1984

Improvement-directed supervision of marginal teachers

Jacqueline K. Mitchell
Iowa State University

Mitchell, Jacqueline K.

IMPROVEMENT-DIRECTED SUPERVISION OF MARGINAL TEACHERS

Iowa State University PH.D. 1984

Improvement-directed supervision of marginal teachers

by

Jacqueline K. Mitchell

A Dissertation Submitted to the

Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department: Professional Studies in Education

Major: Education (Educational Administration)

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1--INTRODUCTION

Inaugurating the Great Debate of 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education submitted its findings concerning the present quality of education in the United States. According to Bell et al., (1983) America is at risk and faces the pending threat of being overtaken by its competitors. American students no longer compare favorably in achievement measures with students in other countries (Boyer, 1983; Bell et al., 1983). To counter this mediocrity which has permitted other nations to match and surpass the United States in its educational achievements, the commission addressed the entire nation in its appeal for educational reform. Such calls for reform are not new and, usually, fall within ten year cycles (Sizer, 1984). Incited by "intense criticism, angry, expose-type books, and search for scapegoats" (Sizer, p. 3), task forces and commissions have, since 1930, addressed concerns of the public through reports and recommendations for changes and school improvement.

Thus, as other reports have quickly followed, the American public has been deluged with a plethora of reports and recommendations. Each focused upon the quality of learning and teaching in American schools and presented a variety of recommendations for reform (Sykes, 1983b; Evans, 1983). Among the many recommendations set forth--higher teacher salaries, lengthened school day and year, increased parental involvement--improvement (or termination) of ineffective teachers as an option for achieving educational excellence is one of the dominant themes for the 80s (Shanker, 1983; Bell et al., 1983; Webb, 1983). In

one sense, the recommendation may be interpreted as a reaffirmation of the belief of Americans in education (Sizer, 1984). Yet, as a whole, the recommendation does give cause for concern among administrators responsible for carrying out this mission.

Administrators cite a number of factors which impact teacher performance and, therefore, create a significant number of teachers who are not meeting district standards. These factors include mounting pressures exerted by external groups, public criticism, and low quality students entering the teacher education programs; thus, building administrators may be confronted with a relatively large proportion of sub-par teachers. To borrow a term used by Manatt (1983; 1984), these teachers are known as marginal teachers--teachers whose overall performance does not meet district standards.

In a 1978 report based on an 11 percent sampling of the school districts in the United States, it was reported that an estimated five to ten thousand marginal teachers are dismissed each year (Neill and Curtis, 1978; Gudridge, 1980). Experience as a consultant and school administrator led Redfern (1983) to estimate that five to ten percent of the two million teachers currently employed may be classified as marginal teachers. Although the percentage is relatively small, the total number of marginal teachers (possibly 100,000) becomes formidable.

The recommendation to improve or terminate appears to be a simple one; however, most school administrators will argue that, given time constraints, inadequate supervisory skills and fear of legal

repercussions, both improvement and termination of marginal teachers are far more problematic and complex (Sweeney and Manatt, 1984; McDaniel and McDaniel, 1980). In fact, most administrators will concur that "as they attempt to monitor and evaluate teacher performance, diagnosis of the condition of a teacher is sometimes easier than the process of healing and correcting the weaknesses" (Scriven, 1981, p. 244).

The complexity of the problem is compounded by at least two serious limitations: state guidelines with unclear definitions of competency and conflicting views held by researchers in the area of effective teaching. To the disadvantage of the administrator/supervisor, little more than checklists are offered that tend to concentrate mainly on termination of the employee (Sweeney, 1983). Such guidelines mandate the development of professional evaluation procedures and the implementation of interventions for improvement. However, to guarantee due process for the employee, legal grounds for dismissal are prescribed (Peterson, 1982; Landauer et al., 1983; Cambron-McCabe, 1983). Conversely, improvement strategies are not indicated; competency is not consistently defined.

For more than 75 years, defining teacher competency has been the goal of extensive research. Employing the technique of relating process measures of teaching to product measures of student outcomes, investigators until recently failed to establish clear relationships between teaching behaviors and student outcome measures (Brophy and Evertson, 1977). In a criticism of the process-product model, Medley

(1982) claimed that there are two major flaws: (1) failure to consider the individual student's learning behavior; and, (2) limited attention to the purpose or intentions of the teacher. In both instances, variations are treated as errors of measurement. More importantly, the results of research on teaching are descriptive, failing to establish cause and effect (Medley, 1982). However, with the improvement in systems of observation and in research designs, results from process-product research have become more promising.

As the search for empirically-supported effective teacher behaviors continues, the question remains, "What can administrators do to help the marginal teacher get better?" Emphasizing collegial consultation, Manatt (1983) Sweeney and Manatt (1984) and Redfern (1980; 1983) suggest that the efficacy with which administrators can work with the marginal teacher is dependent upon the presence of a systematic approach that includes the following:

1. a fair and effective system of evaluation for all teachers;
2. the identification of specific areas of weaknesses;
3. teacher and administrator/supervisory conferences to devise a plan of action for improvement;
4. intensive supervision with frequent and formal observations;
5. assessment of the results; and,
6. teacher and administrator/supervisor conferences to discuss accomplishment of objectives.

Given that a school district adheres to supervisory practices closely resembling the aforementioned model, there is no reason to suppose that sufficient improvement is impossible (Gudridge, 1980; Neill and Curtis, 1978; Sweeney and Manatt, 1984; Manatt, 1984; Redfern, 1980; 1983; McDonald 1977).

Although improvement is essential and achievable, a missing link in the improvement process concerns the absence of any research that attempts to identify the weaknesses of the marginal teachers.

Statement of the Problem

From all indications, both teachers and administrators are the scapegoats for the current problems of public education. On the other hand, the current criticisms and recommendations are clear indications that good teaching is important. Further, survival of our nation may be dependent upon the education of children which may be strongly influenced by teachers.

While there is evidence that marginal teachers do exist, little is known about who they are and why their inadequacies are not addressed by building administrators. Therefore, to facilitate the improvement process, this exploratory study was conducted to determine who they are and what are the recurring patterns in their in-class behaviors and their out-of-class characteristics. More specifically, the following questions were posed:

1. What common themes or weaknesses are attributed to their marginality?
2. What are the behaviors of those marginal teachers whom principals believe can be saved as compared to those who cannot be saved?
3. Do school districts use multiple evaluators to evaluate and improve the performance of marginal teachers?
4. What factors influence principals' decisions to not communicate their concerns to marginal teachers?

Purpose

In creating a profile of the marginal teacher, attention must be directed toward determining the specific set of expectations held by administrators/supervisors. Further, it is their judgment that determines who is and who is not meeting district standards; thus, the purpose of this study is to:

1. create a profile of marginal teachers, based on administrators' perceptions, describing who they are, and identifying common themes or weaknesses.
2. identifying those differences between the "Improve" and "Dismiss" category.
3. determine principals' perceptions of the evaluation policies provided to improve marginal teachers.

4. determine the extent to which certain restraining factors influence their decisions to communicate their concerns to the marginal teacher.

Objectives

To accomplish the primary task of creating a profile of the marginal teacher, the following objectives stated in the form of questions were posed. The questions were arranged according to the four primary purposes of the study.

Description of marginal teachers

1. Among 12 criteria from a research-based teacher evaluation instrument, what are the major performance areas of weakness of marginal teachers?
2. Among 12 criteria from a research-based teacher evaluation instrument, what are the major performance areas of weakness of those marginal teachers whom administrators believe can be improved?
3. Among 12 criteria from a research-based teacher evaluation instrument, what are the major performance areas of weakness of those marginal teachers whom administrators would dismiss given the opportunity.
4. Of the total number of teachers supervised, what percentage are perceived as marginal?
5. How are the marginal teachers distributed among age groups?

6. Among 14 essential behaviors, which of the 3 describe the greatest percentage of marginal teachers?
7. Among seven indicators of unsatisfactory performance, which of the three describe the greatest percentage of marginal teachers?
8. Does the percentage of marginal teachers differ between building size? among the districts? among building levels?
9. What percentage of the marginal teachers can be saved from dismissal? What percentage have been notified of their sub-par performance?

Differences between the Improve and Dismiss categories

1. Is there a difference between the two groups categorized as "Dismiss" and "Improve?"
2. Is there a difference in the ratings of marginal teachers among building levels?

Perceptions of evaluation policies

1. Is there a relationship between principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of the assistance programs and the existence of multiple evaluators?
2. Is there a relationship between principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of the assistance programs and the percentages of marginal teachers?

3. Is there a relationship between the existence of an assistance program and principals' hesitations to address the problem of marginal teachers?
4. Is there a relationship between principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of their assistance programs and their hesitations to address the problem of marginal teachers?
5. Is there a relationship between principals' hesitations to communicate their concerns to marginal teachers and their building level? building size? percentage of marginal teachers reported?

Restraining factors

1. To what extent do principals view five restraining factors as primary reasons for hesitating to communicate their concerns to marginal teachers, i.e., time constraints, empathy for the "good citizen," the hostile employee, staff reaction, and courts and litigation?
2. Is there a relationship among the five restraining factors?
3. Do principals, when grouped by building levels or by building sizes, differ in their response to each of the restraining factors?

Basic Assumptions

To answer the proposed questions, this study was based upon the assumptions that:

- the teacher performance evaluation instrument used for this study is valid because the items were based on effective classroom research;
- administrators can provide accurate and professional assessments of marginal teachers;
- effective teaching behaviors can be described adequately to permit raters to make valid judgments;
- administrators will be able to identify areas of weaknesses; and
- raters' responses can provide ample descriptive data.

Delimitations

This exploratory study was intended to gain insight into the perceptions of principals concerning the classroom behaviors and out-of-class indicators of unsatisfactory performance of marginal teachers. The data were generated from 339 administrators from Michigan, Missouri, New York, and Wisconsin; 223 principals and assistant principals from Iowa, Kansas, North Carolina, Oklahoma; and a small group of administrators across the country. These administrators were a representative sample of the entire population.

These administrators/supervisors were participants seeking training in some aspect of teacher performance appraisal. Asked to rate specific behaviors exhibited by the teacher in the classroom, their responses were based on perceptions rather than on actual performances of marginal teachers.

Definition of Terms

Teacher effectiveness - the results a teacher obtains or the amount of progress the pupils make toward some indicated educational goal.

Teacher performance evaluation - an evaluative process that concentrates on what the teacher does on the job.

Teacher competence - a set of knowledge, abilities, and beliefs that a teacher posseses and brings to the teaching situation.

Marginal teacher - a teacher whose overall performance, based upon the rating of the evaluator/supervisor, does not meet the established standards of the district.

Profile - a description of the in-class behaviors and out-of-class indicators of unsatisfactory teacher performance.

Intensive assistance - a helping routine which provides a subsystem of the school organizations' teacher performance evaluation system.

Progressive discipline - a series of supervisory strategies to manage the marginal employee who has adequate classroom skills but does not follow employee rules.

Teacher dismissal - a carefully planned series of steps to dismiss the teacher who is beyond Intensive Assistance (IA) help.

Teacher improvement - the process of acquiring adequate classroom skills given the existence of appropriate interventions.

CHAPTER 2--REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The methodology used for reviewing the literature was influenced and somewhat hampered by a seemingly lack of research related to the performance of the marginal teacher. It is likely that this absence of information may be attributed to the educators' aversion, distaste, and neglect of problems associated with recognizing and supervising the marginal or unsatisfactory teacher. Thus, the search was restricted to a review of related literature to (1) discuss the perceptions of teacher quality; (2) identify current and proposed strategies to upgrade teachers; and (3) identify ineffective and effective teacher classroom behaviors as extracted from legal cases and from the research on effective teaching.

Perceptions of Teacher Quality

Since the latter portion of the 19th century, the question of teacher quality in America has been a focal point of both educators and critics of public education (Kerr, 1983; Sweeney, 1983; and Weaver, 1983). As an issue, only the definition has altered (Kerr, 1983). Weaver (1983), in a review of literature on teacher quality, stated:

> The very fact that the definition of the qualified teacher has changed repeatedly . . . probably suggests that either professional educators have not been able to discover what actually constitutes the qualified, qua effective, teacher . . . or that each act of discovery is followed by a change in condition that renders the discovery false (p. 3).

Boyer noted that in a brief span of 30 years, American teachers have been forced to contend with shifting public perceptions of teacher quality, a public whose support has dramatically decreased, and a public whose demands for accountability have escalated (Sizer, 1984; Boyer, 1983; Evans, 1983). As public discontent with teacher quality has increased to an all time high, character and personal conduct of teachers is under less scrutiny; the teachers' abilities to motivate and instruct children is presently the focus of public attention. Today, the watchword is excellence, and the bottom-line is the demand for visible evidence that teachers are effective in their jobs or that efforts are expended to either improve their performance or to remove them from the work force (Larson, 1984; Shanker, 1983; Webb, 1983).

Boyer (1983) and Tomlinson (1981) noted that, until the 1950s, modern history of public education was characterized by comparative stability and public esteem. Commonly referred to as the "good ole days," they were times when public gratitude and esteem accounted for teachers' satisfactions with the roles they assumed as educators (Boyer, 1983; Tomlinson, 1981). They were the days when teachers' salaries were meager and socially imposed standards for teacher behavior were strict. However, with character and conduct intact, teachers were free from complaints and their authority remained unquestioned and unchallenged (Tomlinson, 1981). Scant concern or attention was directed toward subject matter competence.

In the absence of a systematic means of assessing an entry teacher's academic ability, teacher quality was measured in terms of the amount of training, professional preparation, and teacher credentials (Weaver, 1983). Student outcomes had not been introduced as a variable to measure teacher quality. Because students were held responsible for their own achievement, student effort and ability accounted for variations in their performances. Low achievement was equated with low student ability and insufficient effort (Tomlinson, 1981).

By the late 1960s, public opinion gradually shifted in its attitude toward both student achievement and teacher performance (Boyer, 1983; Tomlinson, 1981). Parents and critics alike, fighting and resisting increased taxes, promulgated the demand for teacher accountability (Boyer, 1983; Tomlinson, 1981). Students became the constant; teacher ability and motivation were the variables that determined student performance. As a result, when America discovered that schools were graduating a massive number of functional illiterates, the cry for compentency began to surface (Benderson, 1982).

At the close of the 1970s, samplings from the 1979 Gallup polls of both students and public citizens produced evidence of mounting dissatisfactions with public school teachers. Citizens, when asked what public schools should do to earn an "A" in performance, gave the following answer: (1) improve the quality of teachers, (2) increase discipline, and (3) set higher standards. A survey of attitudes of American youths also revealed dissatisfaction with public school

teachers. A large percentage of students felt that they had not been worked hard enough in either elementary (58%) or in high school (45%) (Gudridge, 1980).

U.S. News and World Report, in a 1978 issue, noted: "a growing concern across the country that some public school teachers are inadequate and that this inadequacy is reflected by thousands of American students who cannot read, write, or add properly" (Gudridge, 1980, p. 2). To further incite a more intense evaluation of teachers, the media in the early 1980s called to the public's attention several teacher deficiencies. Articles were published that printed samples of grammatically incorrect and misspelled notes written by teachers, noted examples of large percentages of teachers failing competency tests, and cited examples of classes out of control under teachers unable to maintain effective discipline. Teachers began to feel the painful sting of public barbs. The question for the 1980s was "How academically competent are American teachers?"

Although, much of the criticism has been directed toward classroom teachers, teacher education programs have also received their share of condemnation. As early as 1963, Koerner questioned the effectiveness and quality of teacher education. A prime target for his criticism was the lack of intellectual quality of schools, courses, and students. Currently, critics of teacher education programs justify their attacks based on the low admissions standards of teacher preparatory programs. Watts (1980), in agreement with Woodring (1982), reported that many

universities have admitted into their teacher education programs a large number of students with grade point averages as low as 2.25.

A serious indictment against teacher quality involves studies that reviewed standardized test scores of students admitted into and graduating from teacher education programs. Sykes (1983b), Vance (1982), and Watts (1980), each reported that the rate of decline in the SAT verbal and math scores of future teachers is more than twice as great as the national average of all students which has consistently and significantly dropped during the past 20 years (Boyer, 1983; Griffith, 1981; Weaver, 1983). McGrath (1983) reported that, in 1982, education majors scored 32 points below the national average on the verbal portion of the SAT and 48 points lower in the area of mathematics.

The implications are serious, suggesting that the more capable students are not entering colleges of education (Kerr, 1983; Murnane, 1983; Vance and Schlechty, 1982). In fact, high ability teacher education graduates, as measured by the National Teachers' Examination, are perceived as less likely to enter teaching. Of those academically able teachers who do chose to teach, the higher scoring students leave teaching in greater numbers than those who score at the bottom. Thus, as the teaching profession has failed to attract and retain the academically bright, a disproportionately large number of low achieving students have been attracted to the profession (Kerr, 1983; Weaver, 1983; Vance and Schlechty, 1982).

Strategies for Upgrading Teacher Quality

In the struggle to upgrade teachers, educators are not without an abundance of recommendations, proposed strategies, and alternatives from which to chose. Some of the most frequently mentioned strategies/ recommendations are discussed below.

Teacher education programs

Those who believe that a teacher's academic ability is synonomous with teacher quality suggest that developing a talent pool of the most academically bright is the most viable avenue for improving the quality of teachers. The proposed solutions include raising standards for admission into teacher preparation programs and upgrading teacher education programs (Bell et al., 1983; Kerr, 1983; Timpane, 1984).

Although research relating effective teaching to admission standards is nearly non-existent, much speculation exists concerning the effectiveness of teacher education programs and their contributions to teacher classroom performance. According to Murnane (1983), some studies have shown that academic ability as measured by teachers' scores on tests of verbal ability correlates significantly with teacher effectiveness as measured by student test-score gains.

However, Medley (1979) noted that no empirical evidence exists that ability to write is related to the ability to teach children to write nor is there empirical evidence that knowledge of such courses as history of education and psychology relates to the ability to teach any course in the classroom.

As reported by Kerr (1983) and Evans (1983), the establishment and implementation of more rigorous admissions standards are fundamental requisites for upgrading teachers. They contend that acceptance into the teacher preparatory program should require that an applicant:

1. rank in the upper one third of his/her class;
2. score at or above the 50th percentile on the Cooperative School and College Ability Test (SCAT) or Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT);
3. score at or above the 60th percentile on a standardized intelligence test;
4. demonstrate adequate competence in speech, reading, and English (Watts, 1980).

Dawe (1984) recommends a complete dissolution of extant schools of education by merging the existing faculty with other schools. Dawe proposes the creation of studios for training perspective teachers admitted on the basis of knowledge of subject matter to be taught and the ability to teach. The goal of the studio would be to train and evaluate candidates. Certification would be acquired through auditions.

In a criticism of preparation programs that present only limited teaching approaches, Johnston (1984) recommends that education programs consider the following suggestions:

1. Present a more comprehensive set of instructional strategies and perspectives that foster the candidates own professional development.

2. Provide educational experiences that encourage teachers to explore, evaluate, and acquire insight into the individual's own professional and personal philosophies.
3. Concentrate on classroom observations as a tool for facilitating the prospective teachers in analyzing and evaluating teaching behaviors.
4. Provide opportunities to design and implement both small group and whole class instruction.

Schlechty and Vance (1983), in discussing their attitudes concerning academic ability standards, stated:

> me people who score very low on measures of academic ability may become great teachers and others who score low on such measures may prove to be totally incompetent. However, we believe that occupations that are primarily oriented toward academic pursuits should not implicitly give preference to those who have the least aptitude for academic tasks. The average teacher should be able to score at least as well on measures of academic ability as the average college bound high school senior (p. 101).

In general, beyond rigorous admissions standards, Kerr (1983), Bell et al. (1983), Tomlinson (1981), and Shanker (1983) proposed one or more of the following recommendations:

1. increase the liberal arts offerings;
2. revise methods courses to include an extension of the field experience;
3. extend the teacher education programs from four to five years of experience;
4. shift the training of teachers to the graduate level;
5. require a paid internship prior to hiring; and

6. implement a course of training based on effective teaching.

Competency testing

As the criticism of teachers has continued to grow, state boards of education and some local school districts have begun to search for a means of eliminating teachers lacking in basic reading and writing skills. Thus, once on the decline, competency testing is presently on the rise with both individual school districts and several states such as Louisiana, Texas, and Florida. In 1983, Solorzova predicted that by 1985, more than one-half of the 50 states will require some form of competency testing of basic skills. As of May, 1984, 25 states require such tests and 17 states are giving it serious consideration (USA Today).

Competency testing is not an improvement strategy, but a screening process that either is linked with initial certification or personnel selection and/or retention. The primary purpose, however, is to eliminate teachers of limited intellectual ability before they reach the teaching force or to remove those teachers who are not academically capable as measured by the selected test. To date, 17 states use competency testing as a requirement for those entering teacher education programs; 8 states use some form of testing to test on-the-job skills.

As with teacher education, competency testing has not been shown to be a predictor of effective classroom teaching, whether effectiveness is "estimated from ratings of teachers' competence or from students' achievement gains" (Soar, Medley, and Coker, 1983, p. 241). However,

the growing, widespread use of competency testing by those who support the premise that training, selection, and hiring procedures must be improved to dissipate ineffective teaching clearly suggests that it has been chosen as an option for improving teacher quality.

Shanker, President of the American Federation of Teachers, in a recent interview, stated, "A teacher should have a relatively high level of literacy and should be competent in his or her own subject matter. Everyone who enters ought to be tested on those skills" (1983, p. 41). In contrast to both Shanker of the American Federation of Teachers and Futrell of the National Education Association, a study of 2,981 elementary and secondary public school teachers found 57 percent of the teachers surveyed believed periodic retesting of teachers would improve the quality of teaching (Zigli, 1984).

According to Watts (1980), who objects to the inadequacy of paper-and-pencil tests, "Competence evaluation should be performed by a professional standards board functioning independently of the training institutions" (p. 121). Students unable to demonstrate competencies set forth by the professional standards board would be retrained at the expense of the training institutions.

Gudridge (1980) and Schlechty and Vance (1983), likewise, support the conviction that training institutions must be held accountable to the state for adequate preparation of teacher candidates. For example, schools that consistently produce more than 50 percent of its graduates below the median on selected exit tests, such as the NTE, should lose its accreditation (Schlechty and Vance, 1983).

Incentive based strategies

Those strategies which address the needs and quality of teachers presently employed include recommendations related to various forms of rewards and incentives. Sykes (1983b), Timpane (1983), and Kerr (1983) are among the many who propose a restructuring of the teaching occupation through the development of incentive-based teacher improvement systems. The major thrust of such incentives should, therefore, center on recruiting and retraining (Sykes, 1983b; Boyer, 1983). "Master-teachers," "Career-teachers," and "Career-ladder" are a few of the recently introduced concepts aimed toward expressing the value of, and providing rewards for, effective teachers (Murnane, 1983; Timpane, 1983; Goodlad, 1983).

Despite a history of low success rate, merit pay has become one of the most frequently discussed issues of all the recommendations. Both the President of the United States and public school employees voice the opinion that paying the best teachers more money will assure the improved quality of teachers (Freeland, 1983a). Further, Freeland reported that in response to an American School Board Journal poll, two-thirds of 1,261 teachers supported the issue of merit pay rates based on classroom performance. Respondents included both union and non-union members. Only two to five percent supported merit pay based on seniority and academic ability.

As of October, 1983, McGrath noted that several states have mandated some form of merit pay. Nine states at the time were

considering legislation concerning merit pay; twenty-nine states were studying the idea. Sizer (1984), Sykes (1983b), Boyer (1983), and others support a complete restructuring of the teaching occupation through the development of incentive-based teacher improvement systems.

Inservice training

Few can deny that building administrators will profit from improved personnel procedures for training, selecting, and hiring new teachers. Yet, a shift in present recruiting and training procedures is not likely to impact teacher quality for several years. Therefore, those who believe that critical skills in teaching are acquired through experience support the implementation of staff development programs to improve the quality of teaching (Murnane, 1983; Gudridge, 1980). Benderson (1982) suggested, "Any immediate improvements in teacher performance, therefore, are more likely to be the result of inservice training" (p. 12).

According to Lawrence, certain key ingredients are present in effective staff inservice programs (Gudridge, 1980). Such programs are characterized by: (1) school-based activities; (2) self-instruction by teachers; (3) active rather than passive participation; (4) demonstrations; (5) supervised trials and feedback; (6) sharing and mutual assistance; (7) linkage to school efforts; and (8) goals/activity selection by participants.

Additional components of effective inservice education identified by the Rand Change Agent Study include: concrete, teacher-specific and

extended training; assistance in the classroom from support staff; teacher observation of similar projects; regular meetings; teacher participation in decision making; materials locally developed; and principal's participation in the inservice program.

The major criticism of inservice concerns the limited investments of school districts in the continuing maintenance and improvement of teachers (Gudridge, 1980). While most schools spend less than one percent of the budget for inservice, the Commission on Education for Teacher Education recommends that districts appropriate at least a minimum of ten percent of its total budget for inservice activities (Gudridge, 1980).

As may be noted from the preceding recommendations extracted from a review of literature, none of the strategies, important as they may be, directly address the primary concerns of administrators who must supervise and evaluate teachers. The improvement strategies set forth tend to apply to individual's who either have not entered the teaching occupation or those in need of incentives for facilitating adequate performance, or professional growth and development. Other recommendations, however, do concentrate on the marginal teachers.

Teacher dismissal

As an option for upgrading the quality of teachers in America, a number of studies and reports have cited dismissal of sub-par teachers. However, dismissal as a strategy is not always acceptable to building administrators who are intimidated by the power of unions and tenure

laws and the accompanying expense of litigation (Redfern, 1983; Neill and Curtis, 1978). Woodring asserted (1983), "Under present laws, rules, and union contracts, administrators find it so difficult to discharge teachers for incompetence that they just give up and let the children suffer" (p. 83).

Ohanihan (1982) describes unions as generally concerned with image-making and leader rhetoric rather than rank and file competence. Defending the worst of teachers to avoid endangering the jobs of the best teachers, union leaders insist that it is their job to defend all members of the organization (Palker, 1980; Gudridge, 1980). Palker further accused union leaders of fighting for job security without clearly outlined standards of performance.

Keisling (1982) criticizes unions for transferring "the worst aspects of unionism to an enterprise which is not compatible with the timeclock" (p. 8). Out of fear of being labeled as a "rate-buster," some teachers are reluctant to go the extra mile often needed to provide quality education for students (Keisling, 1982).

Tenure laws are perceived as contributing to principals' tolerance of marginal teachers and their retention (Scriven, 1981). Initially instituted to protect the capable and experienced employees against unlawful, capricious, and arbitrary boards, tenure is often referred to as the "administrators' dilemma" (Pope, 1983; Hudgins and Vacca, 1979). Ohles (1979) noted that, by protecting all teachers (often to the detriment of students, parents, and taxpayers), tenure laws encourage administrators to ignore the issues related to "marginal teachers." The

resulting retention of unsatisfactory teachers generates a loss of respect for a school district electing to exchange equity for productivity (Scriven, 1981).

Schools that do tackle the issue of marginal teachers often regard the process as exceedingly expensive (Keisling, 1982). In suburban Virginia, one school district spent two years, at a cost of $6,000, to dismiss one tenured teacher. Ohanihan (1982) estimates that the efforts to dismiss a single tenured teacher can cost up to $20,000. Recently, the California Office of Administrative Hearings was charged a total of $583,000 over a period of 3 years for 91 dismissal hearings (Pope, 1983). The school boards won only 50 of the dismissal cases. Bridges (1983) estimated that removal of marginal teachers ranges from $7,000 to $20,000, with the highest on record being $100,000. Thus, some administrators, fearing the repercussions and expense of litigations, tend to accept inefficiency among staff as a way of life (Scriven, 1981).

Other school districts, however, have become sensitized to the limits of the law and are not so readily intimidated by the possible complications that can surface when they evaluate and/or remove marginal teachers. It is significant to note that as of 1982 at least 26 states provided guidelines or legislation about teacher evaluation, 20 states having established their statutes or regulations after 1971. In most instances (23), the teacher evaluation requirement was established for the purpose of teacher improvement. Twelve states established an evaluation system for teacher dismissal (Wuhs and Manatt, 1983).

Futrell (1984) suggests that the implementation of effective teacher performance evaluating is the answer to the problems administrators face in evaluating teachers for both improvement and dismissal.

Operating within compliance with such evaluation statutes, school boards have discovered that courts consistently refrain from substituting their own judgment for that of the board's. According to Pope (1983), judicial systems do not view themselves as "Super-Tenure Review Committees." In fact, as noted by Munnelly (1979), courts downplay cases that relate to instructional effectiveness, but center on the due process procedures or the lack of this critical element. As a result, a most important concept for administrators is that of due process, both substantive and procedural. Simply stated, basic due process requires adherence to established rules to protect the rights of the employee. Not only does it require that all employees receive the protection of a fair and reasonable evaluation, but due process guarantees an orderly and systematic means for addressing the employee's concerns about fairness (Peterson and Ward, 1980). Thus, schools that do follow due process guidelines are perceived as less likely to become immobilized out of fear of unions and tenure laws.

Intensive assistance

Not only is due process an important factor in dismissing teachers, but for several school districts seeking to improve marginal teachers, due process serves as the justification for a support system referred to in some school districts as Intensive Assistance (IA). A seldom

mentioned strategy in the reports and recommendations receiving public attention, IA is described as a sub-system of the total evaluation program which follows those evaluation guidelines created by Richard P. Manatt (Manatt, 1983; Sweeney and Manatt, 1984). Intended to increase the effectiveness of the marginal teacher, "IA is a team effort bringing to bear the skills. knowledge, and time of several supervisory personnel, e.g., the first level supervisor, curriculum specialist, the assistant superintendent or supervisor, and, on occasion, consultants" (Manatt, 1984, p. 5).

As noted by Manatt, IA is effective only where due process is seriously addressed. Thus, a primary criterion for the establishment of an effective IA is a thorough understanding of the concept "due process." At the very heart of the concept of due process rests substantive due process--rights guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments of the Constitution. These include such fundamentals as the freedom of speech, religion, and association and the right to privacy (Morris, 1983).

In teacher performance evaluation, procedural due process requirements guarantee the employees those rights which may be grouped into several major categories directly related to the supervision and evaluation of marginal teachers and others. While Cambron-McCabe (1983) places strong emphasis on the requirements of notice and an opportunity for a fair hearing, she recommends that the following critical components should be incorporated into local procedures for their employees as schools attempt to guarantee procedural due process rights:

1. notice of the list of charges,
2. sufficient time to prepare a rebuttal to the charges,
3. names of witnesses and access to evidence,
4. a hearing in the presence of an impartial tribunal,
5. representation by legal counsel,
6. right to introduce evidence and cross examine adverse witnesses,
7. ruling based on the evidence and findings of the hearing,
8. maintenance of transcripts and records of the hearing, and
9. employee right to an appeal on adverse decisions.

Peterson (1982) referred to dismissal with due process as producing evidence of sub-standard performance through documentation. Offering a set of rules stated in the form of guidelines, Peterson noted that the evaluation system insures the existence of due process rights when:

1. teachers are aware of the criteria and procedures;
2. administrators engage in direct observation;
3. conferences are conducted to outline areas of weakness;
4. assistance, in the form of materials, inservice, etc. is given;
5. sufficient time to improve is provided; and
6. observations and evaluation are employed to determine changes.

A second factor which influences the effectiveness of IA is the existence of an evaluation system that has addressed: 1) criteria of

the district; (2) the school's standards of performance; (3) methods of monitoring, analyzing, and reporting results; and (4) strategies for improving the performance of all teachers (Manatt, 1984).

Finally, according to Manatt and others, at the heart of IA are Job Improvement Targets that contain: (1) diagnosis of the performance problem; (2) specific objectives for improvement; (3) procedures and/or resources for achieving objectives; (4) appraisal methods; and 5) timelines with target dates and deadlines (Manatt, 1983, 1984; Sweeney and Manatt, 1984).

As an example of an exemplary program which contributes much to the improvement of marginal teachers, IA has been implemented by the efforts of Don Brubaker and others of the Des Moines Public School System. Consisting of job targets and performance objectives, the program relies heavily on due process guidelines. Other school districts attempting to correct teacher deficiencies through intensive assistance include Salt Lake City, the Norfolk Public Schools, and the Apache Junction Unified School District. In each instance, the overall plan, using appropriate and available resources, is intended to facilitate an individualized plan for the improvement of marginal teachers.

Ineffective and Effective Teacher Characteristics

Despite a few isolated instances where administrators deliberately work with marginal teachers, a review of the literature reveals limited information concerning their in-class behaviors. However, through (1)

an analysis of the improvement plans written over the past three years by administrators of the Des Moines Public Schools, (2) a review of legal hearings, (3) and a review of effective teaching research, a possible profile of marginal teachers begins to emerge.

Improvement plans analysis

In the fall of 1983, an analysis of 26 improvement plans written by Des Moines Public School administrators provided information concerning the patterns of weaknesses of marginal teachers in the district. Des Moines uses an evaluation instrument that consists of 3 performance areas and 11 related criteria.

Improvement plans were written to match those specific areas and criteria where teachers were not meeting the district standards. The analysis revealed that the area of instruction, referred to as the "learning environment," is that area where teachers are having the greatest amount of difficulty. Improvement plans were written for the learning environment area in 82 percent of the cases, as compared to 11 percent for the interpersonal area and 9 percent for the area of professional responsibilities. Within the area of the learning environment, 46 percent of the problems were in planning, 24 percent in classroom management, 18 percent in using a variety of teaching strategies, and 7 percent in effective evaluation of students.

Demographic data suggests that at the elementary level, marginal teachers tend to be older, single, and female. At the secondary level, such teachers tend to be older, married, and male with an unhappy marriage and an unhappy life.

The information from the Des Moines analysis is extremely limited, but it does suggest that viable information can be obtained for preparing appropriate interventions to improve marginal teachers.

Legal definitions

Because incompetent teachers may be described as marginal teachers who have not improved, an analysis of dismissal cases can identify those indicators of ineffective classroom behavior that separate marginal teachers from those who are performing satisfactorily.

Delon, in an interview, has identified 23 causes as specified in various state laws. The most frequently cited cause is "incompetence" (Neill and Curtis, 1978). From the list, two categories may be developed--incompetency, forming its own category, and the remaining 22 forming the category referred to as "counter-productive conduct." The two categories differ in that incompetence requires notice to the teacher and time to improve. On the other hand "counter-productive conduct" does not. While incompetence is based on a pattern of incompetent behavior, counter-productive behavior involves a single serious incident (Neill and Curtis, 1978; Landauer et al., 1983).

Landauer et al. group the predominant causes into three major categories: immorality, insubordination, and incompetency. According to Levin, the rationale for the cause of immorality "is that the teacher is expected to set an example for the minds in his or her charge by living an exemplary life of high moral character" (Neill and Curtis, 1978, p. 14). Despite the use of immorality as a cause of dismissal, legislatures have been reluctant to define the term. However, Landauer

et al. (1983) found in a survey of pertinent cases that immorality may be placed in one or more of the following discrete categories of conduct:

1. heterosexual misconduct with students and nonstudents
2. homosexuality
3. nonsexual misconduct with students
4. physical abuse of students
5. classroom discussion or use of materials that are sexual in nature
6. use of profanity
7. misconduct involving drugs and/or alchohol
8. criminal misconduct
9. misappropriation of funds
10. cheating and/or lying

Insubordination, cited as the most frequently used cause for dismissal, often involves more than a single incident, stated Walden (Neill and Curtis, 1978). Walden, in an interview, defined insubordination as the behavior of the individual who "fails to follow the legitimate orders of his or her employees or is so verbally abusive of supervisors that the school's effectiveness is impaired" (Neill and Curtis, 1978, p. 15). Delon identifies the following seven types of behaviors related to insubordination.

1. local residence requirements
2. professional growth
3. unauthorized absences

4. personal appearance
5. teacher protest
6. curricular decisions
7. employee-supervisor conflicts

In general, courts place the greatest emphasis upon a district's evaluation procedures and its supporting documentation system. As such, the system used should be established for the purpose of providing a communication process to help improve an employee's performance. Of prime importance, there must be compliance with the contractual schemes in the district and with state statutes (Frels and Cooper, 1983).

In the attempt to define incompetency, searching statutes and laws for the one best definition of incompetence proves to be fruitless. Tenure/dismissal statutes do not define incompetence. Rather, incompetence is listed as one of several reasons for dismissal (Munnelly, 1979; Gudridge, 1980; Landauer et al., 1983). Bridges (1983) stated, "Although most state legislatures have singled out incompetence as a legal ground for dismissal, only two states, Alaska and Tennessee, have supplied definitions" (p. 5). Furthermore, their definitions fail to indicate criteria or standards for incompetence.

According to Nolte, the incompetent teacher is the individual who continues to function at a sub-standard level after having been warned, assisted, and counseled. Neill and Curtis (1978) reported in their extensive study on teacher dismissal that courts apply the term "incompetent" to those who are not capable of performing adequately;

teachers with the capacity and the competence to teach, but do so in a careless and ineffective manner, are labeled inefficient teachers.

Palker (1980) suggested that the definitions are varied and cover such deficiencies as a lack of subject matter knowledge, an absence of sensitivity toward students and teaching or the inability to maintain classroom control. In general, all of these factors allegedly constitute incompetency combined with a lack of creativity and imagination in teaching (Palker, 1980).

While it is apparent that courts eschew defining or passing judgment on a teacher's incompetence, a review of dismissal cases upheld by courts does provide some indicators that courts will accept as behaviors of incompetence. Landauer et al. (1983) state "the conditions or behaviors that have successfully applied to incompetence fall into four general categories: inadequate teaching, poor discipline, physical or mental disability, and counter-productive personality traits (p. 159).

In analyzing dismissal cases, Neill and Curtis classify related cases into four broad categories which include: teaching method, effects on pupils, teacher's personal attitude, and knowledge of subject matter. As observed by Neill and Curtis (1978) and Bridges (1983), more than any other reason, inability to maintain discipline--subsumed under the category of teaching method--forms the basis for cases of incompetence. This observation is supported by a review of dismissal cases.

Failure to maintain student discipline was the dominant cause for dismissal in both the Steffen v Board of Directors of South Middletown Topeka School District and the De Koevend v Board of Education, Colorado cases. In addition to inadequate discipline, the De Koevend case cited failure to conform to administrative directives as grounds for incompetency (Quick, 1983).

In the case of Childers v Independent School District, Oklahaoma, 1982, the board's decision was upheld in appellate court both on the grounds of incompetency and willful neglect. Incompetency included lack of discipline, in addition to failure to work with administrators and other teachers. The Whaley v Anoka Hennepin Independent Schools, Minnesota District case included not only discipline as a weakness but other definitions of incompetency were noted--lack of rapport with students, excessive use of worksheets, and lack of student progress (Piele, 1983).

Poor classroom discipline, disorganized lessons, and ridiculing awkward students were the major causes leading to the dismissal of an Illinois teacher. The decision was overturned, however, not on the grounds of the causes cited, but on the basis of the board's failure to provide an opportunity for remediation (Morris v Board of Educ. of the City of Chicago, 421 N.E. 2d 387 Ill. App. 1981)

In a similar case, an Illinois appellate court accepted the following causes for dismissal of a teacher of mentally handicapped students: lack of instructional planning, lack of positive learning

activities, and lack of cooperation with colleagues. Yet, the teacher was reinstated on the grounds that a reasonable period for assessing improvement had not been given (Board of Educ. of School Dist. No. 131 v Illinois State Bd. of Education. 435 N.E. 2d 845 Ill App. 1982).

In another case, the remediation period was deemed unreasonable for the improvement of a high school English teacher. The grounds for dismissal, however, were not questioned: poor classroom discipline, inadequate communication skills, and poor record keeping (Ganyo v Independent School Dist. No 832, 311 N.W. 2d 497 Minn 1981).

The conclusion that classroom management is the prime cause for dismissal is supported by the aforementioned cases. Based on these dismissal cases, ineffective classroom management is a prime in-class behavior of incompetent/marginal teachers who, given time, notice, and assistance, have failed to show adequate improvement.

Effective teaching research

Improving teachers' performance requires that the administrator utilize the resources of the schools of research on effective classrooms. Squires et al. (1983) noted that a few single teacher behaviors do appear to be significant in and of themselves. From a composite of these critical teacher behaviors, Squires et al. have identified three categories: (1) planning, or preparing for classroom activities; (2) management, which concerns managing students' behavior; and 3) instruction, or guiding student's learning. While teacher behavior is critical to student achievement, important student behaviors

of involvement, content coverage, and success rate also show a significant relationship to learning.

Planning In general, teacher planning can be described as a process of selecting objectives, diagnosing learner characteristics, and selecting appropriate instructional and management strategies (Peterson, Marx, and Clark, 1978). The planning process includes, in addition to preparing written plans, arranging the furniture and equipment for effective instruction, reading/studying textbooks and other resource materials, and grading papers. Involved in a decision-making process, the teacher must decide how to present information, when and how to question students, and how to manage his/her classroom. The final decision concerns how to evaluate the effectiveness of the instructional process enabling appropriate revisions and modifications of the initial plan.

Less than effective teachers tend to focus on tasks or activities to be presented in the classroom, rather than on instructional objectives (Peterson et al., 1978; Shavelson and Stern, 1981). The effective teacher focuses on learner outcomes and takes into consideration what the learner already knows. Continuously, classroom instruction is adjusted as objectives are evaluated.

Anderson (1984), Levin (1975), and Block (1970) have shown that for those students whose prior learning was attended to, teachers were able to reduce the effects of students' entering achievement on their final achievement. Thus, effective teachers begin the planning process by identifying and attending to students' prior learning (Bloom, 1981).

Berliner and Rosenshine (1977) found that opportunity to learn, appropriate content coverage, and curriculum-test congruence tend to discriminate between more and less effective teachers. An important variable subsumed under the broad concept of direct instruction, "opportunity to learn" is high when both engaged time and allocated time in the content areas are high, content coverage is wide, and time and content choices match depth and breadth of achievement tests used to assess instruction (Squires et al., 1983). Only through careful planning will such characteristics become visible within the classroom of the effective teacher.

Instruction Referred to as the interactive phase of instruction, implementation of the lesson is more or less spontaneous in nature and requires a different thinking process. Through implementation of the lesson, the teacher brings the planning stage to life. The demonstrated behavior of the teacher, at this point, has considerable influence upon student outcomes.

Research provides several appropriate models for facilitating classroom instruction. Russell and Hunter (1977) suggested that the instructional process includes these stages: (1) anticipatory set; (2) statement of objectives; (3) modeling; 4) input; 5) probing; 6) guided practice; and 7) independent practice. A similar model, as presented by Rosenshine, includes the teacher functions of: (1) daily review; (2) presentation; (3) guided practice; (4) feedback; (5) independent practice; and 6) periodic review (Rosenshine, 1983).

A third model, following a "Demonstrate-Practice-Feedback" loop, has been recommended for students who are younger, slower, and/or have limited prior background (Fitzpatrick, 1982). This process of direct instruction, which has been shown to correlate positively to student achievement, is characterized by a teacher who:

1. structures the learning;
2. teaches in small portions, but at a brisk and task-oriented pace;
3. gives detailed and redundant instructions and explanations;
4. provides many examples;
5. asks a large number of questions and provides overt active practice;
6. provides corrective feedback, especially when introducing new materials;
7. has an 80 percent or higher success rate in initial learning;
8. divides seatwork assignments into smaller assignments; and
9. makes provisions for continued student practice (Rosenshine, 1983).

Crawford (1978) found that students of elementary teachers trained in direct instruction produced higher rates of achievement than students of teachers who had not received the training. In contrast, less successful teachers permit students to set goals and objectives, center the attention on the students, and allow students to have a great deal of choice about the learning activities (Soar, 1977; Stallings and Kaskowitz, 1974; and Solomon and Kendall, 1976).

Rosenshine noted that the use of structuring comments at various intervals of the planned lesson increases the effectiveness of the classroom teacher and correlates positively with student achievement. When used to initiate the lesson, structuring, or anticipatory set as it is called by Madeline Hunter, sets the stage for subsequent learning and avoids discontinuity or irrelevant interjections. Ausubel proposed the use of advanced organizers which may be defined as "a brief overview of the information to be studied and some notion of its importance in the overall scheme of things" (Manatt, 1984). Bloom (1981), who uses the term cueing, estimates that cueing will account for 25 percent of the achievement advantage obtained by effective teachers. During the course of instruction, structuring comments are beneficial as signals, preparing students for a shift from one activity to another and/or making smooth transitions from one set of learning to the next (Rosenshine, 1979).

Modeling is a key behavior of the effective teacher. As a teaching device, modeling is employed for a variety of reasons by teachers who expect students to achieve mastery of new learning and/or new skills. Demonstrating the "how to" of an activity, appropriate modeling usually requires verbalization to provide clear explanations as the teacher moves step-by-step throughout the process. New concepts and terms are defined and new skills are phased in as old ones are being mastered (Rosenshine, 1983; Good and Brophy, 1984).

Effective teachers perform frequent assessments to determine if all students understand the skill or content being taught (Russell and Hunter, 1977). As they continuously check for student comprehension, they monitor students' work and seek feedback from students before moving to subsequent learning (Good and Brophy, 1984). In reviewing a study by Evertson et al., Rosenshine (1983) noted that most effective mathematics teachers spent about 23 minutes per day performing the lecture-demonstration-discussion process. Least effective teachers spent only 11 minutes. The additional time was used by effective teachers to check for student comprehension. Unlike the least effective teachers--who assume everybody understands and introduces more difficult materials before mastery of materials has occurred--the effective teacher questions, probes, analyzes the problem, and institutes corrective measures to ensure mastery (Russell and Hunter, 1977).

Throughout the lesson, the skillful teacher employs questioning techniques to check for student understanding and to assess student progress. Several studies as cited in Good and Brophy (1984) found that a high frequency of questions was shown to relate positively to learning (Brophy and Evertson, 1977). Two types of questions distinguish effective teachers from the less effective teachers: questions calling for specific answers and those asking for explanations of how an answer was found. Effective teachers use easy questions with a high success rate intended. In addition, questions control subject-related interaction, focus upon learning, and stimulate attention. For maximal

benefit, questions directed to students are genuine and require a response.

Despite the mixed findings concerning the types and levels of questions, some studies have shown that low-level, factual questions correlate positively with learning gains of disadvantaged students in early elementary grades (Dillon, 1981; Soar, 1977; Stallings, 1975).

Essential to effective teaching is an awareness of the influence teacher expectations have upon both the planning and interactive stages of instruction. Expectations determine the planned learning experiences selected for implementation in the classroom. Secondly, expectations impact the pace at which students are moved through the curriculum. Finally, teacher behavior is a by-product of that teacher's particular set of expectations. Thus, effective teachers keep their expectations in perspective. Good and Brophy (1984) present extensive research evidence that teacher expectations guide perceptions and behaviors, thus, affecting ones interpretaion of what he/she sees.

Closely related to teacher expectations is motivation, a major aspect of classroom interaction that research has shown makes a difference in learning. A complex concept, it is defined as the state within the learner which activates the learner to satisfy a need or a desire (Hunter, 1984). The effective teacher arranges the lesson and its activities to increase the probablity that a student will be motivated to learn. Six variables that teachers can control and that affect motivation are: (1) concern--an anxiety level created by the

teacher; (2) feeling tone--a verbal and nonverbal response that affects the learners feelings; (3) interest--creating enthusiasm for a lesson or activity; (4) success--level of accomplishment the learner experiences; (5) feedback--knowledge of results which is specific, immediate, and precise; (6) reward--feelings of satisfaction that either comes from within the learner or from another source.

The teacher who effectively uses praise in the classroom gives careful consideration to two issues: (1) when to use praise; and (2) how to use praise. Recognizing that appropriate praise is given to reflect an appreciation of the students' efforts and admiration for students' accomplishments, the teacher directs attention to students' mastery of skills. In providing guidelines for effective praise, Brophy (1981) suggest that praise is: (1) simple and direct, (2) straightforward, (3) applicable to a particular accomplishment, (4) reinforced by nonverbal communication of approval, and 5) generally expressed in private. If teachers expect to reinforce desired student behavior, then the praise must be both systematic and appropriate.

Classroom management Good and Brophy (1984) described four types of classrooms: the first classroom is characterized by chaos and complete disruption; the second, by fun and games used to bribe students into learning; the third, by total quiet, but dictatorial approaches; and the fourth, exhibits an environment that has limited control problems. Principals do not give high ratings to teachers who have difficulties controlling classes. The ideal setting is one in which

control appears to be obtained with little or no apparent effort on the part of the classroom teacher. Such classrooms may be characterized by a proactive strategy for handling classroom discipline. In other words, in the ideal setting, the classroom teacher plans well before he/she acts, employing a variety of preventive measures to counter problems before they occur (Brophy and Putnam, 1979).

Anderson, Evertson, and Brophy (1979) suggested that the effective teacher has a low frequency of corrections for misbehavior. Research shows evidence that successful teachers set up classroom rules, monitor students' behavior, and deliver consequences. Because rules are a means to desired ends, teachers work on rules and routines consistently and continually. Effective teachers are thoroughly prepared and well-organized giving careful consideration to the physical factors of the classroom, including materials. Looking ahead, the successful teacher establishes procedures and routines to manage such frequently recurring problems as missing books, limited supplies, continuous arrival of new students, late arrival of students, and the intercom (Good and Brophy, 1984).

Students are more likely to follow rules when they understand and accept them (Good and Brophy, 1984). Thus, rules are not only clear and explicit, but they are accompanied by a sound rationale that is shared with all students. This sharing process begins the first day of the school year. The tone of the process resembles instruction rather than "control" as the teacher specifies desired behavior in positive terms.

Good and Brophy noted that recent research shows evidence that teachers spending time early in the school year to model their classroom expectations have well-managed classrooms throughout the school year.

Kounin (1970) found that, in most cases, discontinuity in the lesson caused student inattention and misbehavior. Other essential factors that ensure effective classroom management involves smoothness of transitions, with-it-ness, and wait-time. Diminishing the amount of time to shift between activities and within sections of activities is important in maintaining student attention. The skillful teacher shifts gears with little loss of time. Careful planning keeps the lessons moving and includes plans for the student who completes the lesson early. A good strategist, the effective teacher approaches the lesson with a plan that is supported by a contingency plan for what to do when scheduled activities are cancelled or shortened.

In summarizing the findings of the effective research, several behaviors have been shown to be positively related to student learning. It would appear that marginal teachers would demonstrate inadequate or sub-par performance of one or more of the identified effective teacher behaviors.

Related Research

In reviewing the literature, no studies have been found that direct attention to the behaviors or indicators of deficiencies of marginal teachers. However, essential elements of the appraisal process for

working with such teachers and others have been researched by members of an Iowa State University Research team under the direction of Richard Manatt.

Two of the resulting studies have shown that principals are in need of training in the implementation of Teacher Performance Evaluation (TPE). In a study of 529 administrators, Frudden (1982) found that subjects from eight widely spread geographical locations "demonstrated an inability to utilize the information contained in a lesson plan and to make accurate judgments of the ensuing instructional activities (1982, p. 16). However, the study revealed that more accurate rating of pre-instructional materials was positively related to more accurate rating of teacher performance.

Rauhauser (1983) found that not only are job improvement targets poorly written, but administrators fail to write them to the lowest marked areas of performance on the summative evaluation report. However, teachers' perceptions of the effectieness of the improvement plans were more favorable when teachers were granted equal participation in their development.

That principals' skills in TPE can be improved was an important finding in a study by Faast (1982). Given appropriate interventions in the implementation of the TPE model, 125 evaluators from the Des Moines School District exhibited greater success in data gathering from classroom observation. Also, training increased their proficiency in conducting supervisory conferences and lesson plan analyses. These

research activities, in addition to others, have resulted in a research project of which this study is a part.

Referred to as Computer Asssisted Teacher Evaluation/Supervision (CATE/S), the primary objective of the project is to develop a total package for TPE that includes: (1) a clearly stated evaluation process; (2) a graphic response mode; (3) diagnostic/prescriptive indicators of high gain teaching; (4) research based evidence of effective teaching strategies; and (5) computer generated plans of assistance (Mitchell and Newsum, 1983).

Summary

The review of literature chapter concentrated on the need to improve the performance of teachers and proposed strategies for their improvement. Noticeably absent, however, are any studies that have attempted to determine principals' perceptions which describe marginal teachers' in-class behavior and their out-of-class deficiencies.

The research on effective teachers provided vital evidence that certain teacher behaviors are significantly related to effective and ineffective teachers. Distinction between the two was made on the basis of student gain scores and the use of systematic observation schedules. The results of such studies are essential but the behaviors of teachers who have been rated below standard have not been identified. Further, ineffective behavior in one teaching situation may not be classified as such in another (Medley, 1979).

From a review of the legal cases, it is apparent that classroom management is the area of greatest weakness for teachers rated as incompetent. Other behaviors that are mentioned frequently are poor planning and the failure to use a variety of teaching methods.

Regarding out-of-class factors, Redfern (1983) cited certain deficiencies that are indicative of below district standards of performance. They are: failure to carry out instructions; excessive absenteeism; neglect of routine duties; high incidence of pupil and parent complaints; frequent emotional outbursts; hostility toward supervision; and low pupil achievement.

Before school districts and their teacher evaluators can upgrade the quality of teachers across the United States, research data must be provided to guide them in selecting appropriate interventions to improve the performance of marginal teachers. To fill this apparent void in the literature, this study was designed to contribute to the body of knowledge related to the characteristics of marginal teachers, evaluation policies to improve their performance, and those factors which influence principals' decisions to ignore the problem.

CHAPTER 3--METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The major purposes of this study were to: 1) identify common views held by administrators/supervisors concerning those in-class characteristics and out-of-class indicators of unsatisfactory performance that contribute to the phenomena of marginal teachers; 2) identify those characteristics that make a distinction between those marginal teachers whom administrators believe can be saved as compared to those who cannot be saved; 3) determine the existence of an effective evaluation policy to improve marginal teachers; 4) identify those restraining factors that influence principals decisions to not communicate their concerns to marginal teachers.

More specifically, the following questions were posed to accomplish the primary task of creating a profile of marginal teachers:

1. Among 12 criteria from a research-based teacher evaluation instrument, what are the major performance areas of weakness of marginal teachers?
2. Among 12 criteria from a research-based teacher evaluation instrument, what are the major performance areas of weakness of those marginal teachers whom administrators believe can be improved?
3. Among 12 criteria from a research-based teacher evaluation instrument, what are the major performance areas of weakness

of those marginal teachers whom administrators would dismiss given the opportunity.

4. Of the total number of teachers supervised, what percentage are perceived as marginal?
5. How are the marginal teachers distributed among age groups?
6. Among 14 essential behaviors, which of the 3 describe the greatest percentage of marginal teachers?
7. Among seven indicators of unsatisfactory performance, which of the three describe the greatest percentage of marginal teachers?
8. Does the percentage of marginal teachers differ between building size? among the districts? among building levels?
9. What percentage of the marginal teachers can be saved from dismissal? What percentage have been notified of their sub-par performance?
10. Is there a difference between the two groups categorized as "Dismiss" and "Improve?"
11. Is there a difference in the ratings of marginal teachers among building levels?
12. Is there a relationship between principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of the assistance programs and the existence of multiple evaluators?
13. Is there a relationship between principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of the assistance programs and the percentages of marginal teachers?

14. Is there a relationship between the existence of an assistance program and principals' hesitations to address the problem of marginal teachers?
15. Is there a relationship between principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of their assistance programs and their hesitations to address the problem of marginal teachers?
16. Is there a relationship between principals' hesitations to communicate their concerns to marginal teachers and their building level? building size? percentage of marginal teachers reported?
17. To what extent do principals view five restraining factors as primary reasons for hesitating to communicate their concerns to marginal teachers, i.e., time constraints, empathy for the "good citizen," the hostile employee, staff reaction, and courts and litigation?
18. Is there a relationship among the five restraining factors?
19. Do principals, when grouped by building levels or by building sizes, differ in their response to each of the restraining factors?

Identification of the Research Subjects

To complete this study, two different populations were sampled--one designated as Group A (339 subjects) and the other as Group B (223 subjects). In each instance, the subjects were participants in two

training sessions using protocol materials. The purpose of the workshops was to improve administrators' skills in teacher performance evaluation. Group A was comprised of workshop paticipants from the following areas: the BOCES Intermediate Unit of the southwestern region of the state of New York (172); the Grosse Pointe School District of Grosse Pointe Michigan (30); the Association of Wisconsin School Administrators from the state of Wisconsin (122); and administrators from the Hannibal and Wentzville, Missouri school districts (40). Participants in Group B were sampled from the following groups of administrators: the North Carolina Institute for Principals in the state of North Carolina (85); Association of Secondary School Principals from Oklahoma (51); the Educational Resource Center from the state of Kansas (47); the National Association of Secondary School Principals (18); and from the state of Iowa (22).

In each group, respondents were from locations representing both industrial and agricultural areas and typified rural, suburban, and urban sites. Group A respondents were building administrators, central office personnel, and supervisors. Group B respondents were predominantly building principals (173) and assistant principals (50). Because of the possibility of overlap in reporting the numbers of marginal teachers, data collected from assistant principals were eliminated. In addition, data collected from ten principals who reported no marginal teachers were also eliminated and discussed separately.

The data for Group A were collected by Richard P. Manatt from August 1983 to September, 1983. Group B data were collected by Jim Sweeney from October, 1983 to April, 1984.

Instruments

The study was completed using two instruments for collecting data. The one instrument used for Group A was selected to determine how administrators rate two different teacher populations of marginal teachers, those who can be saved and those whom the administrator would dismiss immediately given the opportunity. Each respondent was required to rate the marginal teachers retrospectively. To collect the data, the West Shore Teacher Performance Evaluation Instrument was selected. This instrument, an example of current technology for teacher performance appraisal, was the end product of a stakeholders' committee for the West Shore School District to replace the evaluation instrument required by the state of Pennsylvania. The process involved outside consultation with Richard P. Manatt, administrative input, and field testing with 100 teacher evaluators. A panel of experts also provided input for the formation of the evaluation instrument. Subsequent to its development, the 100 teacher evaluators participated in five days of training. The result was a reliability rating of ± .5 on a 5-point scale using the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development protocol materials. Items of performance behavior are rated on a 0 to 4 point scale: 0=Not observed, 1=Unsatisfactory, 2=Needs Improvement, 3=Meets District Standards, 4=Exceeds District standards, and an additional category for "not observed but not applicable."

The second instrument was designed by Jim Sweeney and the investigator to determine: the principals' perceptions of the number of marginal teachers within their respective buildings; indicators of marginal teachers' ineffective behaviors; the existence of an effective assistance program; and reasons principals give for hesitating to approach the problem.

Part I of the questionnaire collected data related to the building size, district size, the total number of teachers supervised, the total number of marginal teachers, and their age distribution. To gather data on the in-class behaviors of marginal teachers, included in Part II were 11 of the 12 criteria listed in the West Shore Teacher Performance Evaluation Instrument. Three additional variables extracted from the research on effective teaching were added. Part III presented seven out-of-class indicators of unsatisfactory performance selected from the research by Redfern. In both Parts II and III, respondents reported the number of marginal teachers ineffective on each variable listed under each set of characteristics. In each instance, responses were given retrospectively by the principals.

In Part IV, subjects responded to questions related to the presence of an assistance program, the number of marginal teachers notified, and the number of those who can be saved, given proper interventions. Part V was completed by those reluctant to approach the problem (N=102). To determine the extent to which certain factors influence principals' decisions to not communicate their concerns, five statements were

included. Respondents rated each statement on an eight point scale: 1 and 2=Very Little; 3 and 4=Some; 5 and 6=Considerable; and 7 and 8=Very Much. Respondents were given an opportunity to add reasons not included among the five under a sixth category labeled "Other." Those respondents who answered "no" to the question on the effectiveness of the assistance program were given an opportunity to provide a reason for its ineffectiveness.

The first questionnaire was pilot tested with a group of volunteer workshop paticipants in July, 1983; the second was pilot tested with both a group of research assistants from Iowa State University and volunteer workshop participants in the state of Indiana during the month of September, 1983. Comments and recommendations were reviewed and the questionnaires and their accompanying instructions were revised.

Methods of Statistical Treatment

The processing of the data was completed at the Iowa State University Computation Center using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Data were entered as recorded with the exception of building size and district size. The responses were, also, grouped and coded into the following categories:

Building size	District size
01 99 to 499	01 300 to 2499
02 500 to 999	02 2500 to 9999

03	1000 to 1499	03	10,000 to 24,999
04	1500+	04	25,000+

Later in the analysis process, to avoid empty cells or those with an expected frequency of less than five, categories 03 and 04 were combined with category 02 in building size; category 04 was combined with category 03 for district size. Statistical tests used to analyze both Groups A and B data included descriptive statistics and one-way analyses of variance. In addition, paired t-test was used to analyze the Group A data; chi square, Pearson Correlation, and t-test by groups were used for Group B data.

CHAPTER 4--ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH FINDINGS

Following the description of the two groups of respondents by geographical location, building size, building level, and, where applicable, administrative position, the data will be presented in the order of the questions posed in Chapter 1. Tables containing statistical analyses will also be included. Regarding the analyses for inferential statistics, data were tabled only where a significant difference or relationship was found.

Select Characteristics of Groups A and Group B

Generally speaking, among the Group A respondents (principals rating the worst teachers with the West Shore teacher evaluation instrument), the largest group of administrators were from the upper mid-west (36 percent) and New York state (49 percent). Of the 339 administrators, the majority (57%) were employed as principals and the remaining respondents were either assistant principals (16%) or central office administrators and/or supervisory personnel who were classified as "Other" (27%). The building levels at which the administrators work (or had previously worked, as in the case of central office personnel) included elementary (N=145), junior high (N=66), or secondary (N=116). Table 1 presents the distribution and percent of administrators by state, building level and position.

In completing the instrument, the respondents included the grade level of each of the marginal teachers to be rated. The total of 678

TABLE 1. Group A respondents by state, building level, and position

CATEGORY	NUMBER	PERCENT
STATE		
Michigan	30	9
Missouri	20	6
New York	167	49
Wisconsin	122	36
TOTAL	339	100
BUILDING LEVEL		
Elementary	144	42
Jr. High	66	19
Secondary	115	14
TOTAL	339	100
POSITION		
Principal	194	57
Asst Principal	52	15
Others	93	27
TOTAL	339	100

marginal teachers rated were distributed among 4 broad categories: K-3rd grade (N=153); 4-6th grade (N=134); 7-8th grade (N=136); 9-12th grade (N=232).

Of the 173 respondents in Group B (principals responding to the Sweeney-Mitchell questionnaire), 10 principals indicated that not any of their total number of teachers supervised were considered as marginal

teachers. These repondents were, therefore, not included in the data analyses with the remaining 163.

Respondents from the remaining total (N=163) were from the southeastern portion of the country (33%) and the mid-west--Iowa (12%), Kansas (22%), and Oklahoma (23%). The smallest group were principals who represented at least 14 different states from across the country (9%).

Building size, district size, and building level as presented in Table 2 were the major characteristics selected to describe the 163 respondents. Principals were equally distributed among the three categories of building size: 34 percent worked in smaller districts, 30 percent worked in intermediate districts, and 36 percent worked in large districts. Nearly twice as many worked in small buildings (65%) as compared to 35 percent in large buildings. Sixty percent were elementary principals as compared to 12 percent who were junior high principals. The number and percent of the principals' characteristics that are included in the analyses can be observed in Table 2.

Analysis of Group A Respondents

Question: Among the 12 criteria from the West Shore evaluation instrument, what are the major areas of weakness of all marginal teachers?

Based upon administrators' perceptions, Table 3 reflects the mean ratings of their worst teachers including two categories, "Dismiss" and "Improve". The possible ranges of the ratings were from "0," for

TABLE 2. Group B respondents by state, district and building size, and building level

CATEGORY	NUMBER	PERCENT
STATE		
Iowa	20	12
Kansas	38	23
National	15	9
North Carolina	53	33
Oklahoma	37	23
TOTAL	163	100
DISTRICT SIZE		
300-2499	54	34
2500-9999	47	30
10000+	57	36
Unknown	5	
TOTAL	163	100
BUILDING SIZE		
99-499	106	65
500-1499	56	35
Unknown	1	
TOTAL	163	100
BUILDING LEVEL		
Elementary	97	60
Jr. High	19	12
Secondary	46	28
Unknown	1	
TOTAL	163	100

TABLE 3. Performance ratings of marginal teachers on West Shore criteria

CRITERION	MEAN	S.D.	NUMBER
Classroom Management	1.65	.72	676
Questioning	1.70	.77	678
Praise	1.77	.96	676
Expectation	1.81	.83	671
Student Reaction	1.83	.76	677
Modeling	1.85	.80	676
Comprehension	1.86	.75	677
Structuring	1.91	.74	675
Guided Practice	1.91	.72	676
Written Plans	1.94	.80	676
Direct Instruction	2.08	.60	676
Knowledge	2.39	.83	678

Possible ratings: 0=Not observed; 1=Does not meet; 2=Needs improvement; 3=Meets district standards; 4=Exceeds district standards.

behavior that should have been exhibited but wasn't, to "4" for behavior which exceeded district standards. Marginal teachers (N=678) were seen as lacking classroom management skills (1.65), employing questions that have little or no value to the lesson (1.70), using praise inappropriately (1.77), and showing no evidence of setting realistic expectations for student learning (1.81).

On each criterion the mean ratings for the marginal teachers were less than 2.0 (needs improvement) with the exception of the criteria related to direct instruction (2.08) and knowledge (2.39). Implications are that marginal teachers direct classroom activities but are

ineffective. Further, they appear to lack the confidence necessary to successfully handle the lesson.

> Question: Among the 12 criteria from the West Shore evaluation instrument, what are the major areas of weakness of those marginal teachers whom administrators believe can be improved?

Among marginal teachers whom administrators believe can be improved, only one criterion (classroom management, 1.99) received a mean rating less than 2.0 (needs improvement). Reviewing Table 4 indicates that such teachers were described not only as lacking skills in using effective classroom management methods that promote time-on-task (1.95), but this category of teachers was described as needing improvement in the following areas: employing questioning techniques that ensure success (2.06) and checking for comprehension of content being taught before moving on (2.23). The highest mean ratings for this group were related to directing instruction (2.33) and exhibiting mastery of the subject matter taught (2.74).

> Question: Among the 12 criteria from the West Shore evaluation instrument, what are the major areas of weakness of those marginal teachers whom administrators would dismiss given the opportunity?

The "Dismiss" category of marginal teachers received mean ratings less than 2.0 on all of the criteria with the exception of the knowledge criteria. Thus, on 11 of 12 criteria, marginal teachers were rated as not meeting district standards. The ratings, as shown in Table 5, indicated that the "Dismiss" group, similar to the "Improve" category, also lacked classroom management skills (1.31) but were rated lowest on

TABLE 4. Performance ratings of marginal teachers (using West Shore criteria) identified as "possible to improve"

CRITERION	MEAN	S.D.	NUMBER
Classroom Management	1.99	.93	338
Questioning	2.06	.76	338
Comprehension	2.23	.74	339
Student Reaction	2.23	.81	339
Guided Practice	2.24	.85	339
Written Plans	2.24	.91	339
Modeling	2.27	.71	339
Praise	2.29	.90	338
Expectation	2.20	1.04	336
Structuring	2.30	.72	337
Direct Instruction	2.33	.79	338
Knowledge	2.74	.64	339

Possible ratings: 0=Not observed; 1=Does not meet; 2=Needs improvement; 3=Meets district standards; 4=Exceeds district standards.

the praise variable (1.26). Although the scores for each of the 12 criteria were lower than the "Improve" group, the "Dismiss" group were also rated highest in directing instruction (1.82) and exhibiting adequate knowledge of the subject matter taught (2.03).

Question: Is there a difference between the two groups categorized as "Dismiss" and "Improve?"

To determine if there is a significant difference between the "Dismiss" and the "Improve" categories, ratings on each criterion were tested using a paired t-test. The results, as shown in Table 6, indicate that there was a significant difference between the two groups on each of the 12 criteria. The table indicates that for each

TABLE 5. Performance ratings of marginal teachers (using West Shore criteria) identified for dismissal

CRITERION	MEAN	S.D.	NUMBER
Praise	1.26	.81	338
Classroom Management	1.31	.53	339
Questioning	1.34	.71	339
Expectation	1.40	.72	339
Student Reaction	1.42	.57	339
Modeling	1.43	.66	339
Comprehension	1.49	.67	339
Structuring	1.52	.66	337
Guided Practice	1.57	.64	339
Written Plans	1.63	.76	339
Direct Instruction	1.82	.50	339
Knowledge	2.03	.84	339

Possible ratings: 0=Not observed; 1=Does not meet; 2=Needs improvement; 3=Meets district standards; 4=Exceeds district standards.

criterion, the two groups differed below the .001 level of significance. The greatest difference between the two groups was with teachers using praise appropriately (1.03). Those who should be dismissed were rated as far less competent in using praise than were those in the "Improve" category. The least difference was found in the direct instruction variable (.51). Thus, administrators rated the two categories very much alike in directing instruction.

Question: Is there a difference in the ratings of marginal teachers among building levels?

A single classification analysis of variance procedure was used to determine if the respondents within the "Improve" and "Dismiss"

TABLE 6. Comparison of the ratings of the "Dismiss" and "Improve" categories of marginal teachers by West Shore criteria

CATEGORY	CRITERION	NUMBER	MEAN	S.D.	T-VALUE	2-TAILED
Dismiss	Praise	338	1.26	.81	-16.28	.000***
Improve			2.29	.90		
Dismiss	Management	338	1.31	.53	-11.84	.000***
Improve			1.99	.93		
Dismiss	Direct Instruction	338	1.82	.50	-9.98	.000***
Improve			2.33	.79		
Dismiss	Modeling	339	1.43	.66	-18.35	.000***
Improve			2.27	.71		
Dismiss	Questioning	339	1.33	.71	-13.87	.000***
Improve			2.06	.76		
Dismiss	Comprehension	339	1.49	.67	-15.09	.000***
Improve			2.23	.74		
Dismiss	Knowledge	339	2.03	.84	-13.76	.000***
Improve			2.74	.64		
Dismiss	Structuring	337	1.52	.66	-15.44	.000***
Improve			2.30	.72		
Dismiss	Expectation	336	1.40	.72	-13.46	.000***
Improve			2.30	1.04		
Dismiss	Written Plan	339	1.63	.76	-10.15	.000***
Improve			2.24	.91		
Dismiss	Guided Prac	339	1.57	.64	-12.41	.000***
Improve			2.24	.85		
Dismiss	Student Reac	339	1.42	.57	-15.78	.000***
Improve			2.23	.81		

Possible ratings: 0=Not observed; 1=Does not meet; 2=Needs improvement; 3=Meets district standards; 4=Exceeds district standards.

***Significance level $p < .001$.

categories from the three building levels rated marginal teachers differently. Table 7 indicates a significant difference among building levels on ratings of marginal teachers on exhibiting mastery of the subject matter taught and effective planning to develop the lesson.

TABLE 7. Analysis of variance of principals' ratings of marginal teachers by building levels

CATEGORIES	DF	MEAN SQUARES	F-VALUE
IMPROVE CATEGORY			
KNOWLEDGE			
Building Levels	2	3.72	10.24***
Residuals	323	.30	
DISMISS CATEGORY			
PLANNING			
Building Levels	2	2.50	4.59*
Residuals	323	.54	

Possible ratings: 0=Not observed; 1=Does not meet; 2=Needs improvement; 3=Meets district standards; 4=Exceeds district standards.

*Significance=.05.
***Significance=.001.

The Scheffé Multiple Range Test (Table 8) revealed that among the "Dismiss" category, both senior high and junior high administrators rated their teachers significantly lower (1.53) in providing written plans than did elementary administrators (1.77). Among the "Improve"

TABLE 8. Principals' ratings of marginal teachers by building levels on planning and knowledge criteria

CATEGORIES	MEAN	S.D.	NUMBER
DISMISS			
PLANNING			
Elementary	1.77	.71	143
Jr. High	1.52	.85	66
Secondary	1.52	.70	116
IMPROVE			
KNOWLEDGE			
Elementary	2.59	.62	145
Jr. High	2.80	.59	66
Secondary	2.93	.59	114

Possible ratings: 0=Not observed; 1=Does not meet; 2=Needs improvement; 3=Meets district standards; 4=Exceeds district standards.

category, elementary administrators also rated this group as less knowledgeable (2.59) about the subject matter taught than did senior high administrators (2.93).

Analysis of the Group B Respondents

Question: Of the total number of teachers supervised, what percentage are perceived as marginal?

Respondents in Group B (N=163) responding to the Sweeney-Mitchell questionnaire reported a total number of 4771 teachers under their direct supervision. The average number of staff supervised by the

respondents was 21. The least number of teachers supervised was 4 and the largest was 108. At least 40 percent of the principals supervised more than 29 teachers.

The respondents (N=163) indicated that, of the total number of teachers supervised, 450 were classified as marginal teachers which represents nine percent of the total number of teachers supervised.

The percentages of marginal teachers within the building of each principal were computed revealing a mean percent of 11. Thus, on the average, 11 percent of the principal's staff were perceived as marginal teachers. The principal with the smallest percentage of marginal teachers reported only one percent of his/her total staff could be categorized as marginal. The principal with the largest percentage reported that 50 percent of the staff performed below district standards. At least half of the principals (N=81) reported that less than nine percent of the total staff supervised was marginal.

Question: How are the marginal teachers distributed among age groups?

A frequency distribution by age revealed that marginal teachers (N=264) tend to be evenly distributed among three of the five age categories: ages 20-24; 25-34; 35-44; 45-54; 55+. Twenty-four percent were in the 25-34 age group; 29 percent were in the 35-44 age group; and 26 percent were in the 45-55 age group. The age group containing the least number of marginal teachers was the 20-24 group (8%). Fifty-nine percent of the marginal teachers were younger than 45. In the absence of information concerning age distribution among teachers supervised, no further statistical analysis involving age was conducted.

Question: Among the 14 essential behaviors, which of the three describe the greatest percentage of marginal teachers?

An inspection of Table 9 reveals that principals reported 306 of the total number of marginal teachers within the building as teachers who fail to effectively motivate students (68%). At least 63 percent do not appropriately teach to an objective, and 58 percent do not convey appropriate expectations for student learning. Assessing student progress and exhibiting mastery of subject matter taught are those areas reflecting the least number of marginal teachers, 161 and 153 respectively.

Further study of the data presented in Table 10 reveals that, in describing their marginal teachers, nearly half of the principals reported that all of the marginal teachers in their buildings were unable to effectively motivate students in that area, as compared to 17 percent of the principals who reported that not any of their marginal teachers fit this description.

Thirty-five percent of all the principals reported that all of their marginal teachers failed to effectively teach to an objective while 21 percent of the principals reported that not any had a problem with this in-class behavior. Nearly three-fourths of the principals reported that 50 percent or more of the marginal teachers were weak in this area. Failure to convey appropriate expectations was identified by at least one-third of the principals as a problem for all of their marginal teachers. In the case of 31 principals, not any of the marginal teachers were described as deficient in this area. Close to

TABLE 9. Percent of marginal teachers described as ineffective on each of 14 in-class behaviors (N=450)

IN CLASS BEHAVIOR	PERCENT	NUMBER
The teacher failed to effectively:		
Motivate students	68.00	306
Teach to an objective	62.67	282
Convey appropriate expectations	58.00	259
Use a variety of teaching methods	55.56	250
Check for student comprehension	54.89	247
Present information clearly	53.33	240
Use structuring comments	53.33	240
Use modeling	52.22	235
Maintain an environment free of behavior problems	52.14	230
Employ questioning techniques	47.78	215
Plan and prepare daily lesson/units	47.33	213
Use praise	46.22	208
Assess student progress	35.78	161
Exhibit mastery of subject matter	34.00	153

TABLE 10. Distribution of principals among categories of percentages of marginal teachers described as ineffective on 14 essential in-class behaviors (N=163)

IN CLASS BEHAVIOR	NONE	1-49%	50%	51-99%	ALL
The teacher failed to effectively:					
Motivate students	27	17	17	26	76
Teach to an objective	34	12	28	33	57
Convey appropriate expectations	31	25	28	24	55
Maintain environment free of behavioral problems	36	27	22	24	54
Use structuring comments	41	24	25	19	54
Use a variety of teaching methods	50	13	22	26	52
Present information clearly	42	28	23	17	53
Check for student comprehension	48	23	15	30	46
Use modeling	54	17	18	25	49
Plan and prepares daily lessons/units	57	15	26	21	44
Employ questioning techniques	61	15	16	25	46
Use praise	55	25	24	22	37
Assess student progress	81	16	14	24	28
Exhibit mastery of subject matter	76	28	18	11	30

one-half of the principals reported that conveying appropriate expectations was a problem for more than 50 percent of their marginal teachers.

Fewer principals described all of their marginal teachers as failing to demonstrate mastery of the subject matter taught. In fact, close to 50 percent of the principals reported that not any of their marginal teachers were weak in this area. In considering the marginal teachers' abilities to effectively assess student progress, 17 percent of the principals reported this area as a problem for all of the marginal teachers, and 50 percent reported none had this shortcoming.

Question: Among the seven indicators of unsatisfactory performance, which of the three describe the greatest percentage of marginal teachers?

In describing the out-of class indicators of unsatisfactory performance of teachers, Table 11 indicates that according to the principals surveyed, 59 percent of their marginal teachers were characterized by low-pupil achievement (259) and 52 percent by a high incidence of complaints from parents and students (234). Failure to carry out instructions and/or directions was a characteristic describing 34 percent of the marginal teachers (154).

In contrast to the three previously mentioned indicators, principals reported that less than 10 percent of the marginal teachers could be identified by excessive absenteeism. Examination of Table 12 reveals that more than one-third of the principals reported that all of their marginal teachers could be identified by the low achievement or

TABLE 11. Percent of marginal teachers described by out-of-class indicators of unsatisfactory performance

OUT-OF CLASS INDICATOR	PERCENT	NUMBER
Low pupil achievement	59.11	266
Complaints from parents and students	52.00	234
Failure to carry out instructions/directions	34.22	154
Hostile toward supervision	30.00	135
Neglects routine duties	29.33	132
Frequent emotional outburst	24.67	111
Excessively absent	9.56	43

their students; however, less than one-fifth of the principals reported that not any of their marginal teachers could be characterized by low student achievement as reported by 32 principals.

All of the marginal teachers, as reported by 36 percent of the principals, were characterized by a high incidence of complaints from parents and students. Eighteen percent of the principals reported none for this indicator. Of the total number of principals, only ten reported that all of their marginal teachers failed to carry out instructions and/or directions. In contrast, 71 principals did not identify any marginal teachers as deficient in this area. Excessive

TABLE 12. Distribution of principals among categories of percentages of marginal teachers described by indicators of unsatisfactory performance

OUT-OF-CLASS INDICATOR	NONE	1-49%	50%	51-99%	ALL
Low pupil achievement	32	24	28	22	57
Complaints of parents and students	30	32	28	18	55
Failure to carry out instructions/directions	71	29	20	12	10
Hostile toward supervision	82	30	17	9	25
Neglects routine duties	87	23	19	12	22
Frequent emotional outburst	80	37	18	12	16
Excessively absent	128	18	6	2	7

absenteeism was characteristic of all the marginal teachers of only five percent of the principals. Seventy-nine percent reported none of their marginal teachers were ineffective in this area.

When asked to indicate the three top problem areas for the marginal teachers, principals most frequently cited as in-class behaviors the failure to effectively: (1) teach to an objective, (2) maintain an environment that is free of behavioral problems, and (3) motivate students. Teaching to an objective and motivating students were also the areas of weakness reported as describing the largest percentage of marginal teachers. However, the marginal teacher's failure to maintain

an environment that is free of behavioral problems was cited as one of the three top problems areas rather than the marginal teacher's inability to convey appropriate expectations for student learning.

Most frequently cited as out-of-class indicators of unsatisfactory performance that describe marginal teachers were: (1) complaints from parents and students, (2) low pupil achievement, and (3) failure to follow directions and instructions. These three indicators were also reported as those areas containing the largest percentage of marginal teachers.

> Question: Does the percentage of marginal teachers differ between small and large buildings? among the districts? among building levels?

To determine if there was a significant relationship between building sizes and the percentages of marginal teachers in each building, a Pearson Correlation was used. The results as shown in Table 13 indicate that a low negative relationship exists between the actual numbers of students enrolled (building size) as reported by principals and the percentages of marginal teachers in the building ($r = -.30$, $p < .001$). Thus, principals in smaller buildings reported a larger percentage of marginal teachers.

The Pearson Correlation, however, did not reveal a significant relationship between the actual reported numbers of students enrolled in the district and the percentages of marginal teachers within a building.

The chi-square test was the procedure used to determine if the distribution of the percentages of marginal teachers were related to

TABLE 13. Correlation between percentage of marginal teachers and building/district size

CATEGORY	PERCENT OF MARGINAL TEACHERS
BUILDING SIZE	-.30**
DISTRICT SIZE	-.16

**Significant at the .000 level ($p < .001$).

district size. To perform this test, districts were grouped into the three following categories: 300-2499, 2500-9999, and 10,000+. Percentages of marginal teachers were grouped into four categories: 1-5%; 6-9%; 10-13%; and 14-50%.

An examination of Table 14 reveals that the percentages of marginal teachers were associated with the size of the district, significant at the .001 level. More than 50 percent of the principals in large districts reported that less than nine percent of the staff were marginal teachers. Nineteen percent of the principals (19%) from large districts reported that 14 to 50 percent of their staff were marginal teachers as compared to 39 percent from small districts (21) who reported 14 to 50 percent of the staff were considered marginal.

Table 15 indicates that building size was significantly related to the distribution of the percentages of marginal teachers. Thirty-one principals (29%) from small buildings reported 14 to 50 percent of the

TABLE 14. Distribution of percentage of marginal teachers among district sizes

PERCENT OF MARGINAL TEACHER	SMALL DISTRICT (300-2499)	INTERMEDIATE DISTRICT (2500-9999)	LARGE DISTRICT (10000+)	TOTAL
1-5%	10 (18.5%)	5 (10.6%)	16 (28.1%)	31
6-9%	14 (25.9%)	14 (29.8%)	21 (28.1%)	49
10-13%	9 (16.7%)	22 (46.8%)	9 (15.8%)	40
14-50%	21 (38.9%)	6 (12.8%)	11 (19.3%)	38
TOTAL	54 (34.2)	47 (29.7)	57 (36.1)	158 (100)

Chi-Square=25.32 D.F.=6 Significance = .0003; p <.001

staff as marginal. In comparison, 12 percent of the principals from large buildings (7) reported 14 to 50 percent of their staff as marginal. In addition, 43 percent of the principals in large buildings reported 6-9 percent of their staff were marginal while 26 percent of the principals in small buildings reported the same percentages.

The chi-square test found no significant relationship among the categories of percentages of marginal teachers when considering building levels. Thus, the principal's building level, i.e., elementary, junior high, and senior high did not appear to be associated with the number of marginal teachers within his/her building (see Appendix B).

TABLE 15. Distribution of percentages of marginal teachers by building size

PERCENT OF MARGINAL TEACHER	SMALL BUILDING	LARGE BUILDING	TOTAL
1-5%	19 (17.9%)	13 (23.2%)	32 (19.8%)
6-9%	28 (26.4%)	24 (42.9%)	52 (32.1%)
10-13%	28 (26.4%)	12 (21.4%)	40 (24.7%)
14-50%	31 (29.2%)	7 (12.5%)	38 (12.5%)
TOTAL	106 (65.4)	56 (34.6)	162 (100)

Chi-Square=8.35 Significance=.039; $p<.05$

Question: What percent of the marginal teachers identified are seen as having the potential for improving? have been notified of the principals' concerns?

When principals were asked how many of their marginal teachers can be saved from dismissal, they reported that 83 percent can be improved. Thus, it would appear that principals believe that most of their marginal teachers might benefit from special services and/or assistance. Principals also indicated that most of their marginal teachers have been notified as to the principals' concerns.

Question: Is there a relationship between principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of the assistance programs and the existence of multiple evaluators?

Of the 163 principals, 51 percent reported that their school districts provide a formal assistance program for supervising marginal teachers (N=83). From that group, 29 reported that the assistance programs, in addition to requiring job improvement targets, make use of multiple evaluators (35%). The remaining 65 percent did not have the benefit of multiple evaluators. As to the effectiveness of the programs, a greater percent of the respondents reported that the programs were an effective one (71%). To determine if the use of multiple evaluators influences the principals' perceptions of the programs' effectiveness, a chi-square test was performed with a significance level of .05. Table 16 reveals that the existence of multiple evaluators tends to influence the perceptions' of principals. Ninety-two percent who perceive the program as effective also reported that the program required multiple evaluators. Thus, those principals from districts with multiple evaluators as a part of their formal assistance programs were more likely to view the programs as effective.

> Question: Is there a relationship between principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of the assistance programs and the percentages of marginal teachers.

A chi-square test was used to determine if the percentages of marginal teachers under the supervision of the principals were associated with his/her perceptions of the effectiveness of the formal assistance program. The analysis of the data found no significant relationship between the two (see Appendix B).

> Question: Is there a relationship between the existence of an assistance program and principals' reluctances to address the problem of marginal teachers?

TABLE 16. Perceptions of the effectiveness of a formal assistance program and the existence of multiple evaluators

	MULTIPLE EVALUATORS		
EFFECTIVENESS	NO	YES	TOTAL
NO	21 41.2%	2 7.4%	23 29.5%
YES	30 58.8%	25 92.6%	55 70.5%
TOTAL	51 65.4%	27 34.5%	78 100%

Chi-Square= 8.126 D.F.=1 $p < .004$

To determine if the existence of formal assistance programs influenced principals' hesitations to address the problem of marginal teachers, a chi-square was used. The significance level set at .05. However, no significant relationship was found whether principals reported that a formal assistance program existed or not. In both instances, more than 65 percent reported that they were reluctant to address the problem (see Appendix B).

> Question: Is there a relationship between principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of their assistance programs and their hesitations to address the problem of marginal teachers?

Examination of Table 17 presents the results of the chi-square test used to ascertain the relationship between the principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of their assistance programs and their hesitations to address the problem of marginal teachers. Principals who reported they were not reluctant to communicate their concerns were more likely to view their programs as effective. Ninety-two percent of those who were not reluctant reported that their programs were effective. In addition, only eight percent of those who viewed their programs as ineffective were still willing to communicate their concerns to the marginal teachers.

TABLE 17. Perceptions of the effectiveness of a formal assistance program and principals' reluctance to communicate concerns

	RELUCTANCE		
EFFECTIVENESS	NO	YES	TOTAL
NO	2 8.3%	20 38.5%	22 28.9%
YES	22 91.6%	32 61.5%	54 71.1%
TOTAL	24 31.6%	52 68.4%	76 100%

Chi-Square= 5.856 D.F. =1 p = .015

Among those who were reluctant to confront marginal teachers, perceptions of program effectiveness were associated with the existence of multiple evaluators. As may be seen in Table 18, 87 percent reported that the programs were effective and required multiple evaluators.

TABLE 18. Relationship between perceptions of program effectiveness and the existence of multiple evaluators for principal's who are reluctant to confront marginal teachers

	MULTIPLE EVALUATORS		
EFFECTIVENESS	NO	YES	TOTAL
NO	18 48.6%	2 13.3%	20 38.5%
YES	19 51.4%	13 86.7%	32 61.5%
TOTAL	37 71.2%	15 28.8%	52 100.0%
Chi-Square = 4.230	D.F. = 1	p < .0397	

Despite their hesitations, it appears that principals still tend to perceive their programs of assistance as effective. Conversely, principals' positive perceptions of program effectiveness did not appear to guarantee that principals were any less reluctant to communicate their concerns to marginal teachers.

Within the group of those who were not reluctant, the perceptions of program effectiveness were not associated with the existence of multiple evaluators. Seventy-nine percent of those who did not have multiple evaluators in their district also reported that their programs were effective (see Appendix B). Likewise, all of the principals who reported their programs were effective also reported that their districts used multiple evaluators.

Program effectiveness appears to be related to both the presence of multiple evaluators and principals' hesitations to communicate their concerns to the marginal teachers. However, the data suggest that having only single evaluators in the district among those willing to confront marginal teachers did not guarantee negative perceptions of the effectiveness of the formal assistance.

> Question: Is there a relationship between principals' hesitations to communicate their concerns to marginal teachers and their building level? building size? percentages of marginal teachers reported?

More than 65 percent of the principals (107) reported that they were hesitant to communicate their concerns to the marginal teacher. The chi-square test was used to determine if there was a relationship between principals reluctance to communicate their concerns to marginal teachers and their building levels. Eighty-two percent of the senior high principals were reluctant to communciate their concerns to the marginal teacher; among the junior high principals, 56 percent were reluctant and 44 percent were not. These findings as presented in Table 19 provide evidence that senior high principals are more likely to be reluctant to communicate their concerns.

TABLE 19. Reluctance of principals to communicate their concerns to marginal teachers by building levels

	ELEMENTARY	JR. HIGH	SECONDARY	TOTAL
NO	34 (36.2%)	8 (44.4%)	8 (17.8%)	50 31.8%
YES	60 (63.8%)	10 (55.6%)	37 (82.2%)	68.2%
TOTAL	94 59.9%	18 (11.5%)	45 (28.7%)	157 100%

When the chi-square test was used to determine if the principals hesitation was independent of the percentage of marginal teachers in the building, the findings indicated that their hesitations were not influenced by the percentage of marginal teachers within the three building levels. The findings also indicated that their hesitations were not influenced by building size. The data for these results are included in Appendix B.

> Question: To what extent do principals view five restraining factors as primary reasons for hesitating to communicate their concerns to marginal teachers, i.e., time constraints, empathy for the "good citizen," the hostile employee, staff reaction, and courts and litigation?

In rating the extent to which each of five restraining factors influenced their hesitations to communicate their concerns, the principals were most reluctant when the teacher was seen as "a good

person" who works hard in the community and makes quite a contribution to the overall program of the school (4.2). Staff reaction was a factor which caused the least degree of reluctance (2.4). These results are shown in Table 20.

TABLE 20. Ratings factors restraining the principal's dismissal of marginal teachers

FACTORS	MEAN	S.D.	NUMBER
Good Citizen	4.24	1.90	102
Time Constraints	3.99	2.04	102
Difficult Person	3.44	1.96	99
Courts and Litigation	3.20	2.06	101
Staff Reaction	2.44	1.60	102

Question: Is there a relationship among the five restaining factors?

Table 21 presents a correlation matrix of each of the five restraining factors. The Pearson Correlation produced evidence that involvement with the negative aspects of courts and litigation as a restraining factor has a significant relationship with limited time to observe, document, and handle the paperwork and with having to communicate with the marginal teacher who is seen as a "difficult" person. Examination of Table 21 further reveals that the principals'

concerns for staff reactions were significantly related to his/her reluctance to confront the problem when the marginal teacher was considered to be a difficult person.

TABLE 21. Correlation matrix of principals' ratings of restraining factors

	TIME	GOOD PERSON	DIFFICULT PERSON	STAFF REACTION	COURT LITIGATION
Time	1.00				
Good Citizen	.09	1.00			
Difficult	.18	.03	1.00		
Staff	.07	.10	.24**	1.00	
Courts	.20*	.09	.27**	.23**	1.00

*Significance level $p < .05$.
**Significance level $p < .01$.

Question: Do principals when grouped by building level, or by building size differ in their response to each of the restraining factors?

An analysis of variance was used to determine if principals, when grouped by building levels, differed significantly in their responses to each of the five restraining factors. Only one significant difference was found. As Table 22 indicates, there was a significant difference ($p < .01$) among principals by building levels in responding to the factor related to the marginal teacher who is seen as a "good guy." The

Scheffé Multiple Range Test revealed that junior high and elementary principals appear to be influenced less by this factor than do senior high principals.

TABLE 22. Analysis of variance of "Good Citizen" factor among building levels

VARIATIONS	D.F.	MEAN SQUARES	F-VALUE
Building Level	2	16.41	4.87**
	99	3.37	

Scheffé .05

3.33 Jr. High
3.91 Elementary
4.97 Secondary

**Significance level $p < .01$.

CHAPTER 5--SUMMARY, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The basic problem for this study was to create a profile of marginal teachers based upon the principals' and administrators' perceptions of the marginal teachers' weaknesses both in and out of the classroom. In addition, other major goals were to identify those differences between the "Improve" and Dismiss" category; determine principals' perceptions of the evaluation policy provided to improve marginal teachers; and to determine the extent to which certain restraining factors influence their decisions to communicate their concerns to the marginal teachers. To complete this task, two questionnaires were administered to a total of 661 principals, assistant principals, central office administrators, and supervisory personnel from the eastern, south eastern, and midwestern section of the country. The questionnaires, tests, and analysis resulted in findings related to the four major goals of the study.

Findings

Description of marginal teachers

Question: What are the major performance areas of weakness of all marginal teachers?

Administrators rated marginal teachers (as a total group) below district standards on the 12 criteria. The lowest ratings were in

employing effective classroom management skills; demonstrating effective questioning techniques; using praise appropriately; and showing evidence of setting realistic expectations.

Question: What are the major areas of weakness of those marginal teachers whom administrators believe can be improved?

Marginal teachers--whom administrators believed can be improved--were rated below district standards on the 12 criteria. The lowest ratings were in demonstrating classroom management skills; employing effective questioning techniques; checking for student comprehension of content being taught before moving on.

Question: What are the major performance areas of weakness of those marginal teachers whom administrators would dismiss given the opportunity?

Marginal teachers--whom administrators would like to dismiss immediately--were rated below district standards on the 12 criteria used to represent effective teaching. The lowest ratings were in using praise appropriately; demonstrating classroom management skills; employing effective questioning strategies; and showing evidence of setting realistic expectations for student learning.

Question: Of the total number of teachers supervised, what percentage are perceived as marginal?

On the average, principals reported 11 percent of the staff supervised was classified as marginal.

Question: How are the marginal teachers distributed among age groups?

Principals reported that the largest percentage of the marginal teachers were between the ages of 45-54.

Question: Among the 14 essential behaviors, which of the 3 describe the greatest percentage of marginal teachers?

Within each principal's building, the greatest percentages of marginal teachers were described as failing to effectively: motivate students, appropriately teach to an objective, and convey appropriate expectations for student learning.

Question: Among the seven indicators of unsatisfactory performance, which of the three describe the greatest percentage of marginal teachers?

Within each principal's building, the greatest percentage of marginal teachers were characterized by low-pupil achievement, high incidence of complaints from parents and students, and failure to carry out instructions/directions.

Question: Does the percentage of marginal teachers differ between small and large buildings? among the districts? among building levels?

Principals in smaller buildings reported a larger percent of marginal teachers. The actual reported numbers of students enrolled within the district (district size) was not associated with the percentages of marginal teachers within a building (Table 13). However, when district size was categorized into three groups, i.e., small, intermediate, and large, and the percentages of marginal teachers were grouped into four categories, principals in the larger school districts reported fewer percentages of marginal teachers within their buildings than did principals from smaller districts. When building size was categorized as small and large, principals in small buildings reported a larger percentage of marginal teachers within each building than did principals in large buildings. The principal's building level--

elementary, junior high, or secondary schools--was not associated with the reported percentage of marginal teachers.

> Question: What percent of the marginal teachers can be saved from dismissal? have been notified of their sub-par performance?

Principals reported that 83 percent of their marginal teachers have been notified about their concerns.

Differences between Improve and Dismiss categories

> Question: Is there a difference between the two groups categorized as "Dismiss" and "Improve?"

On each of the 12 criteria, principals rated the teachers from the "Dismiss" category significantly lower than they rated marginal teachers within the "Improve category. The largest difference occurred on the praise criteria.

> Question: Is there a difference in the ratings of marginal teachers among building levels?

Secondary administrators rated marginal teachers as less capable of planning to develop the lesson in detail than did elementary administrators; both junior high and elementary administrators rated the marginal teacher as less competent in demonstrating knowledge of the subject matter than did secondary administrators.

Perceptions of evaluation policies

> Question: Is there a relationship between principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of the assistance programs and the existence of multiple evaluators?

Principals who reported that their programs were effective were also more likely to report that multiple evaluators were a part of their formal assistance programs.

> Question: Is there a relationship between principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of the assistance programs and the percentages of marginal teachers?

The percentages of marginal teachers within a building did not appear to be associated with the principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of existing formal assistance programs provided by the district for improving the performance of the marginal teachers.

> Question: Is there a relationship between the existence of an assistance program and principals' hesitations to address the problem of marginal teachers?

The existence of a formal assistance program to improve the performance of the marginal teacher was not associated with the principal's hesitation to address the problem of the marginal teachers.

> Question: Is there a relationship between principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of their assistance programs and their hesitations to address the problem of marginal teachers?

Principals who reported that they were not reluctant to communicate their concerns to the marginal teacher were more likely to report that their programs were effective; however, a significant proportion of principals who had an effective program and multiple evaluators still reported a reluctance to communicate their concerns to the marginal teacher.

> Question: Is there a relationship between principals' hesitations to communicate their concerns to marginal teachers and their building level? building size? percentages of marginal teachers reported?

Both elementary and junior high principals reported that they were less hesitant than senior high principals to communicate their concerns to marginal teachers. The principals' hesitations to communicate their concerns to the marginal teacher were not influenced by the size of their buildings, nor did their hesitations appear to be influenced by the reported percentages of marginal teachers in the buildings.

Restraining factors

> Question: To what extent do principals view five restraining factors as primary reasons for hesitating to communicate their concerns to marginal teachers, i.e., time constraints, empathy for the "good citizen," the hostile employee, staff reaction, and courts and litigations?

Principals' ratings of the five restraining factors indicated that the factor which had the strongest impact upon their hesitations to communicate their concerns to marginal teachers was related to having to work with the teacher seen as a "good citizen" who works hard in the community and makes quite a contribution to the overall program of the school.

> Question: Is there a relationship among the five restraining factors?

Principals' ratings of the negative aspects of courts and litigations as restraining factors were significantly related to limited time to observe, document, and handle the paper work and with having to communicate with the marginal teacher who is seen as a "difficult" person.

> Question: Do principals when grouped by building level, or by building size differ in their responses to each of the restraining factors?

Senior high school principals rated the restraining factors related to having to criticize the "good citizen" higher than elementary and junior high principals.

Conclusions

As a result of the findings, listed below are those conclusions reached concerning principals' perceptions of marginal teachers, effectiveness of formal assistance programs, and restraining factors related to principals' hesitations to communicate their concerns to the marginal teacher.

Description of marginal teachers

1. Marginal teachers are characterized by a lack of classroom management skills; questioning techniques that have little or no value to the lesson; inappropriate criticism/praise; and the absence of any evidence of appropriate expectations for student learning.
2. Marginal teachers whom principals believe can be improved are characterized by a lack of classroom management skills; questions that only extract specific information; using guided or independent practice with unclear purpose; and skeletal lesson plans.
3. Marginal teachers whom principals would like to dismiss immediately are characterized by inappropriate criticism and/or little praise of students; a lack of classroom

management skills; questions that have little or no value to the lesson; and no evidence of student expectations for student learning.

4. The average proportion of marginal teachers within a building is 11%.
5. Within a principal's building, the greatest percentage of marginal teachers fail to effectively: motivate students, appropriately teach to an objective, and convey appropriate expectations to students.
6. Within each building, the greatest percentage of marginal teachers are characterized by low pupil achievement, high incidence of complaints from parents and students, and failure to carry out instructions/directions.
7. The percentage of marginal teachers in smaller buildings is significantly greater than the percentage of marginal teachers in larger buildings.
8. The percentage of marginal teachers is greater in districts categorized as small as compared to those categorized as intermediate and large.
9. The presence of marginal teachers is not related to the building level, i.e., elementary, junior high, and secondary.
10. Principals and other teacher evaluators believe the majority of marginal teachers can be saved from dismissal (83%).

11. The majority of the marginal teachers (81%) have been notified as to the concerns of the principals.

Differences between Improve and Dismiss categories

1. Marginal teachers whom principals would like to dismiss are perceived as less capable on all 12 criteria than marginal teachers whom principals believe can be improved.

Perceptions of evaluation policies

1. The percentage of marginal teachers within a building does not influence the principal's perception of the effectiveness of the existing formal assistance program.
2. The existence of a formal assistance program requiring written job improvement targets for marginal teachers is not related to the percentage of marginal teachers reported within a building.
3. Where formal assistance programs are perceived as effective, principals are perceived as less likely to be reluctant to communicate their concerns to the marginal teacher about his/her substandard performance.
4. Programs requiring multiple evaluators are more likely to be viewed as effective.
5. Principals are frequently reluctant to communicate their concerns about the marginal teacher's substandard performance although their perceptions of the effectiveness of the

existing programs are positive and multiple evaluators are required by district policy.

6. Senior high school principals are more reluctant to communicate their concerns to the marginal teacher about his/her substandard performance than both junior high and elementary principals.
7. The size of the principal's building is not related to his/her hesitation to communicate concerns to the marginal teacher about substandard behavior.
8. The percentage of marginal teachers within a building is not related to the principal's reluctance to communicate his/her concerns to the marginal teachers.

Restraining factors

1. When the teacher is seen as a "good citizen" who works hard in the community and makes quite a contribution to the overall program of the school, principals are most likely to be hesitant about communicating their concerns to the teacher.
2. The involvement of the principal with the negative aspects of the courts and litigations is related to time constraints, staff reaction, and having to work with the difficult person.
3. Senior high school principals are more reluctant to communicate their concerns to the teacher when that person is seen as a "good citizen."

Discussion

Administrators, evaluators, and supervisors of teachers persistently seek to determine the means for solving the problem of marginal teachers--teachers whose overall performances are below district standards. Yet, limited research has been conducted that presents certain vital and necessary information related to the phenomena of marginal teachers. The results of this study offer what should be considered as one of the major first steps toward understanding those problems surrounding the marginal teachers.

That classroom management is the dominant cause for teacher dismissal has been supported by a review of dismissal cases (Landauer et al., 1983; Bridges, 1983). The findings of this study, based on principals' and administrators' perceptions indicate that the marginal teacher is, in fact, rated lowest in demonstrating classroom management skills. Further, principals most frequently cite classroom management skills as the number one problem for evaluators who must work with the marginal teachers.

In rating marginal teachers below district standards on the classroom management variable, administrators suggest that the marginal teacher is best described as the individual whose classroom lacks control and may be characterized by a series of student behavioral problems. The teacher appears to lose valuable time by either reprimanding or criticizing those who misbehave or by ignoring inappropriate student behavior. In either event, opportunities for

students to learn is diminished which, in turn, affects students' achievement. As noted by Good and Brophy (1984) and Curwin and Mendler (1984), to gain maximal performance of both teachers and students limits and expectations must be clearly defined.

Questioning strategies of such teachers were also inadequate suggesting that attention was not given to the types of questions to be asked nor were appropriate methods used in asking questions of students. Thus, those questions posed tend to have no true value for the students. Considering that much of the teacher's time is spent questioning students (Good and Brophy 1984), it would appear that valuable time is again lost as students waste time seeking the answers and responding to questions of little or no value.

It would appear that praise and expectations for student learning are related to one another. Teachers who have low expectations may either tend to avoid criticism in an effort to encourage students to perform or praise sparingly because of his/her disappointment with the students failing to measure up to or reach unrealistic standards. In most instances, ineffective teachers simply do not appear to understand that effective praise requires time, concentrated attention, and, according to the situation and the student, individualization of comments (Brophy, 1981).

Higher ratings of teachers on the knowledge criteria suggest that the marginal teacher may appear to know the subject matter but, at the same time, perform below district standard ratings on checking for

student comprehension, structuring, modeling, and providing guided instruction. This implies that the teacher presents a lesson that is disjointed, teacher-centered, and laced with meaningless questions. In addition, the teacher fails to provide deliberate demonstrations as essential components of the lesson. Above all, there is an absence of management techniques to create a positive learning environment with low potential for trouble.

The most obvious difference between those whom principals believe can be improved and those whom principals would like to dismiss appears to be related to the marginal teachers inappropriate use of criticism and praise. In fact, it was the one criteria where the dismiss group was rated one point higher, as may be noted by a mean rating of 1.27 for the "Dismiss" group and 2.27 for the "Improve" group. As a result of the principals' ratings, using effective praise was ranked ninth for this group when compared to a rank of first place for the "Dismiss" group.

These findings appear to be consistent with those of Manatt. During the course of the workshop experience, administrators were asked to state the one major difference between the two groups of marginal teachers. Administrators consistently reported that the difference was one of attitude. The "Dismiss" group was typically described as critical of and hostile toward others, both students and supervisors.

The findings that 11 percent of the principals' staff are marginal teachers support the estimation of both Redfern (1983) and Manatt (1984)

that approximately five to ten percent of a principal's staff are performing below district standards. While some principals have less than five percent of the staff to contend with as marginal teachers, others (50%) must supervise and improve the performance of 10 to 50 percent of his/her staff. The largest number of principals, however, reported that 9% of their staff are marginal teachers.

Despite the apparent deficiencies of marginal teachers, principals do not appear to view them as hopeless causes as suggested by Scriven (1980) and Gudridge (1980) who noted that administrators and principals tend to become so disheartened by the presence of the marginal teachers that they often ignore the problem. Furthermore, although 66% of the principals are reluctant to communicate their concerns about the marginal teacher's performance, principals appear to overcome what hesitations they may have and notify at least 81 percent of those teachers who are performing below district standards.

Manatt (1984), Rauhauser (1983), Redfern (1980) and Sweeney and Manatt (1984) have each consistently stressed the importance of intensive assistance programs that require written job improvement targets and multiple evaluators. The findings of this study are consistent with their points of view as evidenced by the fact that principals' perceptions of program effectiveness increased where multiple evaluators are used. In addition, reluctance to communicate the concerns of the principals decreased where programs were considered to be effective.

From the review of the literature, one would have expected either time constraints or fear of courts and litigations to receive the highest ratings as restraining factors that contribute to the principals' hesitations to communicate their concerns (Gudridge, 1980; Neill and Curtis, 1978). In rating the factor related to working with the "good citizen," principals appear to allow their sympathetic feelings to influence their hesitations to address the problems. This was particularly evident in smaller buildings and at the elementary level where principals are more likely to have closer relationships with individual teachers.

Although the ratings were lower on the remaining four restraining factors, each appears to be related to one another. Fear of courts and litigation (the negative aspects) is significantly related to time constraints, staff reaction, and having to confront the marginal teacher who is seen as a "difficult person." The strongest relationship was between the fear of the negative aspects of the courts and the reluctance to tackle the "difficult" and hostile employee.

Limitations

1. Data were collected from specific geographical locations with only a minimal number of respondents representing the entire area.
2. Respondents were expected to rate teachers in retrospect.

3. The instruments used, the West Shore teacher evaluation instrument and the questionnaire, were not standardized instruments.
4. Data for the study were collected from administrators with an implied interest in developing skills in evaluating teachers.
5. Administrators were characterized by varied levels of training in teacher performance evaluation.
6. Data were collected prior to training for developing administrators' skills in identifying marginal teachers.
7. Age distribution was collected on marginal teachers only rather than both marginal teachers and the total staff under the supervision of the principals.
8. Findings of this study were based on perceptions' of principals and not actual teacher performance.

Recommendations for Principals

For school districts and administrators who are concerned with improving teacher performance, it is recommended that:

1. Inservice activities be developed and implemented that stress training to develop those essential effective teaching skills extracted from current research.
2. To reach those areas of greatest weakness, principals must provide interventions that concentrate on developing the classroom management skills of marginal teachers, both the

planning and management conducted outside of the classroom and interactive work done with students in the classroom.

3. To reach the largest group of marginal teachers within a building, greater emphasis should be placed on developing skills of marginal teachers in: motivating students, teaching to an objective and conveying appropriate expectations.
4. School districts make provisions for on-site district wide training of evaluators in teacher performance evaluation, supervising the marginal teacher, and developing administrators' skills in effective leadership.
5. Implement a formal assistance program that requires written job improvement targets and multiple evaluators.
6. School districts provide a support system for administrators who must work with marginal teachers.
7. Consider implementation of a peer teacher program with teachers helping teachers.

Recommendations for Further Study

This study is a first of what should be many studies concerning the phenomena of marginal teachers. Future research should, therefore, center upon:

1. Conducting an in-depth study, collecting classroom observation data and student gain scores for a select group of marginal teachers.

2. Conducting a thorough analysis of job improvment targets collected from various and diverse and geographical locations.
3. Determining the values, philosophies, and learning styles of marginal teachers and compare with that of the evaluator.
4. Comparing perceptions of principals according to levels of experience and training in teacher performance evaluation.
5. Comparing perceptions of principals according to various geographical locations, and according to urban and suburban and rural locations.
6. Surveying students and peers concerning their perceptions of marginal teachers.
7. Determining the extent to which feedback from students, parents and other staff influences principals' perceptions of marginal teachers.
8. Determining if the leadership style influences principals' perceptions of marginal teachers.
9. Surveying school districts known to use intensive assistance to determine principals' and teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of the programs.
10. Comparing the essential components of the various existing intensive assistance programs.
11. Surveying those marginal teachers who have experienced the intensive assistance process.

12. Determining those measures used by administrators to support their beliefs that low-student achievement describes the marginal teachers.
13. Conducting a study to determine if gender of the administrators influences their perceptions of marginal teachers.

Of the many constraints under which administrators must operate, the existence of marginal teachers is one of the most crucial. Beyond the possibility that marginal teachers may seriously impede the academic achievement of students, their very presence generates ill-feelings among fellow staff members, the public they serve, and the students they must attempt to teach.

Yet, improvement of marginal teachers is possible where administrators are willing to expend every effort to continue to gain insight into the limits and weaknesses of such teachers. As supervisors/evaluators continue to reach higher levels of understanding about those characteristics which distinguish the marginal teachers from those who meet or exceed district standards, they must provide such teachers with an evaluation process which is diagnostic in nature and concentrates on specific and appropriate criteria for improvement. Further, appropriate supervisory skills and individualized inservice that stress the collaborative efforts of both the teacher and the administrator are the possible solutions to the problem of changing the behaviors of those who perform below district standards. "More

specifically, administrators should help teachers develop their classroom skills, set learning goals, and assess achievement; provide for praise, support, recognition, and stimulation; . . . and further teachers' control of their work. All these strategies must be from an acceptance of teachers as partners in a collective pursuit, and all of them together should serve to enrich teachers' work" (Thompson, 1979, p. 367).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, L. Time and School Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1984.

Anderson, L. M.; Evertson, Carolyn M.; and Brophy, Jere E. "An Experimental Study of Effective Teaching and First-Grade Reading Groups." Elementary School Journal 79 (1979): 193-223.

Barber, Larry W., and Klein, Karen. "Merit Pay and Teacher Evaluation." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (December 1983): 247-251.

Beckham, Joseph. "Critical Elements of the Employment Relationship." In Legal Issues in Public School Employment, pp. 1-21. Edited by Joseph Beckham and Perry A Zirkel. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1983.

Bell, Terrell et al. National Commission on Excellence in Education. A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Washington, D.C., 1983.

Benderson, Albert. "Teacher Competence." Focus 10, pp. 1-17. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1982.

Berliner, David C. "The Half-Full Class: A Review of Research on Teaching." In Using What We Know About Teaching, pp. 51-75. Edited by Phillip L. Hosford. Alexandria, Virgina: Association For Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984.

Berliner, David C. "Using Research on Teaching for the Improvement of Classroom Practice." Theory into Practice 19 (Fall 1980): 302-308.

Berliner, David C. "Tempus Educare." In Research on Teaching, pp. 120-135. Edited by Penelope L. Peterson and Herbert Walberg. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1979.

Berliner, D. C. Changing Academic Learning Time: Clinical Interventions in Four Classrooms. San Francisco, California: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1978.

Berliner D. C., and Rosenshine, B. "The Acquisition of Knowledge in the Classroom." In Schooling and the Acquisition of Knowledge, pp. 375-396. Edited by R. C. Anderson, R. J. Spiro, and W. E. Montague. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1977.

Block, J. H. "The Effects of Various Levels of Performance on Selected Cognitive, Affective, and Time Variables." Doctoral dissertation. University of Chicago, 1970.

Bloom, Benjamin. All Our Children Learning. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1981.

Borich, Gary D. The Appraisal of Teaching: Concepts and Process. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1977.

Bowers, C. A. "Rethinking Teacher Education: This Time Let's Get it Right (A Response to Donna Kerr)." Teachers College Record 84 (Spring 1983): 557-563.

Boyer, Ernest. High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America (Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching). New York: Harper and Row, 1983.

Bridges, Edwin. The Management of Teacher Incompetence. Project Report No. 83-A20, April 1983.

Brookover, Wilbur; Beamer, Laurence; Efthim, Helen; Hathaway, Douglas; Lezotte, Lawrence; Miller, Stephen; Passalacqua, Joseph; and Tornatzky, Louis. Creating Effective Schools. Holmes Beach, Florida: Learning Publications, Inc., 1982.

Brophy, Jere. "On Praising Effectively." Elementary School Journal 81 (May 1981): 269-278.

Brophy, Jere, and Putnam, J. "Classroom Management in the Elementary Grades." In Classroom Management. The 78th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Edited by D. Duke. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Brophy, Jere E., and Evertson, Carolyn M. "Teacher Behavior and Student Learning in Second and Third Grades." In The Appraisal of Teaching: Concepts and Process, pp. 79-85. Edited by Gary D. Borich. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1977.

Cambron-McCabe, Nelda H. "Procedural Due Process." In Legal Issues in Public School Employment, pp. 78-97. Edited by Joseph Beckham and Perry A. Zirkel. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1983.

Cohen, Micneal. "Effective Schools What the Research Says." Today's Education 70 (April-May 1981): 58-61.

Cottrell, Victor A. "Evaluating Your Teaching Staff." ERIC ED 173 927, April 1979.

Crawford, J. "Interactions of Learner Characteristics with the Difficulty Level of Instruction." Journal of Educational Psychology 70 (1978): 523-531.

"Current Teacher Evaluation Won't Support Merit Pay, Study Finds." Update: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 26 (March 1984): 3.

Curwin, Richard L., and Mendler, Allen N. "High Standards for Effective Discipline." Educational Leadership 41 (May, 1984): 75-76.

Darling-Hammond, Linda; Wise, Arthur E.; and Pease, Sara R. "Teacher Evaluation in the Organizational Context: A Review of the Literature." Review of Educational Research 53 (Fall 1983): 285-328.

Davy, John. "Teaching Competence and Teacher Education: The Fundamental Issues." Teachers College Record 84 (Spring 83): 553-556.

Dawe, Harry A. "Teaching: A Performing Art." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (April 1984): 548-552.

Dillon, J. T. "Duration of Response to Teacher Questions and Statements." Contemporary Educational Psychology 6 (January 1981): 1-11.

Dolgin, Ann B. "Two Types of Due Process: The Role of Supervision in Teacher Dismissal Cases." NAASP Bulletin 65 (February 1981): 16-21.

Downey, Gregg. "How to Get Rid of Your Bad Teachers, and Help Your Good Ones Get Better." American School Board Journal 165 (June 1978): 23-26.

Duckett, Willard. Teacher Evaluation: Gathering and Using Data. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1983.

Duckett, Willard. Planning for the Evaluation of Teaching. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1979.

Evans, H. Dean. "We Must Begin Educational Reform 'Every Place' at Once." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (November, 1983): 173-177.

Faast, Dorothy. "An Analysis of the Effectiveness of Training Teacher Evaluators in Specific Steps in the Processes of Clinical Supervision and Teacher Performance Evaluation." Doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, May, 1982.

Feistritzer, Emily. "NEA President Speaks out on Tougher Standards for Teaching." Interview with Mary Hatwood Futrell. Teacher Education Reports 6 (April 26, 1984): 2.

Fisher, C. W.; Berliner, D. C.; Filby, N. N.; Marilave, R; Cahen, L. S.; Dishaw, M.; and Moore, J. E. "Teaching and Learning in the Elementary Schools." San Francisco, California: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1978. Report VII-I. Summary of the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study. 1978.

Fitzpatrick, K. A. "The Effect of a Secondary Classroom Management Training Program on Teacher and Student Behavior." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New York, 1982.

Freeland, Sherry. "With Education in Washington." Education Digest 49 (September 1983a): 61-74.

Freeland, Sherry. "With Education in Washington." Education Digest 49 (November 1983b): 60-67.

Frels, Kelly, and Cooper, Timothy. "Documentation of Employee Performance." In Legal Issues in Public School Employment, pp. 121-136. Edited by Josephy Beckham and Perry Zirkel. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1983.

Frudden, Sarah. "A comparison of school administrators' ratings of teaching performance utilizing varied instructional materials in the assessment process." Doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, 1982.

Futrell, Mary Hatwood. "An Educators's Opinion." Education Week 3 (May 1984): 4.

Gage, N. L. "Improving Instruction: Ideas Superintendents can Give Principals to Help Teachers." School Administrators 40 (May 1983): 23-26.

Gallup, George H. "The 15th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Towards the Public School." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (September 1983): 33-47.

Good, Thomas L., and Brophy, Jere. Looking in Classrooms. 4th edition. New York: Harper and Row, Publications, 1984.

Good, Thomas L. "Teacher Effectiveness in the Elementary School." Journal of Teacher Education 30 (March-April 1979): 52-64.

Good, Thomas L., and Grouws, Doughlas A.; "Missouri Mathematics Effectiveness Project: Experimental Study in Fourth-Grade Classrooms." Journal of Educational Psychology 71 (1979): 355-362.

Goodlad, John L. "Teaching: An Endangered Profession (A Response to Donna Kerr)." Teacher College Record 8 (Spring 1983): 575-578.

Griffith, Daniel E. "The Effective Teacher." ERIC ED 214 865, October 1981.

Gudridge, Beatrice. AASA Critical Issues Report: Teacher Competency. Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators. Sacramento, California: Education News Service, 1980.

Hosford, Phillip L. "The Art of Applying the Science of Education." In Using What We Know about Teaching, pp. 141-161. Edited by Phillp L. Hosford. Alexandria, Virgina: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984.

Howe, Harold II. "Education Moves to Center Stage: An Overview of Recent Studies." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (November 1983): 167-172.

Howe, Harold II. "Improving Teaching: Solution Close to the Classroom." The College Board Review 125 (November 1983): 12-14, 28.

Hudgins, Bryce B.; Phye, Gary D.; Schau, Candace Garrett; Theisen, Gary L.; Ames, Carole; and Ames, Russell. Educational Psychology. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1983.

Hudgins, H. C., Jr. and Vacca, R. S. Law and Education: Continuing Issues and Court Decisions." Charleston, VA: Michie Co., 1979.

Hunter, Madeline. "Knowing, Teaching and Supervising." In Using What We Know About Teaching, pp. 169-192. Edited by Philip Hosford. Alexandria, Virgina: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984.

Jacobson, William C. "Bring Teachers Up to Snuff." The Executive Educator 6 (February 1984): 41-46.

Johnston, Mary Ann. "Providing for the Intellectual and Philosophical Development of Prospective Teachers." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (January 1984): 361-362.

Kash, Marilynn M., and Borich, Gary D. "Teachers." In Improving Educational Standards and Productivity, pp. 49-71. Edited by Herbert J. Walberg. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1982.

Keisling, Phil. "The Class War We Can't Afford to Lose." American Education 18 (August September 1982): 4-11.

Kerr, Donna. "Teaching Competence and Teacher Education in the United States." Teacher College Record 84 (Spring 1983): 525-552.

Kounin, J. S. Discipline and Group Management in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Landauer, W. Lance; Spangler, John H.; and Van Horn, Benjamin F. Jr. "Good Cause Basis for Dismissal of Education Employees." In Legal Issues in Public School Employment, pp. 154-170. Edited by Jospeh Beckham and Perry Zirkel. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1983.

Larson, Richard. "Teacher Performance Evaluation--What are the Key Elements?" NASSP Bulletin 68 (February 1984): 13-18.

Levin, T. "The Effect of Content Prerequisite and Process Oriented Experiences on Application Ability in the Learning of Probability." Ph.D. disseration, University of Chicago, 1975.

Lortie, Dan C. Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Lottes, John and others. "Development and Assessment of Professional Competence in Teaching." August 1973. ERIC ED 143 658.

Manatt, Richard P. "Picking up the Ten-Foot Pole: Removal of Bad Teachers!" Speech given at AASA National Convention, Las Vegas, Nevada, February 1984.

Manatt, Richard P. "Supervising the Marginal Teacher." Videotape. Alexandria Virginia: ASCD, 1983.

Manatt, Richard P. "Teacher Performance Evaluation." Practical Application of Research. (Occasional Paper No. 82-1, Northwest Area Foundation, Iowa State University, January 1982)

McDaniel, Suzanne H., and McDaniel, Thomas. "How to Weed out Incompetent Teachers without Getting Hauled into Court." The National Elementary Principal 59 (March 1980): 31-36.

McDonald, Frederick J. "Research on Teaching: Report on Phase II of the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study." In The Appraisal of Teaching: Concepts and Process, pp. 3-57. Edited by Gary D. Borich. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1977.

McGrath, Ellie. "The Bold Quest for Quality." Time 122 (October, 1983): 58.

McIntire, Ronald G., and McIntire, Jeanne D. "Termination and Contract Nonrenewal: How to Prepare for the 'Hot-Seat'." NASSP Bulletin 66 (December 1982): 90-92.

McIntyre, Kenneth E. "The Merits and Demerits of Merit Pay." NASSP Bulletin 68 (February 1984): 100-104.

McNergney, Robert, and Carrier, Carol A. Teacher Development. New York: Macmillan, 1981.

Medley, Donald. "Teacher Effectiveness." In Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Vol. 4. New York: The Free Press, 1982.

Medley, Donald. "The Effectiveness of Teachers." In Research on Teaching: Concepts, Findings and Implications, pp. 11-27. Edited by Penelope L. Peterson and Henry J. Walberg. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1979.

Medley, Donald M., and Crook, Patricia. "Research in Teacher Competency and Teaching Task." Theory into Practice 19 (Fall 1980): 294-308.

Mertens, Sally. "The Basics in Inservice Education: Findings from the Rand and Teacher Center Studies." Action in Teacher Education 4 (Spring-June 1982): 61-66.

Mitchell, J. K. and Newsum, R. "The Computer Tackles the Supervisor's Toughest Job: Teacher Performance." The Iowa Curriculum Bulletin 7 (Spring 1983): 49-52.

Morris, Arval A. "Substantive Constitutional Rights: The First Amendment and Privacy." In Legal Issues in Public School Employment, pp. 55-77. Edited by Joseph Beckham and Perry A. Zirkel. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1983.

Munnelly, Robert J. "Dealing with Teacher Incompetence: Supervision and Evaluation in a Due Process Framework." Contemporary Education 50 (Summer 1979): 221-225.

Murnane, Richard J. "Understanding the Sources of Teaching Competence: Choices, Skills, and the Limits of Training (Response to Donna Kerr.)" Teacher College Record 84 (Spring 1983): 564-569.

Nardine, Frank E. "Competence: A Working Definition." Theory into Practice 25 (June 1977): 302-307.

Neill, Shirley Boes, and Curtis, Jerry. AASA Critical Issues Report: Staff Dismissal. Education News Service: Sacramento, California, 1978.

Ohanihan, Susan. "Teachers are Organized but to What End?" Learning 11 (October 1982): 88-90.

Ohles, John F. "The Business of Education." 1979. ERIC ED 169 674.

Oliva, Peter F. Supervision for Today's Schools. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1976.

Palker, Patricia. "How to Deal with Incompetent Teachers." Teacher 97 (January 1980): 42-45.

Peterson, Donovan, and Peterson, Kathryn. "A Research-Based Approach to Teacher Evaluation." NASSP Bulletin 68 (February 1984): 39-46.

Peterson, Donovan, and Ward, Annie. Due Process in Teacher Evaluation. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1980.

Peterson, Jerry D. "Teacher Termination Hearings: The ABC's of Survival." NASSP Bulletin 66 (December 1982): 83-89.

Peterson, Penelope L. "Direct Instruction Reconsidered," In Research on Teaching, pp 57-69. Edited by Penelope L. Peterson and Herbert J. Walberg. Berkeley California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1979.

Peterson, P. L.; Marx, R. W.; and Clark, C. M. "Teacher Planning, Teacher Behavior, and Students' Achievement." American Educational Research Journal 15 (1978): 417-432.

Petix, Robert G. "We Must Reform Teacher Tenure." The Executive Educator 6 (February 1984): 56.

Phay, Robert E. Legal Issues in Public School Administrative Hearings. Topeka, Kansas: National Organization on Legal Problems of Education, 1982.

Piele, Philip, ed. Yearbook of School Law. Topeka, KS: National Organization on Legal Problems of Education, 1983.

Place, Roger A. "Removing the Incompetent Practitioner." February 1974. ERIC ED 088 237.

Pope, Laura Mean. "State Regulation of Educator Evaluation." In Legal Issues in Public School Employment. Edited by J. Beckham and P. A. Zirkel. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1983.

Quick, Albert T. "Recent Developments in the Law" Journal of Law and Education 12 (January 1983) 115-169.

Rauhauser, William. "An Analysis of the Quality and Effectiveness of Teachers' Job Improvement Targets." Doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, 1983.

Redfern, George B. "Dismissing Unsatisfactory Teachers: A Four Phase Process." ERS Spectrum 1 (Summer 1983): 17-21.

Redfern, George B. Evaluating Teachers and Administrators: A Performance Objectives Approach. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1980.

Reutter, E. Edmond Jr. Schools and the Law. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1983.

Rosenshine, Barak. "Teaching Functions in Instructional Programs." Elementary School Journal 83 (April 1983): 335-352.

Rosenshine, Barak V. "Content, Time and Direct Instruction." In Research on Teaching Concepts, Findings and Implications, pp. 28-56. Edited by Penelope L. Peterson and Henry J. Walberg. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1979.

Rosenshine, Barak. "Review of Teaching Variables and Student Achievement." In The Appraisal of Teaching: Concepts and Processes, pp. 111-120. Edited by Gary D. Borich. Reading, Massaschusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1977.

Roth, Robert A. "The Reform of Teacher Education: A Review of Current Proposals." March 1983. ERIC ED 233 989.

Rupley, William H. "Research in Effective Classroom Instruction: Implications for Preservice and Inservice Education. September 1982. ERIC ED 221 523.

Russell, D. and Hunter, Madeline. "Planning for Effective Instruction." Instruction 55 (September, 1977): 57.

Ryans, David G. Characteristics of Teachers. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

Schlechty, Phillip C., and Vance, Victor S. "Institutional Responses to the Quality/Quantity Issue in Teacher Training." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (October 1983): 94-101.

Scriven, Michael. "Summative Teacher Evaluation." Handbook of Teacher Evaluation, pp. 241-271. Edited by Jason Millman. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1981.

Scriven, Michael. "Teacher Personnel Policies: Equity, Validity, and Productivity." October 1980. ERIC ED 206 741.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J., and Starratt, Robert J. Supervision: Human Perspective. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1983.

Shanker, Albert. "Want Better Teachers? Raise Pay, Stop Classroom Violence." U.S. News and World Report (Interview) 94 (March 1983): 41.

Shavelson, Richard and Stern, Paula. "Research on Teachers' Pedagogical Thoughts, Judgments, Decisions, and Behavior." Review of Educational Research 51 (Winter 1981): 441-453.

Sizer, Theodore R. A Review and Comment on the National Reports. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary Principals, 1984.

Soar, Robert S. "An Integration of Findings from Four Studies of Teacher Effectiveness." In The Appraisal of Teaching: Concepts and Process. pp. 3-57. Edited by Gary D. Borich. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1977.

Soar, Robert S.; Medley, Donald M.; and Coker, Homer. "Teacher Evaluation: A Critique of Currently Used Methods." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (December 1983): 239-246.

Solomon, D. and Kendall, A. "Individual Characteristics and Children's Performance in 'Open' and 'Tradition' Classroom Settings." Journal of Educational Psychology 68 (1976): 613-625.

Solorzano, Lucia. "What's Wrong with Our Teachers." U.S. News and World Report 94 (March 1983): 37-40.

Squires David A.; Hunt, William G.; and Segars, John K. Effective Schools and Classrooms: A Research-Based Perspective. Alexandria, Virgina: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1983.

Stallings, Jane. "Implementation and Child Effects of Teaching Practices in Follow Through Classrooms." Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development 40 (December 1975): 7-8.

Stallings, J. A., and Kaskowitz. D. Follow Through Classroom Observation Evaluation, 1972-73. Menlo Park, Calif.: Stanford Research Institute, 1974.

Sweeney, Jim. "Teacher Competence: The Past, Present and Future of its Assessment." Unpublished paper. Department of Professional Studies in Education, Iowa State University, 1983.

Sweeney, Jim. "Planning Makes a Difference: Improving the Post-Observation Conference." NASSP Bulletin 66 (December 1982): 38-40.

Sweeney, Jim, and Manatt, Richard P. "A Team Approach to Supervising the Marginal Teacher." Educational Leadership 41 (April 1984): 25-27.

Sykes, Gary. "Caring about Teachers (A Response to Donna Kerr)." Teacher College Record 84 (Spring 1983a): 579-592.

Sykes, Gary. "Incentive-Based Restructuring for the Teaching Profession." Education Week 2 (May 1983b): 24, 19.

Sykes, Gary. "Contradiction, Ironies, and Promises Unfulfilled: A Contemporary Account of the Status of Teaching." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (October 1983c): 87-93.

Thompson, Sydney. Motivation of Teachers. Burlingame, California: Association of California School Administrators, 1979.

Timpane, Michael. "Business Has Rediscovered the Public Schools." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (February 1984): 389-392.

Timpane, Michael. "Needed: A Popular Profession of Education (A Response to Donna Kerr)." Teacher College Record 84 (Spring 1983): 570-574.

Tomlinson, Tommy M. "The Troubled Years: An Interpretive Analysis of Public Schooling Since 1950." Phi Delta Kappan 62 (January 1981): 373-376.

Tomlinson, Tommy M. "Mirror or Mirage." Today's Education 70 (April-May 1981): 60-61.

Tuckman, B. W.; Steber, J. M.; and Hyman, R. T. "Judging the Effectiveness of Teaching Styles: The Perceptions of Principals." Educational Administration Quarterly 15 (Winter, 1979): 104-115.

Vance, Victor S, and Schlechty, Phillip C. "The Distribution of Academic Ability in the Teaching Force: Policy Implications." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (September 1982): 22-27.

Watts, Doyle. "Admission Standards for Teacher Preparatory Programs: Time For a Change." Phi Delta Kappan 62 (October 1980): 120-121.

Watts, Doyle. "Four Views of NCATE's Role and Function. Phi Delta Kappan 64 (May 1983): 646-649.

Weaver, W. Timothy. America's Teacher Quality Program: Alternatives for Reform. New York: Praeger, 1983.

Webb, L. Dean. "Teacher Education." In Education and the Law, pp. 69-80. Edited by Stephen B. Thomas, Nelda H. Cambron-McCabe and McCarthy. Elmont, N.Y.: Institute for School Law and Finance, 1983.

Woodring, Paul. The Persistent Problems of Education. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1983.

Wuhs and Manatt. "The Pace of Mandated Teacher Evaluation Picks Up." American School Board Journal 170 (May 1983): 28.

Zigli, Barbara. "Teachers Love Jobs, Not Pay." USA Today (June 28, 1984): 1D.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Every completed task gives cause for a celebration and exaltation. However, it is an experience that must be shared with those practicing administrators in the education community who provided the data upon which this study was based. In addition, special recognition must be given to many Iowa State University faculty members, especially the members of my committee: Drs. Richard P. Manatt, Sandy McNabb, Penny Ralston, Shirley Stow, and Richard Warren. Each member, both collectively and individually, presented me with essential intellectual challenges and accompanying guidance. Dr. Ann Thompson earned special recognition and thanks for graciously accepting a last minute responsibility.

Guidance, expertise, and inspiration were important elements contributing to the accomplishment of my goals. As my major professor, Dr. Richard P. Manatt provided those elements. For his contribution, I shall always remain grateful.

Working through a rigorous graduate program can become an impossibility without friends who share their knowledge, provide expertise, and offer moral support. Libby Bilyeu, my final typist, was that sort of friend and co-worker. To give adequate thanks to her is not easy. I shall forever regard her as an important force in my life. Other special friends were Loretta Davenport with her unfailing confidence and pride in my strength and ability and Valerie Broughton with her statistical assistance and her candid, but sound advice.

No celebration is complete without acknowledging the support and votes of confidence that come from one's family. My gratitude is boundless for those persons who lovingly became my "Ames Family." The sincere concern, intellectual stimulation, and warm comraderie from George and Clemmye Jackson and Jim and Jan Sweeney can never be replaced. Their "open door" policies made my experiences worthwhile and unforgettable.

As they have always done in the past, my mother and father, Leanna and Randall Anderson, and my sister, Carol Cutter, gave me much needed confidence. At no time did they ever allow me to struggle alone without their prayers and their love. Whatever success I may have realized, rightfully so, is theirs.

Above all, I extend sincere thanks to my daughters, Leslie Keaton Simms and Linda Keaton. My gratitude to Linda runs especially deep. Her personal sacrifice, patience, and understanding were the most treasured gifts a mother can ever receive. Through the entire experience, she was a loving and compassionate friend.

APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRES

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

College of Education
Educational Administration
N229 Quadrangle
Ames, Iowa 50011
Telephone 515-294-5450

The attached Teacher Performance Appraisal form has been given to you as a part of a research project designed to identify the common performance areas of weaknesses observed in teachers whom you have identified as least effective, or performing below your district's standards.

Your candid response will be beneficial in providing vital information to be used in creating a profile of teachers whose overall performances "do not meet district standards" or teachers who have been evaluated as "needs improvement." To assist principals in providing appropriate assistance to the ineffective classroom teachers, it is essential that we continue to gather data that will produce further insight into the in-class behavior of the teacher described above.

In completing the form:

1. Select the teacher whose performance is so poor that you would fire that person tomorrow.

2. Assign the number "01" to that person.

3. For each of the twelve items, write the number "01" above the appropriate descriptor.

4. Next, select the teacher whose performance does not meet district standards, but the teacher is someone whom you feel you might be able to help improve.

5. For each of the twelve items, write the number "02" above the appropriate descriptor.

On page two, in the space reserved for comments, write the teacher's number, grade and subject taught, and teacher's status - probationary, or tenured. Also, indicate your position.

To assure confidentiality, do not include the names of any of the teachers in question. Likewise, in reporting results, neither individual responses nor names of schools will be used.

Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

WEST SHORE SCHOOL DISTRICT

TEACHER PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PLAN

OBSERVATION REPORT

Employee	Building	Grade	Subject

Date of Pre-Conf.	Date of Obs.	Time In	Time Out	☐ Yes ☐ No In-depth ?	Date of Post-Conf.	Length of Post-Conf.

* *

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA AND DESCRIPTORS

Criteria	Levels of Performance			STANDARD	
The teacher... 1. Use of praise	Not observed A I	Was very critical and/made little use of praise.	Praised seldom and criticized sparingly.	Used praise as a reward for proper responses and criticized sparingly.	Encouraged class participation through the use of praise and criticized only when educationally appropriate.
2. Classroom management	Not observed A I	Lacked classroom management skills.	Used methods of classroom management which infringed upon students' time on task.	Used methods of classroom management which were assertive and considered students' time on task to be important.	Employed methods of classroom management which promoted time on task for all activities and promoted student self-discipline.
3. Direct instruction	Not observed A I	Did not direct classroom activities.	Was ineffective in directing classroom activities.	Directed classroom activities in a manner which enhanced learning.	Directed classroom activities in a manner which exposed students to a variety of learning activities and promoted and enhanced teacher-student interaction.
4. Modeling	Not observed A I	Did not competently explain or demonstrate the concept being taught.	Was inconsistent in explaining and demonstrating the concept being taught.	Exhibited the ability to explain and demonstrate the concepts being taught and the appropriate values and attitudes.	Artfully explained and demonstrated the concepts being taught and modeled appropriate values and attitudes.
5. Questioning	Not observed A I	Employed questions that have little or no value to the lesson.	Employed recall questions to extract specific information.	Employed questioning techniques which insure success and require critical thinking skills.	Employed questioning techniques of all kinds, including probing questions which require students to elaborate on their answers.
6. Comprehension	Not observed A I	Showed no evidence of comprehension checks.	Checked for comprehension inconsistently.	Checked for student comprehension of content being taught before moving on.	Set an appropriate instructional pace, provided frequent feedback, checked extensively for comprehension before moving on.
7. Knowledge of subject matter	Not observed A I	Showed poor knowledge of subject matter.	Displayed a lack of confidence in handling subject matter.	Dealt readily with basic subject matter.	Exhibited mastery of the subject matter by bringing to the lesson experiences beyond the text to increase student learning and to make the subject more interesting.

2-Performance Criteria and Descriptors

8. Structuring comments	Not observed A I	Made no effort to prepare students for the lesson.	Assumed the students understood what is expected of them.	Allocated intervals of time during each period to prepare students for subsequent learning activities.	Clearly stated what is expected of students before, during and at the end of the lesson and adjusted expectations when need was identified.
9. Expectations for student learning	Not observed A I	Did not have evident expectations for students.	Had low expectations for student learning.	Set high expectations for each student's learning which were evident and realistic.	Consistently maintained high expectations of students and adjusted those expectations periodically to provide the best learning atmosphere possible.
10. Written planning	Not observed A I	Had no written lesson plans or plans were not complete for the week.	Had skeletal lesson plans.	Had lesson plans which developed the lesson in detail.	Had imaginative, articulated lesson plans with a variety of activities which resulted in high time on task.
11. Guided and/or independent practice	Not observed A I	Did not use guided and/or independent practice when it would have been appropriate.	Used guided and/or independent practice with unclear purposes.	Provided productive and monitored guided and/or independent practice to reinforce concepts being taught and/or check student understanding.	Was highly effective in the use of guided and/or independent practice.
Students... 12. Pupil reaction	Not observed A I	Were inattentive and exhibit little knowledge or concern for concept being taught.	Were attentive but participate little in the lesson and there was little evidence of knowledge of subject matter.	Exhibited appropriate behavior and worked at activities which promote learning.	Participated in a two-way communication which shows knowledge of subject matter, interest in concepts being taught, inquiry, desire for more depth of study, and so on.

YES ____ NO ____ FOLLOWED WSSD CURRICULUM UPDATE

COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATIONS OF ADMINISTRATOR/SUPERVISOR

Signature of Administrator/Supervisor

Date

_____ A check mark indicates _____ Continuation Sheets

COMMENTS OF PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEE

This report has been reviewed with me, including _____ Continuation Sheets.

Signature of Professional Employee

Date

Original Copy: Personnel Office

Copy: Administrator

Copy: Employee

ljs:#10

IOWA STATE
UNIVERSITY

College of Education
Educational Administration
N229 Quadrangle
Ames, Iowa 50011
Telephone 515-294-5450

Dear Administrator:

The attached questionnaire is part of a research project designed to gather data which will be helpful in dealing with teachers performing below district standards. Your candid response will be beneficial in providing vital information to be used in creating a profile of these teachers and providing more representative data. These so-called "marginal teachers," are those who typically fall within at least one of two categories: a) their unsatisfactory performance is directly related to classroom behavior and/or b) they exhibit adequate performance in the classroom, but their unsatisfactory ratings are the result of out-of-class factors.

In completing the questionnaire, please carefully follow the directions for each section. To assure confidentiality and anonymity, please do not include the names of any teachers.

Thank you for your cooperation in completing the survey.

Respectfully yours,

Jacqueline K. Mitchell
Graduate Research Assistant

JKM:ep

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Please complete the following, placing the correct response on the appropriate line:

a. Building level.
(i.e., Elementary, Jr. High, Secondary, etc.) _____

b. What is your position? _____

c. District enrollment. _____

d. Total # of students enrolled in the unit you supervise. _____

e. Total # of teachers you supervise. _____

f. Total # of marginal teachers for whom you have primary responsibility. _____

g. Please indicate below the age distribution of the marginal teachers in your building:

Total number of marginal teachers supervised.

20-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55+
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

h. Please write the name of your state _____

NOTE: If you answered "0" in Part I: a, it is not necessary that you complete Parts II, III, IV, and V. Please return the instrument at the close of the session.

PART II: IN-CLASS-CHARACTERISTICS:

If you supervise one marginal teacher or more, please indicate the statement which describes the marginal teacher(s) in your unit by placing the number of teachers it describes on the line at the right. If the statement does not describe a marginal teacher on your staff, place a "0" on the line at the end of each statement. In making your decisions for most of these statements, you are required to make a judgment call. Please make decisions based on observations and whatever other information you have available.

The teacher fails to effectively:

a. use praise to elevate student achievement. _____

b. maintain a learning environment free of major behavioral problems. _____

c. use modeling. _____

d. employ questioning techniques. _____

e. check for student comprehension of content being taught during the lesson. _____

f. exhibit mastery of his/her subject matter. _____

g. teach to an objective. _____

h. use structuring comments to prepare students for subsequent learning. _____

i. convey appropriate expectations to students (not too high or too low). _____

j. present information clearly. _____

k. demonstrate that they plan and prepare daily and unit lessons. _____

l. employ strategies that motivate students. _____

m. assess student progress. _____

n. use a variety of teaching methods. _____

o. Please review the items "a" through "n" above; select and list the top three problem areas for the marginal teacher(s) you supervise. Rank according to the degree of seriousness listing the most serious as number 1.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

PART III: OUT-OF-CLASS FACTORS

Please indicate the number of marginal teachers on your staff described by the out-of-class factors listed below. If the statement does not describe a marginal teacher on your staff, place a "0" on the line at the right.

a. fails to carry out instructions or directions. _____

b. excessively absent. _____

c. neglects routine duties. _____

d. high incidence of pupil and parent complaints. _____

e. frequent emotional outbursts. _____

f. hostile toward supervision. _____

g. low pupil achievement. _____

h. Please review the indicators in items "a" through "g" above. Select and list the top three problem areas of those marginal teachers you supervise. Rank according to the degree of seriousness listing the most serious as number 1.

1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

PART IV:

Please respond to the following items listed below:

a. With the appropriate help, how many of the total number of marginal teachers you supervise can be saved from dismissal? _____

b. How many of these marginal teachers do you feel might be suffering from burnout? _____

c. Of the marginal teachers in your building, how many have you notified as to your concerns? _____

d. Does your school district have a formal assistance program requiring written job improvement targets for marginal teachers? Yes _____ No _____

e. Does the assistance program require multiple evaluators? Yes _____ No _____

f. Is it an effective program? Yes _____ No _____

If you answered "no" to the above question, please explain why the program is not effective:

_____

_____

_____

_____

g. Are there times when you are reluctant to communicate your concerns to a marginal teacher about his/her substandard performance?

Yes _____ No _____

NOTE: If you answered "no" to item "g" in Part IV, do not complete Part V.
If you answered "yes" to item "g" in Part IV, please continue to Part V.

PART V:

The following statements have been given by administrators as reasons for hesitating to communicate their concerns to marginal teachers about their substandard performance. Using the following scale, please specify the extent to which each statement tends to reflect your feeling:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Very Little			Some		Considerable		Very Much

Please write the number that best expresses your opinion on the line at the end of each statement.

a. There just isn't enough time to observe, document, and handle the paperwork involved. _____

b. If the teacher is a really "good person" who works hard in the community and makes quite a contribution to the overall program, I am reluctant to tackle the problem. _____

c. If the teacher is one who is very difficult to deal with, I am hesitant about tackling the problem. _____

d. Identifying marginal teachers might cause my staff to join forces: therefore, I am reluctant to tackle the problem. _____

e. It's not worth the effort to get involved with the negative aspects of courts and litigation. _____

f. Other: (Please specify)

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX B: TABLES WITH NON-SIGNIFICANT RESULTS

TABLE 23. Analysis of variance of principals' ratings of dismiss categories by building levels

CATEGORY	D.F.	MEAN SQUARES	F-VALUE
PRAISE	2	1.50	2.26
	320	.67	
MANAGEMENT	2	.10	.10
	321	.27	.27
DIRECT INSTRUCTION	2	.11	.48
	321	.24	
MODELING	2	.16	.38
	321	.43	
QUESTIONING	2	.34	.67
	320	.51	
COMPREHENSION	2	.23	.52
	321	.45	
KNOWLEDGE	2	1.75	2.61
	321	.67	
STRUCTURING	2	.08	.20
	319	.41	
EXPECTATION	2	.38	.74
	319	.51	
GUIDED	2	1.07	2.67
	321	.40	
STUDENT	2	.15	.47
	323	.33	

TABLE 24. Principals' ratings of dismiss category of marginal teachers by building levels on West Shore criteria

CATEGORIES	MEAN	S.D.	NUMBER
PRAISE			
Elementary	1.37	.76	142
Junior High	1.22	.76	65
Senior High	1.16	.91	116
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT			
Elementary	1.28	.52	143
Junior High	1.31	.47	65
Senior High	1.34	.54	116
DIRECT INSTRUCTION			
Elementary	1.86	.51	143
Junior High	1.85	.44	65
Senior High	1.80	.48	116
MODELING			
Elementary	1.41	.69	143
Junior High	1.40	.66	65
Senior High	1.47	.63	116
QUESTIONING			
Elementary	1.37	.70	142
Junior High	1.40	.76	65
Senior High	1.28	.71	116
COMPREHENSION			
Elementary	1.52	.71	143
Junior High	1.42	.61	65
Senior High	1.49	.65	116
KNOWLEDGE			
Elementary	1.99	.83	143
Junior High	1.89	.92	65
Senior High	2.16	.73	116
STRUCTURING			
Elementary	1.52	.64	143
Junior High	1.58	.58	65
Senior High	1.54	.68	114

TABLE 24 (Continued)

CATEGORIES	MEAN	S.D.	NUMBER
EXPECTATION			
Elementary	1.37	.76	143
Junior High	1.38	.68	63
Senior High	1.47	.67	116
GUIDED PRACTICE			
Elementary	1.67	.59	143
Junior High	1.49	.73	65
Senior High	1.52	.63	116
STUDENT REACTION			
Elementary	1.41	.58	143
Junior High	1.35	.57	65
Senior High	1.44	.56	116

TABLE 25. Analysis of variance of principals' ratings of improve categories by building levels

CATEGORY	D.F.	MEAN SQUARES	F-VALUE
PRAISE	2	.43	.63
	321	.68	
MANAGEMENT	2	1.47	2.71
	320	.54	
DIRECT INSTRUCTION	2	.29	.84
	320	.35	
MODELING	2	.58	1.16
	322	.50	
QUESTIONING	2	.02	.05
	322	.41	
COMPREHENSION	2	.31	.74
	321	.42	
STRUCTURING	2	.82	2.17
	321	.38	
EXPECTATION	2	.34	.61
	318	.65	
WRITTEN PLANS	2	.75	1.32
	320	.57	
GUIDED PRACTICE	2	.10	.22
	320	.45	
STUDENT REACTION	2	.48	.95
	321	.51	

TABLE 26. Principals' ratings of improve category of marginal teachers by building levels on West Shore criteria

CATEGORIES	MEAN	S.D.	NUMBER
PRAISE			
Elementary	2.31	.78	144
Junior High	2.29	.82	66
Senior High	2.19	.89	114
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT			
Elementary	2.03	.78	144
Junior High	1.77	.67	66
Senior High	1.96	.72	113
DIRECT INSTRUCTION			
Elementary	2.25	.56	144
Junior High	2.26	.64	65
Senior High	2.34	.59	114
MODELING			
Elementary	2.32	.65	145
Junior High	2.16	.81	66
Senior High	2.25	.70	114
QUESTIONING			
Elementary	2.03	.69	145
Junior High	2.06	.52	66
Senior High	2.05	.64	114
COMPREHENSION			
Elementary	2.19	.70	145
Junior High	2.31	.66	65
Senior High	2.21	.56	114
STRUCTURING			
Elementary	2.35	.61	144
Junior High	2.18	.55	66
Senior High	2.24	.65	114
EXPECTATION			
Elementary	2.21	.79	144
Junior High	2.08	.69	66
Senior High	2.10	.72	113
WRITTEN PLANS			
Elementary	2.22	.79	141
Junior High	2.12	.69	66
Senior High	2.25	.71	114
STUDENT REACTION			
Elementary	2.27	.75	144
Junior High	2.12	.83	66
Senior High	2.14	.72	113

TABLE 27. Relationship between percentage of marginal teachers and building levels

PERCENTAGE OF MARGINAL TEACHERS	BUILDING LEVELS			TOTALS
	Elementary	Jr. High	Sr. High	
1-5%	20 20.6%	2 10.5%	10 21.7%	32 19.8%
6-9%	31 32.7%	7 36.8%	4 30.4%	52 32.1%
10-13%	27 27.8%	7 36.8%	6 13.0%	40 24.7%
14-50%	19 19.6%	3 15.8%	16 34.8%	38 23.5%
TOTAL	97 59.9%	19 11.8%	46 28.4%	162 100.0%

$X^2 = 8.78366$ D.F. = 6 $p > .05$.

TABLE 28. Relationship between the existence of a formal assistance program requiring written job improvement targets and percentage of marginal teachers within the principal's building

PERCENTAGE OF MARGINAL TEACHERS	FORMAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM		TOTAL
	NO	YES	
1-5%	16 20.5%	17 20.7%	33 20.6%
6-9%	23 29.5%	28 34.1%	51 31.9%
10-13%	21 26.9%	19 23.2%	40 25.0%
14-50%	18 23.1%	18 22.0%	36 22.5%
TOTAL	78 48.8%	82 51.3%	160 100.0%

$X^2 = 0.52082$ D.F. = 3 $p > .05$.

TABLE 29. Relationship between principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of their formal assistance program and percentage of marginal teachers within the building

PERCENTAGE OF MARGINAL TEACHERS	EFFECTIVENESS		TOTAL
	NO	YES	
1-5%	4 17.4%	11 19.6%	15 19.0%
6-9%	7 30.4%	21 37.5%	28 35.4%
10-13%	5 21.7%	14 25.0%	19 24.1%
14-50%	7 30.4%	10 17.9%	17 21.5%
TOTAL	23 29.1%	56 70.9%	79 100.0%

$X^2 = 1.54381$ D.F. = 3 $p > .05$.

TABLE 30. Relationship between principal's reluctance to communicate concerns and existence of a formal assistance program

RELUCTANCE	ASSISTANCE PROGRAM		TOTAL
	NO	YES	
NO	23 30.3%	27 34.2%	50 32.3%
YES	53 69.7%	52 65.8%	105 67.7%
TOTAL	76 49.0%	79 51.0%	155 100.0%

$X^2 = .122$ D.F. = 1 $p > .05$.

TABLE 31. Relationship between perceptions of program effectiveness and existence of multiple evaluators among principals not reluctant to communicate their concerns

EFFECTIVENESS	MULTIPLE EVALUATORS		TOTAL
	NO	YES	
NO	3 21.4%	0 .0%	3 12.0%
YES	11 78.6%	11 100.0%	22 88.0%
TOTAL	14 56.0%	11 100.0%	25 100.0%

X^2 = 1.03367 D.F. = 1 p > .05.

TABLE 32. Relationship between principals' reluctance to communicate concerns and the percentage of marginal teachers

PERCENTAGE OF MARGINAL TEACHERS	RELUCTANCE		TOTAL
	NO	YES	
1.00	9 17.6%	22 20.6%	31 19.6%
2.00	18 35.3%	34 31.8%	52 32.9%
3.00	15 29.4%	22 20.6%	37 23.4%
4.00	9 17.6%	29 27.1%	38 24.1%
TOTAL	51 32.3%	107 67.7%	158 100.0%

$X^2 = 2.71876$ D.F. = 3 $p > .05$.

TABLE 33. Relationship between principals' building size and their reluctance to communicate concerns to marginal teachers

RELUCTANCE	BUILDING SIZE		TOTAL
	0 TO 499	500 TO 1499	
NO	34 33.0%	17 30.9%	51 32.3%
YES	69 67.0%	38 69.1%	107 67.7%
TOTAL	103 65.2%	55 34.8%	158 100.0%

X^2 = .00818 D.F. = 1 $p > .05$.

TABLE 34. Relationship between principals' reluctance to communicate their concerns and the existence of multiple evaluators

MULTIPLE EVALUATORS	RELUCTANCE		TOTAL
	NO	YES	
NO	14 51.9%	37 71.2%	51 64.6%
YES	13 48.1%	15 28.8%	28 35.4%
TOTAL	27 34.2%	52 65.8%	79 100.0%

$X^2 = 2.11171$ D.F. = 1 $p > .05$.

TABLE 35. Relationship between percentages of marginal teachers and existence of multiple evaluators

PERCENTAGE OF MARGINAL TEACHERS	MULTIPLE EVALUATORS		TOTAL
	NO	YES	
1-5%	9 17.3%	8 27.6%	17 21.0%
6-9%	18 34.6%	10 34.5%	28 34.6%
10-13%	12 23.1%	7 24.1%	19 23.5%
14-50%	13 25.0%	4 13.8%	17 21.0%
TOTAL	52 64.2%	29 35.8%	81 100.0%

$X^2 = 1.052$ D.F. = 3 $p > .05$.

TABLE 36. Comparison of principals' ratings on restraining factors by building size

CRITERION	MEAN	T-VALUE	N
TIME CONSTRAINTS			
Small buildings	4.08	.57	66
Large buildings	3.83		36
GOODGUY SYNDROME			
Small buildings	4.34	.72	65
Large buildings	4.05		37
HOSTILE EMPLOYEE			
Small buildings	3.46	.12	65
Large buildings	3.41		34
STAFF REACTION			
Small buildings	2.56	.31	66
Large buildings	2.22		36
COURTS AND LITIGATION			
Small buildings	3.32	.42	65
Large buildings	2.97		36

APPENDIX C: LEDGER OF PRINCIPAL'S WRITTEN COMMENTS

OTHER REASONS FOR HESITATIONS TO COMMUNICATE CONCERNS TO THE MARGINAL TEACHER

Not be able to pinpoint specific concerns, I suspect might be the problem; identifying and documenting my suspicions.

Have made some effort to assist the teacher and have seen few positive results.

Possess marginal skills in the evaluation process.

Hard to make them believe they deviate from the norm; hard to get concrete evidence; they are so defensive.

A teacher has never been fired in North Carolina for incompetence; this says it all.

Political pressure from central office.

Both marginal teachers are very near within three years of retirement.

One marginal teacher is a "good" person, firmly entrenched in the community and "well-connected." I would be committing professional suicide to tackle her.

In neither case is the problem severe. I don't think I could possibly win a dismissal case.

It can be harmful to future promotions or even job retention; depends upon who they know or who they are related to.

Intrapersonal relationships, compassion for older teachers.

If you can't win, only fight and destroy staff morale.

Wisconsin arbitrator recently returned a teacher to the classroom; that was ineffective and incompetent; WEAC is powerful and has very effective attorneys.

Teacher has three years to retire.

In poor physical health; near retirement age.

Personally and emotionally draining; tremendous time investments.

Is occasionally met with success, but at considerable strain in supervisory relationships.

Has been an effective teacher 10-20 years; has lost students' respect and cooperation; it is difficult to try to change him back.

I have not become proficient in a supervision model; for instance, the Madeline Hunter model.

Our problem teachers are close relatives to members of our board.

Four of teachers are related--husband and wife; mother-in-law and daughter-in-law; approach one, incure the wrath of the other.

Superintendent hires the teachers; low evaluations of teachers is kicking him in the face; rate this a 6 or 7.

Some marginal teachers are overtly hostile to any suggestions from anyone; some are too stupid to realize there is a problem.

My greatest concern about marginal teachers is about the teacher who just doesn't want to learn or grow professionally.

I am not sure of exactly what I can or cannot do; I need more experience.

Teachers have only one year left before retirement; I hesitate to make waves with this much time left.

REASONS GIVEN FOR PERCEPTIONS OF ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS AS NOT EFFECTIVE

Many of the questionable evaluation items require higher degrees of inference. I tend to give the teacher the benefit of the doubt.

It is not required; it is mutually agreed upon; teachers have not changed.

Puts most of responsibility on principal, and we don't always know how to help.

It is general in nature and is designed so that all teachers could benefit in a general way.

Doesn't reflect the district philosophy of good teaching.

I am not sure what the district philosophy is on this issue; at the building level we need some definite improvement.

Some teachers are reached, but not all; leadership, which is so important, is lacking in some areas.

Because there is no outside assistance for the teachers.

Assistance is given only by principal; some helped by assistance from only the supervisor in the district.

Responsibility lies almost solely with the principal; cannot be objective enough.

No administrative support from superintendent.

Principals do not have enough assistance in evaluating in the way of personnel or guidelines.

What criteria are to be used? Tenure is the problem.

Little follow-up except for immediate supervisor.

Board policy does not call for 2nd appraisal.

Too much political or social pressure to remove people that need to be removed from the profession.

It is not consistent.

No plan to "help" for a marginal teacher; particularly if the teacher is not receptive to help.

Dictated by state law.

Too difficult to implement.

They (job targets) have not been developed.

We still have marginal teachers.

No district standards.

First year of process.

Assistance program includes principal and occasionally the department head.

Most teachers have tenure and a very strong union.

Poor legal backup for central office.

A district program of formal assistance is non-existent.

Each principal is anxious to develop a program but at this time it exists building by building.

We're in the first year of the program.

Too objective.

We do not have job targets.

Has not been consistent.

There really is no formal program.

Not done frequently enough.

None available except principal-teachers.

Performance has not improved.

An extremely poor evaluation instrument adopted before came on board; was designed to say and do nothing; one of the teachers on committee that developed the instrument; when I complained about is, said that it was purposely designed.

Has not achieved desired results.