DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 464 915 TM 033 845

AUTHOR	Colby, Susan A.; Bradshaw, Lynn K.; Joyner, Randy L.
TITLE	Teacher Evaluation: A Review of the Literature.
PUB DATE	2002-04-01
NOTE	18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 1-5, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Criteria; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; Literature Reviews; Program Effectiveness; *Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	ERIC

ABSTRACT

The teacher evaluation literature was reviewed to discover insights to further the understanding of teacher evaluation. Information was gathered from a review of the empirical research and theoretical literature related to teacher evaluation through more than 30 ERIC searches. A matrix was developed to summarize the findings from each research study and theoretical article or book. Findings were coded by topic, and the topics were grouped by general theme. Findings were categorized into five criteria that can be used to determine the effectiveness of a teacher evaluation system. These criteria are: (1) purposes for evaluation match the methods or procedures; (2) district commitment is evident in sound policies and practices and appropriate allocation of time and resources; (3) teacher evaluation is tightly connected to district priorities and school functions; (4) educational leaders play a strong, positive role in evaluation; and (5) the evaluation environment is supportive of ongoing professional learning. These criteria served as a foundation for effective teacher evaluation beginning in the 1980s and can serve as a framework for guiding research and educator efforts to strengthen teacher evaluation. An appendix compares research-based criteria with expert guidelines. (Contains 102 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 464 915

Teacher Evaluation: A Review of the Literature

Paper presented at the 2002 Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association

Division A: Administration
Section 2: Leadership, Organizational Development, and School Renewal

New Orleans, LA
April 1, 2002

Susan A. Colby, Ed.D.
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
East Carolina University
309 Speight
Greenville, NC 27858-4353
252-328-2886
colbys@mail.ecu.edu

Lynn K. Bradshaw, Ed.D.
Department of Educational Leadership
East Carolina University
303 Speight
Greenville, NC 27858-4353
252-328-6444
bradshawl@mail.ecu.edu

Randy L. Joyner, Ed.D.
Department of Educational Leadership
East Carolina University
223 Speight
Greenville, NC 27858-4353
252-328-1107
joyneerr@mail.ecu.edu

TM033845

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Colby

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teacher Evaluation: A Review of the Literature

The focus of teacher evaluation has changed over the last few decades as the educational community has increased its understanding of successful teacher evaluation systems. In 1988, McLaughlin and Pfieffer recognized that teacher evaluation is an organizational problem more than a technical one. This insight identified early on the complexity of establishing successful teacher evaluation systems and continues to gain popularity as educators realize that efforts to improve the technical quality of evaluation have not resulted in better evidence of teaching quality and student achievement (Duke, 1995). Although there exists great hope that teacher evaluation will reach its potential for impacting instruction (Frase & Streshly, 1994; Peterson, 1995; Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995; Stiggans & Duke, 1988; Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin & Bernstein, 1984), it is also recognized that efforts to create and implement an effective teacher evaluation system must extend beyond basic goals and must be able to promote changes in teaching and learning (Lofton, Hill and Claudet, 1997). As an understanding of the appropriate role for teacher evaluation and its impact on instructional quality increases, educators are anxious to integrate meaningful and effective evaluation as a component of systemic reform with the primary goal of greater student learning. The purpose of this study was to provide a current review of the teacher evaluation literature and discover insights that can further our understanding of teacher evaluation. A framework synthesizing what has been learned through research and practice during the last two decades would prove useful as the educational community continues to seek improved methods for maximizing the potential of teacher evaluation.

Method

In this study, information was gathered from a review of the empirical research and theoretical literature in the field relating to teacher evaluation. Over 30 different ERIC searches were conducted. Fifty-seven research studies were reviewed for purposes of this study. These research studies were undertaken between 1983 and 2001. Thirty-nine of the studies were conducted between 1995-1999. Eighteen studies were conducted between 1983-1994. Older studies were selected based on their prominence in the field. Of the 57 research studies, 15 used a mixed methodology approach, 23 were qualitative in nature, 15 were quantitative and 4 were reviews of the literature. Ninety-two books, book chapters, articles, papers and organizational statements were reviewed for this literature review. Sixty-one were published between 1995-2001 and 31 were published between 1987-1994. Of the 92, 41 were articles published in journals, 12 were books, 27 were chapters from books, 5 were papers gathered through ERIC or online services, 1 was a report, and 6 were position statements from educational organizations. The majority of the theoretical literature used for this review was published between 1995-2000 as articles in journals.

The process used for synthesizing the data from the review of the literature included: (a) developing a matrix summarizing the findings of each research study, (b) developing a matrix outlining the main ideas for each theoretical article or book, (c) coding the findings and main ideas based on topics, and (c) grouping the topics by general themes.

Results

The findings from the review of the research and theoretical literature were categorized into five criteria that can be used to determine the effectiveness of a teacher evaluation system. These five criteria are presented below.

Purposes for evaluation match the methods/procedures. The findings from the review indicated that effective teacher evaluation systems aligned the purposes of evaluation with the process for implementation. Experts believed that there must be a close connection between the purposes, goals and methods of an evaluation system (Darling-Hammond, Wise, & Pease, 1983; Good & Mulryan, 1990; Stiggans & Duke, 1988; Stodolsky, 1990; Wilson & Wood, 1996; Wise et al., 1984). Purposes, as a foundation for a teacher evaluation system, should be stated clearly (Frase & Streshly, 1994; Darling-Hammond, et al. 1983; Sullivan, 1999) agreed on by all stakeholders (Iwanicki, 1990; B. L. Johnson, 1999; Wise et al., 1984) and used to govern the design of the system. In addition, an understanding of these purposes was essential (Bradshaw & Glatthorn, 2001; Iwanicki, 1990; Wheeler & Scriven, 1997). Not only did purposes for evaluation need to be made explicit, but also teachers needed to perceive the evaluation as a process to help them improve their performance (Darling-Hammond, et al., 1983; Wan Mo, Connors, & McCormick 1998) and principals needed to perceive the process as a means to provide instructional leadership (Darling-Hammond et al., 1983).

The findings from the review also indicated that effective evaluation systems addressed both accountability and professional growth, and used multiple data sources and multiple evaluators. Experts disagreed on whether or not one system could accomplish both formative and summative goals simultaneously, but, there was consensus that any effective evaluation system had given thought to both accountability and professional growth (Bradshaw & Glatthorn, 2001; McConney, 1995; Stiggans & Duke, 1988; Stronge, 1995; Wan Mo et al., 1998; Wilson & Wood, 1996). Advocates for a single-track system that promoted both growth and accountability believed that the two purposes complimented each other and helped to unify efforts for school improvement (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988; Stronge, 1995, 1997; Weiss & Weiss, 1998). Advocates for multi-track systems believed that differing purposes naturally lent themselves to different methods (Good & Mulryan, 1990; Mason, 1996; Millman, 1997; Stiggans & Duke, 1988; Wilson & Wood, 1996; Wise et al., 1984; Wise & Gendler, 1990). Findings from research revealed the difficulty in trying to achieve both accountability and professional development purposes in the same teacher evaluation system (Haughey & Howard, 1996; Hazi, 1994; Stiggans and Duke, 1988; Wise et al., 1984). Differentiated evaluation systems, systems that utilized different processes and procedures for different groups of teachers (e.g. new teachers, competent teachers, and experienced teachers with deficiencies), were mentioned in the literature as an important consideration for better meeting the needs of all teachers (Beerens, 2000; Bradshaw & Glatthorn, 2001; Clandinin, Kennedy, & La Rocque, 1996; Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Duke, 1995; Killian & Wood, 1996; Stiggans & Duke, 1988; Sweeney, 1994).

Both the theoretical literature (Beck, 1994; Beerens, 2000; Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Ellet, 1997; McConney, 1995; McConney, Schalock, & Schalock, 1997; Peterson, 1995, 2000; Stronge, 1997) and empirical research (Dawson & Acker-Hocevar, 1998; Stiggans & Duke, 1988) advocated the use of multiple data sources as an approach leading to more effective evaluation of teachers. The use of multiple data sources was viewed as offering more advantages than single source data collection (Bradshaw & Glatthorn, 2001; Ellet, 1997; Peterson, 1995, 2000; Scriven, 1988; Stronge, 1997).

In supporting a movement towards more growth-oriented systems, many experts argued that multiple evaluators or reviewers should be included in the teacher evaluation process (Beerens, 2000; Clark, 1993; Peterson, 1995, 2000; Stiggans & Duke, 1988; Sullivan, 1999; Wan Mo et al., 1998; Wise et al., 1984; Wise & Gendler, 1990). However, practice generally relied on the report of one single administrator (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Loup et al., 1996; Brandt, 1996; Peterson, 1995, 2000).

District commitment is evident in sound policies and practices and appropriate allocation of time and resources. Both research studies (McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988; Stiggans & Duke, 1988; Stronge & Tucker, 1999; Sullivan, 1999; Wise et al., 1984) and theoretical literature (Annunziata, 1997; Scriven, 1995; Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995) indicated that strong organizational commitment to teacher evaluation was necessary for an effective evaluation system. Top-level commitment ensured that that written policies and practices were translated into action. Further, explicit mechanisms, to include policy decisions, needed to be in place to ensure that evaluation received a high priority (Sullivan, 1999; Wise et al., 1984). However, Frase and Streshly (1994), summarizing from research, found that in many districts a refusal to accept responsibility for teacher evaluation led to less than desirable outcomes.

The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation advocated developing teacher evaluation systems based on sound practices (Joint Committee, 1988). However, a research study analyzing the practices of the 100 largest school districts (Loup et al., 1996) indicated that many districts did not attend to important elements of high-quality teacher evaluation systems. The findings from this review of the literature identified sound practices as involving teachers, identifying quality criteria and standards, implementing effective practices and procedures, establishing validity and reliability, establishing a monitoring process, systematically communicating expectations, effectively using research, and effectively using evaluation results.

In regards to involving teachers, research supported the involvement of teachers in the development and implementation of formal teacher evaluation systems as a means for more effective evaluation (Atkins, 1996; Clandinin et al., 1996; Cousins, 1995; Johnson, 1997; Darling-Hammond, et al. 1983; Stiggans & Duke, 1988; Stronge & Tucker, 1999; Wise et al., 1984). Further, many experts believed that one key element promoting teacher growth was the involvement of teachers in decision making (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Stiggans & Duke, 1988; Wise et al., 1984; Wohlstetter, Van Kirk, Robertson, & Mohrman, 1997). The theoretical literature also agreed that teachers and other stakeholders should be involved in the teacher evaluation process to ensure effectiveness in the evaluation of teachers (Bradshaw & Glatthorn, 2001; Delandshere, 1996; Nevo, 1994; Shinkfield and Stufflebeam, 1995).

In regards to using quality criteria and standards, conclusions based on findings from research identified the need to use meaningful criteria as an important piece for successful teacher evaluation (Machell, 1995; Stiggans & Duke, 1988). However, findings from research (Loup et al., 1996) indicated that many of the 100 largest districts in the nation were deficient in establishing performance standards. Theorists also argued that high quality standards or criteria should be the central piece in an effective evaluation system (Atkins, 1996; Beerens, 2000; Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995; Wheeler & Scriven, 1997).

In regards to implementing effective practices and procedures, research findings revealed that a wide variety of procedures and models led to successful teacher evaluation (McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988; Stiggans & Duke, 1988). In addition, both research (McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988; Stiggans & Duke, 1988; Strickland-Tinklham, 1994; Wagner & Hill, 1996; Wise et al., 1984)

and theory (Wilson & Wood, 1996) identified the use of more flexible evaluation procedures and instruments as more aptly promoting professional growth for all teachers.

In regards to establishing validity and reliability, findings from research indicated that it was important to develop an evaluation system that was reliable, was valid and one that promoted fairness (McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988; Wise et al., 1984). Theorists also supported the idea that evaluation systems should demonstrate validity, reliability and fairness (Dwyer, 1998; Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995). However, a few problems exist in practice. Some experts cautioned that in most systems evaluation ratings are inflated (Frase & Streshly, 1994; Haefele, 1993; Tyson & Silverman, 1994). Scriven (1988, 1995) and Haefele (1993) declared that most models of teacher evaluation are invalid. Some experts identified poorly constructed criteria as a problem in validity (Ellet, Wren, Callender, Loup, & Liu, 1986; Haefele, 1993). Ellet et al. found, when analyzing the policies of 100 largest school systems, that while some instruments contained criteria based on well-documented teacher effectiveness, most contained criteria that were not based on research. In a follow-up study, conducted 10 years later, Loup et al. (1996) found that local districts were slow to design procedures to deal with reliability and validity issues.

In regards to establishing a monitoring process, experts agreed that monitoring the implementation of an evaluation system was critical to effectiveness (Annunziata, 1997; Bradshaw & Glatthorn, 2001; Embery & Jones, 1996; Frase & Streshly, 1994; McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988; Wise et al., 1984). Findings from case study research (McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988; Wise et al. 1984) suggested that districts effective in implementing teacher evaluation differ from districts that are less effective in the strategies they use to provide checks and balances for the system. However, Loup et al. (1996) found in surveying the practices of the 100 largest school districts that only half have policies for monitoring their evaluation systems.

In regards to systematic communication of expectations, there was agreement among experts that effective communication about the policies and procedures prior to implementing the teacher evaluation system, and during the evaluation process itself, was essential to successful systems (Darling-Hammond et al., 1983; Stronge, 1997; Stronge & Tucker, 1999).

In regards to effective use of research and results, Clark (1993), in a review of teacher evaluation literature, noted that districts should use the research base to change outdated systems. However, Loup et al. (1996) in a survey of the 100 largest school districts in the nation, found that districts have a minimal knowledge of national trends in teacher evaluation. In addition, findings from this review indicated that generally, teacher evaluation results were filed away, and successful work has seldom been acknowledged (Peterson, 1995, 2000; Wise et al., 1984). Clark (1993) promoted the idea of sharing and using teacher evaluation results for staff development purposes with the intent of increasing student achievement.

The review of the literature also found that appropriate allocation of time leads to more effective evaluation. Research findings (Ovando, 2001; Stiggans & Duke, 1988; Wagner & Hill, 1996) and theory (Wilson & Wood, 1996) support the view that more time allocated to evaluation may lead to increased teacher growth. Despite this belief, the evaluation of teachers in most schools consisted of an administrator visiting a classroom a few times a year for a very brief period (Bradshaw & Glatthorn, 2001; Brandt, 1996; Haughey & Howard, 1996; McConney, 1995; Peterson, 1995, 2000; Wise et al., 1984).

In addition,, the appropriate allocation of resources also leads to a more effective teacher evaluation system. The literature supports the idea that school districts must budget for the additional costs of teacher evaluation (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Frase & Streshly, 1994; Peterson, 1995, 2000; Stiggans & Duke, 1988; Wise et al., 1984). Case study research confirmed

that one essential element for effective evaluation systems was the provision of sufficient resources (Wise et al., 1984). Further, there was a widely held belief that districts must invest in training for all educators involved in evaluation (Annunziata, 1997; Bradshaw & Glatthorn, 2001; Danielson & McGreal 2000; Frase & Streshly, 1994; Heafele, 1993; Stiggans & Duke, 1988; Stodolsky, 1990; Tyson & Silverman, 1994; Wagner & Hill, 1996; Wilson & Wood, 1996; Wise et al., 1984). However, Loup et al. (1996) found that policies of the 100 largest school districts in the nation were deficient in establishing a base for comprehensive training programs.

Teacher evaluation is tightly connected to district priorities and school functions such as school improvement, professional development and student learning. The findings from the literature on teacher evaluation emphasized the importance of integrating teacher evaluation with district priorities and school functions in order to have a greater impact on teacher growth and student learning (Beerens, 2000; Bradshaw & Glatthorn, 2001; Iwanicki & Rindone, 1995; Killian & Wood, 1996). Criterion Three examined the importance of connecting teacher evaluation to district priorities as well as teaching and learning processes in an attempt to unify efforts for overall school improvement. Schools, teachers and students benefited when teacher evaluation was a process connected to district priorities and school improvement initiatives, professional growth and staff development, and student learning.

In regards to school improvement, experts in the field of evaluation encouraged a link between teacher evaluation and school improvement (Bradshaw, 1996; Bradshaw & Glatthorn, 2001; Danielson & McGeal, 2000; Horn, 1996; Iwanicki, 1990; Iwanicki & Rindone, 1995; Pecheone & Stansbury, 1996; Stronge, 1995, 1997; Webster, 1995; Wise & Gendler, 1990). Conclusions based on research also identified effective teacher evaluation systems as systems that link teacher evaluation to organizational goals (McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988; Stiggans & Duke, 1988; Stronge & Tucker, 1999; Wise et al., 1984). However, despite research suggesting that teacher evaluation would be more beneficial when it is connected to school improvement, Killian and Wood (1996) found that even in schools known for successful school improvement efforts, teacher evaluation appeared to have contributed little to those successes.

In regards to professional development, conclusions from research confirmed the necessity of focusing on professional development in order to make teacher evaluation more meaningful (Cousins, 1995; Johnson, 1998; Lofton et al., 1997; Stiggans & Duke, 1988; Wagner & Hill, 1996). However, current practice tended to focus on the accountability aspect of teacher evaluation even when a system has identified a priority on teacher development (Bosetti & O'Reilly, 1996; Clandinin et al., 1996; Ellett et al., 1996; Haughey & Howard, 1996; Killian & Wood, 1996; Loup et al., 1996; Peterson 1995). Loup et al. found that the primary use of evaluation data in the 100 largest school districts in the nation was for accountability purposes. Theorists also suggested the need to transition from a focus on accountability to a primary focus on professional growth (Beerens, 2000; Delandshere, 1996; Johnson, 1998). Teacher evaluation needs to act as a guide for new learning that is directly related to a teacher's needs (Joint Committee, 1988). This idea was supported in both the empirical research (Lofton et al., 1997; McLaughlin & Pfiefer, 1988) and theoretical literature (Annunziata, 1997; Beerens, 2000; Bradshaw & Glatthorn, 2001; Iwanicki, 1990).

In regards to student learning, there was a widely-held belief that student learning should be a primary focus of teacher evaluation (Annunziata, 1997; Bradshaw & Glatthorn, 2001; Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Darling-Hammond, 1998; Mendro, 1998; Millman & Schalock, 1997; Popham, 1998; Sanders & Horn, 1998; Schalock, 1998; Schalock & Schalock, 1993; Stiggans & Duke, 1988; Stronge & Tucker, 2000). Findings from the review of the literature

suggested that quality teaching had a positive impact on student learning (Darling-Hammond & Loewenberg-Ball, 1997; Sanders & Horn, 1998; Stronge & Tucker, 2000; Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1993).

Educational leaders play a strong, positive role in evaluation. Strong educational leaders were highly involved in the teacher evaluation process as well as the teaching and learning processes within the school on a daily basis. In addition, strong leaders (a) possessed knowledge and dispositions that helped maximize the potential of teacher evaluation and its impact on professional growth, (b) focused on learning, (c) promoted collaborative interactions with evalutees, (d) provided useful feedback and (e) facilitated reflection on practice.

Many experts agreed that the principal has a large impact on the culture of the school and/or the effectiveness of a school (Beck, 1994; Darling-Hammond, et al., 1983; DuFour & Eaker, 1998; Fullan, 1991; Glatthorn, 1997; Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Joyce & Showers, 1995). Research findings confirmed that administrators played a key role in the evaluation process (Cousins, 1995; McLaughlin & Pfiefer, 1988; Wagner & Hill, 1996). However, recent literature also suggested that educational leaders need to change from a manager to more of an instructional leader or learner-centered leader (Beck, 1994; Glatthorn, 1997; Murphy & Shipman, 1999; Sheppard 1996; Sullivan & Glanz, 2000; Wohlstetter et al., 1997). Research supported the connection between leaders who displayed instructional leadership behaviors and school effectiveness and improvement (Sheppard, 1996; Wohlstetter et al., 1997). However, findings from research also identified the difficulty that principals had in transforming their leadership role (Poole, 1996; Reitzug, 1997; Sheppard, 1996).

Evaluators with greater knowledge of content and teaching were viewed by teachers as much more helpful (Atkins, 1996; Bennett, 1995; Haughey & Howard, 1996; Stiggans & Duke, 1988; Wise et al., 1984). Research on teachers' perceptions found that a majority of teachers believed that the supervisor's knowledge of technical aspects of teaching, experience in classrooms, and ability to provide and model useful suggestions were very important (Atkins, 1996; Machell 1995). Evaluator competence required the ability to make sound judgments about teaching, and the ability to make suggestions for improvement as necessary.

Research studies focused on teachers' perceptions found that effective feedback was one of the most important attributes of successful teacher evaluation (Lawler, 1992; Machell, 1995; Rindler, 1994; Stiggans & Duke, 1988). Teachers' perceptions of the intent of teacher evaluation was identified as the most critical feature of effective feedback (McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988) and when teachers perceived the quality of feedback as being important to the success of an evaluation experience, evaluation was likely to be more effective (Machell, 1995).

Case studies on effective teacher evaluation systems found that a critical factor for success was how credible teachers believed their supervisor to be (Machell, 1995; Stiggans & Duke, 1988). In order for teachers to act on the suggestions of their evaluators, they needed to believe they were credible (Machell, 1995; McLaughlin & Pfeiffer, 1988; Stiggans & Duke, 1988). Research findings also revealed that the ability to inspire trust was important for successful teacher evaluation (Cousins, 1995; Haughey & Howard, 1996; Singh & Shifflette, 1996; Stiggans & Duke, 1988). In the theoretical literature, Beerens (2000) and Edwards (1995) argued that followers must be able to trust their leader in order for the leader to be able to provide any kind of sustained and effective leadership.

Strong educational leaders promoted professional growth for their faculty. Research, conducted in schools where teacher evaluation produced evidence of professional growth, revealed that administrators in these schools focused on ongoing conversations with teachers

about teaching and learning, and used data from observations for discussion and reflection purposes (Haughey & Howard,1996). Empirical research (Blasé & Blasé, 1999; Wagner & Hill, 1996) and theoretical literature (Annunziata, 1997; Beck, 1994; Darling-Hammond, 1997) both supported the idea that educational leaders who consciously promoted the professional growth of their teachers, not only during the teacher evaluation process but also in day to day in interactions, were viewed as stronger instructional leaders, and had the potential to be more helpful. Several research studies also indicated that positive, collaborative interactions are one component of successful evaluation (Bryant & Currin, 1995; Cousins, 1995; Dawson & Acker-Hocevar, 1998).

Recent literature (Bennett, 1995; Blasé & Blasé, 1999; Bradshaw & Glatthorn, 2001; Cousins, 1995; Delandshere, 1996; Joyce & Showers, 1995; Lofton et al., 1997; Shinkfield, 1994; Sullivan & Glanz, 2000) emphasized the importance of self-reflection for promoting professional growth. Several research studies focused on the value of self-reflection. Lofton et al., (1997) found that collaborative, reflective conferences using assessment data had excellent potential for enhancing the learning of teachers. Bennet (1995) found that reflective supervision is the preferred method of supervision endorsed by teachers. And, Cousins (1995) reported that supervisors are strongly supportive of growth-oriented processes that stimulate reflection in teachers.

The evaluation environment is supportive of ongoing, professional learning. The findings from the literature on teacher evaluation emphasized the important role a supportive environment played in the success of a teacher evaluation system. School cultures focused on teaching and learning for all, collaboration between teachers, and reflection on practice benefited the outcomes of teacher evaluation. Both empirical research (McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988; Wagner & Hill, 1996) and theoretical literature (Bradshaw & Glatthorn, 2001; Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Darling-Hammond, 1990; Iwanicki & Rindone, 1995; McLaughlin, 1990; Peterson, 1995, 2000) found that a supportive, professional learning environment was important for implementing and maintaining effective teacher evaluation. Research findings suggested that successful teacher evaluation was conducted in an environment where teacher growth was valued (McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988; Stiggans & Duke, 1988) and that focusing on changing the underlying structure and culture of a school can lead to more effective evaluation (Lofton et al., 1997; McKay, 1998).

Conclusions

During the last few decades, experts from the field of teacher evaluation have developed guidelines for effective teacher evaluation based on research, literature and theory. These guidelines are written as criteria, recommendations, or implications for effective evaluation. For purposes of this study, guidelines from seven sets of authors have been compared to the five criteria that emerged from this review of the teacher evaluation literature. The guidelines that have been used for comparative purposes are not necessarily a comprehensive examination of the authors' ideas on effective evaluation but have been gathered from one or more pieces of their work. All guidelines have implications for the development and implementation of effective teacher evaluation systems.

A representation of work published in the mid 1980's through 2000 is included. Older paradigms were selected based on their prominence in the field and were cited in many articles. Newer paradigms identifying a list of effective criteria were often not the focus of the research/theory but emerged in the process. Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and

Bernstein (1984) presented conclusions and recommendations that constitute a set of necessary, but not sufficient, conditions for successful teacher evaluation based on a study beginning with a review of the literature and a preliminary survey of 32 districts identified as having highly developed teacher evaluation systems and concluding with four case study districts. McLaughlin and Pfiefer (1988) presented findings based on case studies in four school districts creating programs that serve both accountability and improvement goals. Stiggans and Duke (1988) based their conclusions on three large-scale research studies that examined growth producing teacher evaluation systems. Stronge (1995) listed key features of an effective teacher evaluation system as editor of a book on best practices. Peterson (2000) identified guidelines specifying new directions for teacher evaluation that enhanced teacher evaluation results. Killian and Wood (1996) presented guidelines based on a study exploring connections in practice between teacher evaluation, instructional supervision and staff development. And, Danielson and McGreal (2000) identified guidelines focusing on lessons learned about teacher evaluation based on research from model districts. Although this last book was reviewed after the findings were established for this review of the literature, there were many similarities (see Appendix).

Older paradigms (McLaughlin and Pfeifer, 1988; Stiggans and Duke, 1988; Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin & Bernstein, 1984) tend to focus on the technical aspects of evaluation including the following: matching evaluation purposes with policies and methods; employing sound practices for developing and implementing teacher evaluation systems; making a strong organizational commitment to the teacher evaluation process; employing competent, credible evaluators with the ability to skillfully gather data and provide feedback; relating teacher evaluation to organizational goals; and involving teachers in the evaluation process. Newer paradigms (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Killian & Wood, 1996; Peterson, 2000; Stronge, 1995) tend to give more consideration to the context of evaluation which include the following: attending to the climate of a school and the nature of on-going professional development as a contributor to effective evaluation; attending to the sociology of teacher evaluation; promoting connections between evaluation and school improvement, professional development and student learning; and understanding the role of the principal as an instructional leader.

The five criteria that emerged from this review of literature represent criteria that served as a foundation for effective teacher evaluation beginning in the 1980's, as well as criteria developed after the mid 1990's that reflect trends in the field of education focusing on school reform, school cultures, and connections between teaching and learning processes. This study is significant because it furthers our understanding of effective teacher evaluation criteria and provides a conceptual framework for evaluating the effectiveness of teacher evaluation. Cousins (1995), in a review of the teacher evaluation literature found that prespecified frameworks were lacking in many research studies. Davis (1999), in an analysis of articles published in the Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, found many theoretical articles to be lacking empirical grounding. This set of criteria can serve as a framework that can be used for guiding the direction of research studies and guiding the efforts of educators to strengthen teacher evaluation in public schools.

References

Annunziata, J. (1997). Linking teacher evaluation and professional development. In J. H. Stronge (Ed.), Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice (pp. 288-301). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Atkins, A. O. (1996). Teachers' opinions of the teacher evaluation process. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 398 628)

Beck, L. G. (1994). Reclaiming educational administration as a caring profession. New York: Teachers College Press.

Beerens, D. R. (2000). Evaluating teachers for professional growth. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Bennett, D. D. (1995, February). The role of content knowledge in instructional supervision. Research report presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Detroit, MI.

Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. (1999). Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: Teachers' perspectives. Educational Administration Quarterly 35(3), 349-378.

Bosetti, L., & O'Reilly, R. (1996). The evaluation of teachers: Towards teacher growth. Journal of Education Policy, 11(2), 155-158.

Bradshaw, L. K., & Glatthorn, A. A. (2001). Teacher evaluation for better student learning. Lancaster, PA: Pro>Active Publications.

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

Bryant, M., & Currin, D. (1995). Views of teacher evaluation from novice and expert evaluators. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 10(3), 250-261.

Clandinin, D. J., Kennedy, M., & La Rocque, L. (1996). Living the tension: A case study of teacher stories of teacher evaluation. Journal of Education Policy 11(2), 169-183.

Clark, D. (1993). Teacher evaluation: A review of the literature with implications for educators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 359 174)

Colby, S. A. (2001). A comparison of the impact of state-mandated and locally developed teacher evaluation systems. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC.

Cousins, J. B. (1995). Using collaborative performance appraisal to enhance teachers' professional growth: A review and test of what we know. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 9(3), 199-222.

Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. L. (2000). Teacher evaluation to enhance professional growth. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). Teacher evaluation in transition: Emerging roles and evolving methods. In J. Millman, & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers. (pp. 17-32). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). Toward what end? The evaluation of student learning for the improvement of teaching. In J. Millman (Ed.), Grading teachers, grading schools: Is student achievement a valid evaluation measure? (pp. 248-263). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Standards for assessing teaching effectiveness are key: A response to Schalock, Schalock, and Myton. Phi Delta Kappan 79(6), 471-472.

Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. Phi Delta Kappan 76(8), 597-604.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A. E., & Pease, S. R. (1983). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of the literature. Review of Educational Research 53(3), 285-328.

Davis, D. R. (1999). History and summary analyses of articles published in the Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education: Documenting the first twelve years. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 13(1), 5-26.

Dawson, V. L., & Acker-Hocevar, M. (1998, November). Contradictions within a state-mandated teacher evaluation system: A historical perspective, personal reflections and principal interviews. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Education Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Delandshere, G. (1996). From static and prescribed to dynamic and principled assessment of teaching. The Elementary School Journal 97(2), 106-12.

Dufour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement. Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service.

Duke, D. L. (1995). The move to reform teacher evaluation. In D. L. Duke (Ed.), Teacher evaluation policy: From accountability to professional development. (pp. 1-12). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Duke, D. L., & Stiggans, R. J. (1990). Beyond minimum competence: Evaluation for professional development. In J. Millman, & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers. (pp. 116-132). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Dwyer, C. A. (1998). Psychometrics of Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 12(2), 163-187.

Edwards, M. A. (1995). Growth is the name of the game. Educational Leadership 52(4), 72-74.

Ellett, C. D. (1997). Classroom-based assessments of teaching and learning. In J. H. Stronge (Ed.), Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice (pp. 107-128). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Ellett, C. D., Wren, C. Y., Callender, K. E., Loup, K. S., & Liu, X. (1996). Looking backwards with the Personnel Evaluation Standards: An analysis of the development and implementation of a statewide teacher assessment program. Studies in Educational Evaluation 22(1), 79-113.

Embery, C., & Jones, J. (1996). Appraisal: Monitoring and evaluating its progress. Educational Research 38(2), 123-133.

Frase, L. E., & Streshly, W. (1994). Lack of accuracy, feedback, and commitment in teacher evaluation. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 1, 47-57.

Fullan, M. G. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Glatthorn, A. A. (1997). The principal as curriculum leader: Shaping what is taught and tested. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Good, T. L., & Mulryan, C. (1990). Teacher ratings: A call for teacher control and self-evaluation. In J. Millman, & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers. (pp. 191-215). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

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

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995. Educational Administration Quarterly 32(1), 5-44.

Haughey, M., & Howard, P. (1996). Technical expertise and teacher growth: Results of a teacher evaluation policy impact study. Journal of Education Policy 11(2), 159-168.

Hazi, H. M. (1994). The teacher evaluation-supervision dilemma: A case of entanglements and irreconcilable differences. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 9(2), 195-216.

Iwanicki, E. F. (1990). Teacher evaluation for school improvement. In J. Millman, & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers. (pp. 158-171). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Iwanicki, E. F., & Rindone, D. A. (1995). Integrating professional development, teacher evaluation, and student learning: The evaluation of teacher evaluation policy in Connecticut. In D. L. Duke (Ed.), Teacher evaluation policy: From accountability to professional development. (pp. 65-98). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1988). The personnel evaluation standards. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Johnson, B. L. (1997). An organizational analysis of multiple perspectives of effective teaching: Implications for teacher evaluation. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 11, 69-87.

Johnson, B. L. (1999). Great expectations but politics as usual: The rise and fall of a state-level evaluation initiative. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 13(4), 361-381.

Johnson, T. D. (1998, April). A case study of horizontal teacher evaluation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1995). Student achievement through staff development: Fundamentals of school renewal (2nd ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman Publishers USA.

Killian, J. E., & Wood, F. H. (1996, November). Connections in practice: Instructional supervision, teacher evaluation, and staff development. Paper presented at the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision, Tempe, AZ.

Lawler, D. W. (1992). An examination of teacher evaluation in Iowa. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University.

Lofton, G. G., Hill, F., & Claudet, J. G. (1997). Can state-mandated teacher evaluation fulfill the promise of school improvement? Events in the life of one school. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 11(2), 139-165.

Loup, K. S., Garland, J. S., Ellett, C. D., & Rugutt, J. K. (1996). Ten years later: Findings from a replication of a study of teacher evaluation practices in our 100 largest school districts. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 10, 203-226.

Machell, J. (1995). The teacher evaluation environment: An examination of attributes related to teacher growth. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 9(3), 259-273.

Mason, T. C. (1996). Introduction: Why assess teaching? Elementary School Journal 97(2) 101-104.

McConney, A. A. (1995). Introduction: Common ground for a unified approach. Studies in Educational Evaluation 21, 105-110.

McConney, A. A., Schalock, M. D., & Schalock, H. D. (1997). Indicators of student learning in teacher evaluation. In J. H. Stronge (Ed.), Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice (pp. 162-192). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

McConney, A. A., Schalock, M. D., & Schalock, H. D. (1998). Focusing improvement and quality assurance: Work samples as authentic performance measures of prospective teachers' effectiveness. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 11(4), 343-363.

McKay, V. P. (1998). The implementation of new teacher evaluation procedures in a Massachusetts school district: A problem in organizational culture (school reform, unions, professional growth). Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston College.

McLaughlin, M. W. (1990). Embracing contraries: Implementing and sustaining teacher evaluation. In J. Millman, & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers. (pp. 403-415). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Pfeifer, R. S. (Eds.). (1988). Teacher evaluation: Improvement, accountability, and effective learning. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Mendro, R. L. (1998). Student achievement and school and teacher accountability. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 12(3), 257-267.

Millman, J. (1997). How do I judge thee? Let me count the ways. In J. Millman (Ed.), Grading teachers, grading schools: Is student achievement a valid evaluation measure? (pp. 243-247). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Millman, J., & Schalock, H. D. (1997). Beginnings and introduction. In J. Millman (Ed.), Grading teachers, grading schools: Is student achievement a valid evaluation measure? (pp. 3-8). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Murphy, J., & Shipman, N. (1999). The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: A standards based approach to strengthening educational leadership. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 13(3), 205-223.

Nevo, D. (1994). How can teachers benefit from teacher evaluation? Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 8, 109-117.

Ovando, M. N. (2001). Teacher's perceptions of a learner-centered teacher evaluation system. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 15(3), 213-231.

Pecheone, R. L., & Stansbury, K. (1996). Connecting teacher assessment and school reform. Elementary School Journal 97(2), 163-167.

Peterson, K. D. (1995). Teacher evaluation: A comprehensive guide to new directions and practices. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Peterson, K. D. (2000). Teacher evaluation: A comprehensive guide to new directions and practices. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Poole, W. L. (1996). Contradictory messages and complex change: An application of constructivist and paradox theories to supervisory change. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 10, 247-269.

Popham, W. J. (1998). Why standardized test scores should not be used to judge school/teacher effectiveness [On-line]. Available: http://www.aasa.org/LN/Inews/8-26-98scores.htm

Reitzug, U. C. (1997). Images of principal instructional leadership: From super-vision to collaborative inquiry. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 12(4), 356-366.

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

Sanders, W. L., & Horn, S. P. (1998). Research findings from the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) database: Implications for educational evaluation and research. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 12(3), 247-256.

Schalock, H. D. (1998). Student progress in learning: Teacher responsibility, accountability, and reality. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 12(3), 237-246.

Schalock, H. D., & Schalock, M. D. (1993). Student learning in teacher evaluation and school improvement: An introduction. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 7(2), 103-104.

Scriven, M. (1988). Evaluating teachers as professionals. Western Australia. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 300 882)

Scriven, M. (1995). A unified theory approach to teacher evaluation. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 21, 111-129.

Sheppard, B. (1996). Exploring the transformational nature of instructional leadership. Alberta Journal of Educational Research XLII(4), 325-344.

Shinkfield, A. J. (1994). Principal and peer evaluation of teachers for professional development. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 8, 25-266.

Shinkfield, A. J., & Stufflebeam, D. (1995). Teacher evaluation: Guide to effective practice. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Singh, K., & Shifflette, L. M. (1996). Teachers' perspectives on professional development. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 10(2), 145-160.

Stiggans, R. J., & Duke, D. L. (1988). The case for commitment to teacher growth: Research on teacher evaluation. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Stodolsky, S. S. (1990). Classroom observation. In J. Millman, & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers. (pp. 175-190). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Strickland-Tinkham, B. (1994). The impact of alternative methods of teacher evaluation on teacher perception of organizational climate, teacher instructional practices, and teacher self-perception. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC.

Stronge, J. H. (1995). Balancing individual and institutional goals in educational personnel evaluation: A conceptual framework. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 21, 131-151.

Stronge, J. H. (1997). Improving schools through teacher evaluation. In J. H. Stronge (Ed.), Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice (pp. 1-23). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Stronge, J. H., & Tucker, P. D. (1999). The politics of teacher evaluation: A case study of new system design and implementation. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 13(4), 339-359.

Stronge, J. H., & Tucker, P. D. (2000). Teacher evaluation and student achievement. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Sullivan, K. A. (1999). Documentation in teacher evaluation: What does the professional literature say? NASSP Bulletin 83(607), 48-58.

Sullivan, S., & Glanz, J. (2000). Supervision that improves teaching: Strategies and Techniques. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, Press, Inc.

Sweeney, J. (1994). New paradigms in teacher evaluation: The SBESCD Model. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 8(3), 223-237.

Tyson, L., & Silverman, S. (1994). A detailed analysis of statewide teacher appraisal scores. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 8(4), 377-400.

Wan Mo, K., Conners, R., & McCormick, J. (1998). Teacher appraisal in Hong Kong self-managing secondary schools: Factors for effective practices. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 12(1), 19-42.

Wagner, N. C., & Hill, M. S. (1996, November). Linking teacher evaluation, professional growth, and motivation: A multiple-site case study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration, Savannah, GA.

Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1993). Toward a knowledge base for student learning. Review of Educational Research 63(3), 249-294.

Webster, W. J. (1995). The connection between personnel evaluation and school evaluation. Studies in Educational Evaluation 21, 227-254.

Weiss, E. M., & Weiss, S. G. (1998). New directions in teacher evaluation. ERIC digest. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education.

Wheeler, P. H., & Scriven, M. (1997). Building the foundation: Teacher roles and responsibilities. In J. H. Stronge (Ed.), Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice (pp. 27-58). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Wilson, B., & Wood, J. A. (1996). Teacher evaluation: A national dilemma. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 10(1), 75-82.

Wise, A. E., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M. W., & Bernstein, H. T. (1984). Case studies for teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

Wise, A. E., & Gendler, T. (1990). Governance issues in the evaluation of elementary and secondary school teachers. In J. Millman, & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers. (pp. 374-389). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Wohlstetter, P., Van Kirk, A. N., Robertson, P. J., & Mohrman, S. A. (1997). Organizing for successful school-based management. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Appendix
Comparisons of Research-Based Criteria for Effective Teacher Evaluation with Expert Guidelines

RESEARCH-BASED CRITERIA (COLBY, 2001)	WISE, DARLING-HAMMOND, MCLAUGHLIN, AND BERNSTEIN (1984)	MCLAUGHLIN AND PFEIFER (1988)	STIGGANS AND DUKE (1988)
Purposes for evaluation match methods/procedures.	The district should decide the purpose of evaluation and then correlate with the process. The system must suit the educational goals, conception of teaching and values of the district.	(a) Accountability and improvement are necessary partners for evaluation. (b) Flexible instrumentation is used.	(a) Creating a differentiated evaluation system is the most important policy decision. (b) Various sources of data should be used.
District commitment is evident in sound practices and appropriate allocation of time and resources.	(a) Top-level commitment and resources for evaluation outweigh checklists and procedures. (b) Evaluation must be seen to have utility. (c) Teacher involvement improves evaluation. (d) School districts should give sufficient time for evaluation. (e) Evaluators should be trained. (f) The quality of the evaluation system should be assessed.	(a) The superintendent makes an explicit commitment to evaluation, places evaluation at the center of improvement, and creates the instructional climate. (b) Resources are provided to support needs.(c) Stakeholders are involved in the process. (d) Joint training is advocated. (e) Accountability structures are in place.	(a) Policies should support growth-oriented teacher evaluation. (b) Teachers should be involved and trained. (c) Resources should be available to support professional development.
Teacher evaluation is tightly connected to school improvement, professional development and student learning.	Teacher evaluation is part of a larger strategy for school improvement, not just an ancillary activity.	(a) Evaluation is embedded in a broader improvement effort. (b) Staff development is linked to evaluative feedback. (c) The value of evaluation lies in its potential to merge professional and organizational goals.	(a) Evaluation systems should support professional development. (b) Evaluation results should be used to plan for staff development and evaluate organizational and personal goals.
Educational leaders play a strong, positive role in evaluation.	Evaluator competence requires the ability to make sound judgments and concrete recommendations.	(a) Principals are key to the process as a source of approval and how they spend their time reflects organizational values. (b) Effective feedback procedures are used.	Training and preparation to promote growth-oriented evaluation is necessary as success of evaluation is often a function of the skill, knowledge and attitudes of the leader.
The evaluation environment is supportive of ongoing-professional learning.		(a) Evaluation is an organizational issue more than a technical problem. (b) Essential to sustain a culture of trust and open communication. (c) Reflection and self-evaluation are evident.	

Peterson (1995, 2000)	Stronge (1995)	Killian and Wood (1996)	Danielson and McGreal (2000)
(a) Use evaluation to emphasize the good teaching that already exists. (b) Use good reasons to evaluate. (c) Use multiple evaluators and multiple and variable data sources. (d) Use the results to acknowledge success.	(a) Evaluation should be improvement oriented, serving both accountability purposes and personal growth. (b) Multiple data sources should be used.	Teacher evaluation using the state criteria/checklist should be limited to new teachers and others with concerns.	
(a) Spend the time and other resources needed to recognize good teaching. (b) Use research on teacher evaluation correctly. (c) Place teacher at center of evaluation activity. (d) Use more than one person to judge performance.	(a) An emphasis on systematic communication is important. (b) Technically sound systems are essential. (c) Administrators and teachers should be involved in the design.		There must be a commitment to allocating adequate resources to allow new systems to be successful.
When possible, use actual student achievement data.	Mutually beneficial goals, valued by both the individual teacher and the school, are vital.	Connections in practice between instructional supervision, teacher evaluation, and staff development strengthen school improvement.	(a) New evaluation systems should be directly linked to the mission of the school district. (b) New evaluation systems should emphasize student outcomes.
Limit administrator judgment in evaluation.		(a) Administrators need to acquire instructional leadership skills. (b) Principals need to increase their focus on planning and implementing strategies for professional growth.	
Attend to the sociology of teacher evaluation (the powerful effects of expectations, roles, rewards, sanctions, and relationships in the workplace).	Evaluation needs to be conducted in an environment that fosters mutual trust.	(a) Staff development needs to focus on job-embedded learning. (b) Schools need to make explicit the vital "helping" role colleagues play.	New evaluation and professional development systems should be viewed as continuing processes.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC®

TM033845

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Teacher Evaluation: A Review of the Literature	
Author(s): Susan A. Colby; Lynn K. Bradshaw; Randy L. Joyner	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: 4/1/02

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ☒	Level 2A ☐	Level 2B ☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Raproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please	Signature: Susan A. Colby	Printed Name/Position/Title: Susan Colby, Assistant Professor
	Organization/Address: East Carolina University 309 Speight Greenville, NC 27858	Telephone: 252 328-2886 FAX: E-Mail Address: colbys@mail.ecu.edu Date: 4/5/02

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com