can Experts Judge Secondary Schools?" School Executive, LVII (December, 1937), 149-51.

Eells, Walter C. "Combination of Evaluative Factors and Their Use in Judging and Stimulating Schools," Evaluation of Secondary Schools - Supplementary Reprints, Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards. Washington, D.C.: 1939, 18-19.

Elementary School Department of the National Catholic Educational Association, Criteria Committee. Criteria for Evaluation of Catholic Elementary Schools. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1965.

Ely, Laurence E. "Teachers' Reactions to School Evaluations Using Evaluative Criteria," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLIII (December, 1959), 38-43.

Hagen, Elizabeth P., and Thorndike, Robert L. "Evaluation," Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Third Edition. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1960.

Jessen, Carl A. "Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards After Twenty-One Years," The North Central Association Quarterly, XXX (October, 1955), 219-25.

Jessen, Carl A. "The Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards: Twentieth Birthday," School and Society, LXXVIII (October 31, 1953), 139-41.

Jessen, Carl A. "The Revised Evaluative Criteria," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXIV (October, 1950), 70-76.

Jessen, Carl A. "Revision of the Evaluative Criteria," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLII (May, 1958), 1-6.

Jessen, Carl A. "Success of the Product of the School," Evaluation of Secondary Schools - Supplementary Reprints, Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards. Washington, D.C.: 1939, 8-12.

Manlove, Donald C. "Self-Study and Visitation for All Member Schools," The North Central Association Quarterly, XXXIX (Winter, 1965), 233-37.

Martin, Clyde Melvin. "The Adequacy of Selected Procedures Developed for Administering the Evaluative Criteria Study in Oregon." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Oregon State College, 1959.

Matthews, Roderic D. "Reactions of Administrators After Evaluation With Materials Developed by the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLII (May, 1958), 7-27.

Matthews, Roderic D. "What Are Effective Ways of Evaluating the Secondary School?" The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLI (April, 1957), 19-22.

Mort, Paul R., and Cornell, Francis G. American Schools in Transition. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1941.

National Study of Secondary School Evaluation. Evaluative Criteria, 1960 Edition. Washington, D.C.

National Study of Secondary School Evaluation. Evaluative Criteria for Junior High Schools, 1963. Washington, D.C.

North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Evaluation Guide for Secondary Schools.

North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Policies and Criteria for the Approval of Secondary Schools.

Owens, Morgan R. "Report on the Use of the Evaluative Criteria," The North Central Association Quarterly, XXVII (October, 1952), 234-35.

_____. Personal letter from Donald C. Manlove, State Chairman, Indiana State Committee, North Central Association. May 9, 1966.

Ricart, John Edward, Jr. "A Survey of Actions Taken on Recommendations Resulting from the Evaluations of the Pittsburgh Public Secondary Schools." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1956.

Squire, James R. "Evaluating High School English Programs," The North Central Association Quarterly, XL (Winter, 1966), 247-54.