DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 292 TM 840 472

AUTHOR Rose, Janet S.; Popham, W. James
TITLE Developing a Defensible Language Skills Test for Teachers.
PUB DATE Apr 84
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (68th, New Orleans, LA, April 23-27, 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Board of Education Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Political Issues; *Reading Skills; Teacher Dismissal; *Teacher Evaluation; *Test Construction; Test Validity; *Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Charleston County School District SC; IOX Assessment Associates; *Teachers Test of Language Skills; Test Specifications

ABSTRACT

This presentation describes the rationale and major steps in the development of the Teacher's Test of Language Skills (TTLS) to be administered to selected certificated teachers in the Charleston County School District, South Carolina. The paper recounts the factors underlying the establishment of the School Board's policy, then traces the major events in the development of the TTLS from a dual perspective--that of the school district and that of the test developer, IOX Assessment Associates. The authors deal with (1) the isolation of competencies to be tested, (2) the creation of test specifications, (3) the development of test items, (4) the field-testing of TTLS items, and (5) the creation of multiple forms of the TTLS. Both test-development and political considerations are addressed. (Author)

Symposium: Creating a Basic Skills Test for Tenured Teachers

Presentation: Developing a Defensible Language Skills Test for Teachers

Authors: Janet S. Rose, Charleston County (S.C.) School District
W. James Popham, UCLA and IOX Assessment Associates

The symposium's initial presentation described the rationale and major steps in the development of the Teacher's Test of Language Skills (TTLS) to be administered to selected certificated teachers. The paper recounted the factors underlying the establishment of the School Board's policy, then traced the major events in the development of the TTLS from a dual perspective — that of the school district and IOX. The authors dealt with (1) the isolation of competencies to be tested, (2) the creation of test specifications, (3) the development of test items, (4) the field-testing of TTLS items, and (5) the creation of multiple forms of the TTLS. Both test-development and political considerations were addressed.

DEVELOPING A DEFENSIBLE TEST OF TEACHERS' LANGUAGE SKILLS*

by

Janet S. Rose
Charleston County School District

W. James Popham
UCLA and IOX Assessment Associates

The focus on educational accountability currently is setting the stage for a reaffirmation of the need for teacher evaluation as well as a shift in its primary intent. As Harris (1981) points out, annual escalation in per-pupil expenditures, coupled with progressive declines in student achievement levels, has alarmed the public and forced politicians to scrutinize institutions responsible for providing publicly-financed education. States and local school districts first addressed the need for more stringent academic standards for students by implementing competency testing programs. One by one, states formalized their programs through legislative mandates until the momentum accelerated such that, today, nearly all states have confronted and acted upon this issue.

Now, we are beginning to see what appears to be another domino effect. In order to assure quality of instruction which will give students a fair opportunity to attain the new academic requirements, the public more recently is demanding that educators guarantee the competency of the professional school staff. On the state level (e.g., South Carolina) policies are being developed which strengthen certification requirements for beginning teachers. At the local level parents are asking that ineffective teachers be removed from the classroom. In response, School Boards are supporting stronger teacher evaluation policies to hasten the removal of incompetent teachers. Such is the case in Charleston, South Carolina.

*A symposium presentation at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, New Orleans, April 23-27, 1984.

The political forces operating within this context is changing the course of teacher evaluation (Armiger, 1981). At one time, its main purpose was formative in nature, i.e., to encourage professional growth by identifying areas for improvement, developing an improvement plan or "contract," monitoring plan implementation and assessing the extent of improvement. Whether a management-by-objectives approach or a clinical supervision model was followed, evaluation typically occurred within a supportive and non-threatening environment (Iwanicki, 1981); the evaluator, often the principal, was perceived as a friend. As a result of political pressures, the focus of teacher evaluation began to shift toward more summative purposes. Administrators began to design teacher evaluation programs which would provide them with information they need to make employment decisions regarding promotion and tenure, dismissal, etc.

In response to school board action, teachers became hostile and complained about the competencies of school board members and the unethical nature of their goals (McNeil, 1981). Teachers insisted that they were being victimized and blamed for students' academic deficiencies when, in fact, changes in values, family structure and the cultural milieu were partly responsible. Feeling stripped of their professional rights, teachers strongly voiced their continued preference for an evaluation system built upon trust and aimed at self-growth and self-improvement. Indeed, teachers expressing this viewpoint present a logically, legally, and ethically compelling argument. They criticize school administrators for (1) failing to evaluate beginning teachers thoroughly and appropriately according to current district policies and (2) allowing incompetent teachers to continue their employment with the system. If dismissed, teachers who have a reasonable expectation of continued employment, defined either explicitly (e.g., by tenure laws) or implicitly (e.g., by continuing contract laws) can claim infringement of a property interest and insist upon their procedural due process guarantees. Because expectations of contract

renewal presume competence, the courts have rightfully placed the burden of proof for incompetence upon school authorities. From an ethical perspective, terminating a twenty-year veteran teacher for incompetence is difficult to justify without blatant and unquestionable documentation.

Evaluators, mostly school principals, are placed in an uncomfortable conflict-of-interest situation. Once in a supportive role — supervisors who guided teachers towards professional growth — they are now accused of shirking their responsibilities and, as a consequence, are forced by policy to become a critic and potential enemy of the teacher with whom they must work. Can a principal reconcile the helping and supportive function with appraisal of teacher competence for summative decision-making? What will happen to the climate and rapport so vital for positive job morale?

Within this tense and strained atmosphere, stronger teacher evaluation policies and new evaluation programs began to emerge. States and local school districts, like Charleston, were pressured by the public to implement immediately a program to identify incompetent teachers and either remediate or remove them. On occasion, new teacher evaluation policies were initiated as a reaction to an explosive "incident" which drew public attention to a need for stronger evaluation practices. Such an incident occurred in the Charleston County School District (CCSD), a district of approximately 42,000 students and 2,200 teachers, located on the coast of South Carolina.

Scene I, The Crime

The tale begins with a rather seemingly insignificant, but not uncommon, incident. A note written by a teacher containing unforgiveable grammatical errors was sent home to a parent who, horrified at the teacher's basic skill deficiencies, turned the document over to a member of the Charleston County School Board of Trustees. The Board member's reaction was not expected, given the general climate of educational accountability sweeping the nation and the

school district at the time. He was horrified and shared his horror with the media who shared it with the public. Suddenly a great deal of interest was generated in teacher evaluation. The School Board presumed that current teacher evaluation practices were inadequate and did not do the job intended if teachers' deficiencies, such as the one exposed in this incident, had not been corrected. In their discussion of teacher evaluation in Charleston County, board members asked whether skill deficiencies displayed in the teacher's note were common to other teachers. Several members felt that it was necessary to test teachers' level of basic skills in order to assess the extent of the problem.

Scene II, The Solution

A subcommittee of the School Board drafted a proposal for a new teacher evaluation program to replace the "weak" clinical supervision model which relied, for the most part, on principals' subjective ratings of teachers. Among the provisions of the teacher evaluation program proposed by the School Board were a "professional" test and a "writing exercise." Although the policy under consideration stated that evaluation data would be used to identify and correct existing areas of need, it was evident that a primary purpose was to weed out "illiterate" teachers.

Scene III, The Reaction

Fear, anxiety and anger spread throughout the school district. Teachers reacted in a predictably negative fashion to the Board's proposal. They perceived the new program, especially the basic skills component, as an unabashed insult. Slowly, the relationship between the School Board and the district's teachers deteriorated.

Scene IV, The Road to Compromise

The District Superintendent, placed in an obviously uncomfortable situation, gathered together members of his cabinet to discuss the teacher evaluation and

testing requirements and to prepare a statement of their reactions which would be given to the School Board. The cabinet recommended that a test, developed by a reputable company, be administered to teachers. Those who "fail" would be evaluated further to identify needs so that appropriate remediation activities could be provided. Thus cabinet members acceded to the Board's desire for an "objective" method of identifying below-standard teachers but maintained a focus on the formative features of the evaluation system. No mention was made of dismissing teachers on the basis of their performance on a test. Teachers, however, did not agree with the position of the cabinet.

Differences in viewpoints between School Board members and district administrators, coupled with the growing hostility of those involved, necessitated action by the Superintendent. He created an ad hoc committee of administrators, principals, and teachers to review the School Board's proposal and make recommendations. The committee was divided into subcommittees which would thoroughly investigate various aspects of the proposal. The CCSD Director of Evaluation and Research (the first author) chaired the subcommittee on "Testing and Writing Skills" which studied the advantages and disadvantages of testing, as well as alternative methods of evaluating teachers' skills. This subcommittee recommended use of teachers' lesson plans to assess basic writing needs. This proposal had the advantage of evaluating writing skills and other teacher competencies that were more closely associated with actual classroom instruction. In addition, this approach would be less expensive, would target remedial needs, and would be less apt to dampen teacher morale. The subcommittee also recommended that, if the School Board insisted upon a writing test, it be administered only to those teachers for whom there was cause.

After considering the input of the ad hoc committee, the School Board approved a teacher evaluation policy in June, 1982. The policy required that the state's performance evaluation instrument, "Assessment of Performance in

Teaching" (APT), developed to certify beginning teachers, would be used on all experienced teachers as well. Teachers' lesson plans would be reviewed, and a brief writing sample on a suitable topic would be obtained. In addition, those teachers who did not make an acceptable score on the APT would be required to take a basic skills test. Test results would be used to identify areas of deficiency so that they could be remediated. Although not stated openly, the original intent of the policy — to weed out incompetent teachers — remained a primary objective.

The selection or development of a basic skills test was assigned to the Evaluation and Research (E&R) office, along with a three-month deadline. E&R staff voiced serious concerns about the legal implications of the proposed teacher evaluation policy, as well as the timeline and technical aspects of the assessment tools used to implement the policy. Having been given this charge, E&R took the position that a sensible and legally defensible program could be designed as long as pertinent legal issues were considered and sufficient time was allowed to develop appropriate instrumentation. In response, the School Board accused the administration of espousing slow-down rhetoric in order to delay program implementation.

Recognizing the lack of understanding of testing issues displayed by some administrators and School Board members, the E&R director prepared a brief report describing legal issues and technical concerns, then organized a meeting to discuss the report. The E&R director invited some leading experts in the area of tests and measurement to attend the meeting as consultants. These experts were urged to share their reactions and recommendations. The meeting concluded by giving the E&R office two years and sufficient funding to develop a legally defensible and technically sound test to assess teachers' basic skills. The responsibility for the teacher assessment policy's implementation was left to the Superintendent and School Board.

Political and Legal Considerations

In planning a teacher evaluation program focused, in part, on the assessment of teachers' basic skills, one must be attentive to the legal issues that arise when a basic skills test is used for summative decision-making. Although incompetence is indeed a legitimate cause for terminating a teacher, as Strike and Bull (1981) note, granting tenure (or continuing employment status) presumes competence which must be disproven with rather persuasive evidence. In addition, if teacher evaluation practices result in the termination of a disproportionate number of teachers from a legally protected minority, the school district must be able to defend the procedures in court. A strong defense requires demonstration that the evaluation instruments are valid or related to on-the-job performance. Two court decisions highlight the importance of ensuring the validity of a test used for employment decisions. In Chance v. Board of Examiners (1971) and Walston v. County School Board of Nansemond (1974) termination practices were found to violate employees' rights because the educational agencies failed to demonstrate a relationship between content of the evaluation instrument and successful job performance.

Although the use of tests for teacher termination has not yet reached the federal courts, the district's administrators were attentive to the counsel of experts in the field (e.g., Trachtenberg, 1981) who recommend that school districts use tests developed from a formal job analysis of the teacher profession. This viewpoint led to an earlier rejection of the Board's recommendation to use the high school level of the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, a test given to students. Also, developers of the South Carolina's Education Entrance Examination (EEE) and the National Teacher Examinations' (NTE) Core Exam would not permit CCSD to use these tests for purposes other than those for which they were designed.

The administration also studied the federal government's 1978 Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures which described the qualities which must be incorporated into a test so that it is used equitably in making employment decisions. The Uniform Guidelines state that content validity can be demonstrated if the test's content "is a representative sample of the content of the job" or "is a necessary prerequisite to successful job performance."

The first decision to be made concerned the areas which the test should cover. At first, the School Board wanted the test to assess reading, writing, and mathematics. Yet, although all teachers should be expected to possess basic communication skills regardless of what they teach, not all teachers need mathematical proficiency in order to perform credibly in the classroom. After much deliberation, the only mathematical skill that the staff could identify which was common to all teachers was "averaging two digit numbers." The School Board reluctantly accepted the staff's recommendation to exclude mathematics from the test content.

The next decision concerned validity, that is, the relationship of test content to job performance. Even though the test was intended to be a basic skills test in reading and writing, not all teachers (such as chemistry teachers) would consider their chief instructional mission as promoting reading and writing skills. It seemed more appropriate to defend the test on the grounds that it measured what constituted a "necessary prerequisite" for satisfactory performance as a teacher than to defend it as a representative sample of required job content. Thus, reasonable command of the ability to read and write was considered a necessary but not sufficient condition for successful teaching performance. This notion was to underly the identification of the skills to be measured by the test.

At this point a Request for Proposals (RFP) to develop the Teacher's Test of Language Skills (TTLS) was issued by the E&R office. The contract was

awarded to IOX Assessment Associates (IOX) and planning began immediately. Although CCSD and IOX agreed on the majority of activities to be included in the plan, our respective situations and prior experiences gave us differing perspectives on a few key issues. The first issue to arise concerned the appropriateness of the different concepts of content validity for this particular test. CCSD was satisfied with the concept of job-relevancy described earlier. IOX, however, wanted to proceed one step further and suggested that we consider gathering data regarding an aspect of test quality in which the courts have recently shown interest, the degree of match between the skills assessed and the preparation examinees have previously received at teacher training institutions. IOX based their interpretations upon their experiences with the Debra P. (1982) case in which the courts ordered that use of the Florida high school graduation test was not valid unless students had been adequately prepared for the test. A 1977 federal court decision in South Carolina approving use of the NTE was based upon the same logic. However, CCSD believed that similarity between test content and preparation should not be a concern, because (a) preparation of teachers was the responsibility of teacher education programs and (b) students — the group being protected in this instance — shouldn't have to suffer if teacher education programs had produced teachers who were incompetent in basic skills. The district's concern focused upon skills needed by teachers to perform successfully in the classroom, regardless of the quality of training they received. Besides, the district's evaluation effort in itself revealed skepticism of the preparation their teachers had received in college. Accordingly, no effort was made to ascertain wehther the contents of the TTLS had been treated in CCSD teachers' college programs.

Isolation of Competencies to be Tested

Although the CCSD School Board had approved a policy calling for the use of a test to evaluate teachers' reading and writing proficiencies, the intent

of the policy and the interests of board members had to be clarified before skills could be identified. Clarification occurred through informal conversations with board members. By probing it was learned that board members' perceptions were that only "literate" individuals should serve as public school teachers. Thus the nature of the test to be developed should allow non-literate individuals to be identified. Board members did not want a test which assessed literacy at the lowest possible level. Rather, the Board defined literacy as a level of proficiency consonant with the requirements of successful performance as a teacher. Board members supplied insights which would be helpful in the subsequent preparation of test specifications. The Board believed that teachers should be able (1) read a variety of written materials related to their profession and (2) write coherent and grammatically correct communications to parents and students.

The next step was to conceptualize, more specifically, the nature of the skills to be isolated. It was clear that the reading and writing skills selected for the test should be basic literacy skills and, in addition, unquestionably relevant to a teacher's responsibilities. Content validity would be ensured by evaluating a teacher's reading or writing competency within the context of simulated job relevant situations, e.g., selections from professional journals, teacher's guides, district policy manuals, etc. Rulings of previous court cases suggested an additional requirement. In the past, courts have insisted that teachers be given sufficient time and assistance to correct deficiences before adverse employment decisions are made. Therefore, the skills selected for the test had to be such that, having been provided with relevant remedial instruction, teachers had a reasonable chance to master the skills.

Given these ground rules, a plan had to be devised which addressed key legal and political considerations. First, the plan had to yield "moderately"

difficult job-relevant skills for which remediation activities could be designed. Second, to avoid future legal challenges, key groups of individuals had to participate in the identification process. IOX and CCSD staff agreed that groups affected by decisions made on the basis of the TTLS (e.g., teachers) should have a voice in the skill-identification process. Also, inclusion of district administrators and faculty members from South Carolina teacher education programs would increase credibility of the skill-selection process. And, finally, perspectives from parents and community representatives would garner local support for the new teacher evaluation program.

The skill-identification procedures originally proposed in the RFP were revised following conversations during which IOX staff shared their experiences in similar ventures with CCSD staff. The initial RFP-stipulated plan required a screening and consolidation process. Individuals from school and community groups would generate or react to a list of possible reading and writing skills. The contractor was then to coalesce the preferences of the diverse groups into broader skill domains. IOX staff pointed out the possibility that such an aggregation process could result in a set of skills which would not necessarily coincide with the requirements described earlier, e.g., job relevancy. An agreement was reached to have IOX propose an initial, tentative set of skills which would then be reviewed by the various groups involved.

In order to accumulate input from concerned constitutencies in a way that was both manageable and timely, the skill-identification process was designed in two stages: (1) a preliminary identification of skills and (2) a refinement of the skills. In stage one a sample of approximately 70 school district administrators, principals, teachers, PTA chairpersons, constituent board members (CCSD's school governance consists of a single county-wide board plus a number of smaller, constituent boards), and representatives of key community groups completed a survey in which they reacted

to a small number of skills carefully prepared by IOX. A revised version of these skills was then shared with all certificated staff in the district who thus had an opportunity to rate the importance of the skills during the second stage of the skills-identification process.

A Teacher Evaluation Committee (TEC) was created to review survey forms prior to distribution and to make recommendations based upon tabulation of survey results. The TEC, chaired by the Superintendent, consisted of board members, district administrators, principals, teachers, and faculty members from teacher training institutions. In all decision-making situations, the Superintendent acted upon the committee's recommendations and took responsibility for the final recommendations to be submitted to the School Board.

The initial survey consisted of a list of skills, written as close to final form as possible, which were to be evaluated by respondents according to the importance of each skill. Skill statements were followed by a list of job-relevant content apt to be used to assess the extent to which examinees had mastered the skills. Respondents were asked to offer suggestions for additions, deletions, or modifications to the skills and likely content.

The survey was completed by 70 Charleston educators and citizens. Nearly all respondents (approximately 91-94 percent) wished to retain all reading and writing skills. A few respondents recommended an additional writing skill based upon a new Board policy that had been approved two weeks earlier. The policy stated that all students' written work turned in to teachers would be graded according to grammar and composition as well as appropriate content. Suggested TTLS items consonant with this new policy would assess teachers' ability to correct errors in students' compositions. Respondents also suggested revisions to the lists of likely content.

The Teacher Evaluation Committee studied the report summarizing results from this initial review of skills. All committee members agreed with the pro-

posed revisions. A few members, including the Superintendent, wanted to add another skill — Completing Forms and Applications — which they contended the teachers had to do on a rather frequent basis.

In the next stage of the skills-identification process, three groups of certificated personnel, i.e., teachers, school-site administrators, and district staff, were given an opportunity to react anonymously to the revised list of skills. Prior to distributing the survey, all relevant personnel were formally notified that they would be given this skills-review opportunity. Surveys were distributed to principals who organized a system in the schools whereby teachers could voluntarily complete the survey. Respondents received a description of the skills, then rated the skills on a continuum from 1 (unimportant) to 5 (essential). Respondents also were encouraged to offer suggestions. Responses were secured from 561 individuals, that is, 25 percent of the certificated staff employed in the school district. Average ratings of each skill ranged from 3.6 to 4.7 for the three groups of respondents with teachers' ratings being considerably lower for each skill. The writing skills were rated somewhat higher than the reading skills. The percentage of individuals selecting each response alternative indicated that a majority of individuals from each group selected ratings of 4 or 5 for each reading and writing skill.

The TEC reviewed the report prepared by IOX which summarized the survey's results and contained recommendations. IOX recommended deletion of three skills, one of which was "Correcting Student Writing." IOX staff believed that such a skill would be hard to justify (in court) as being necessary for all teachers. Although all teachers were required (by the new board policy) to correct students' written work, IOX questioned whether all teachers would have an opportunity to correct students' assignments on a consistent basis. The committee, however, believed that only one skill, "Completing Forms and Applications,"

should be deleted. The rationale for this decision was based upon a re-analysis of the nature of the skill, rather than survey data. The committee decided that this skill relied more on reading ability and following directions than on writing ability. Also, it was not thought to be relevant to the instructional process. The Superintendent then presented the final version of the skills to be tested by the TTLS to the Board of Trustees for approval. The skills (described in Appendix A) included five reading skills - Details, Main Idea, Inference, Reference Usage, and Analysis of Job-Related Literature - and five writing skills - Mechanics, Word Usage, Sentence Formation, Organization, and Correcting Student Writing. The reading skills would be assessed by multiple-choice items. The first four writing skills would be evaluated via a sample of teachers' writing; the last writing skill would be tested by giving teachers a sample of student writing with errors, then asking the teachers to make corrections.

Creation of Test Specifications

A strategy similar to the one used in the skills-identification process was applied to the development of test specifications. Whereas CCSD initially wanted local educators to draft the contents of the specifications, IOX proposed a procedure which offered more guidance and structure without sacrificing local control. Given the controversial nature of the TTLS and the manner with which it would be used, the psychometric and legal defensibility of the instrument had to remain of paramount importance. IOX had to ensure that this attribute of the test was not compromised in favor of the preferences of local educators. The approach that was finally adopted allowed local educators to have general initial input into draft specifications and to review all subsequent versions. It was stipulated, however, that content suggested by local educators would be incorporated into the specifications only if it did not jeopardize the defensibility of the test. With care IOX and CCSD planned the activities for

this phase of the project.

Reading and writing Teacher Evaluation Area Committees (TEACs) functioned in the suggesting-monitoring capacity recommended by IOX. The TEACs, composed of school district and college/university teacher education experts in reading and writing, were involved in specifications-development over a six-weeks period. For each skill selected for the TTLS, IOX prepared a document, formatted according to the components used in preparing specifications, which included "possible" skills and sample items, followed by discussion issues regarding stimulus attributes, response attributes, scoring procedures and administration procedures. The discussion issues, prepared in the form of questions, highlighted key decision-points to be addressed by the TEACs. The issues covered such topics as readability, passage length, sentence length, word level limitations, stimulus content and scoring rubrics for the writing items. After having received the specifications discussion issues, the TEACs attended a meeting moderated by an IOX staff member (the second author) during which they discussed item types and considered the discussion questions for each skill. Following the meeting, IOX prepared tentative test specifications to be presented to the TEACs for review at a second meeting conducted one month later. Several minor modifications were incorporated into the specifications as a result of TEAC review. Yet, it was not until test items were written and reviewed that certain aspects of the specifications which needed revision were brought to CCSD's attention.

The Test Items

Once sufficient test items had been prepared by IOX, they were relayed to CCSD for review by the two TEACs. Careful analysis of the items made it possible to identify not only particular items that needed to be revised or deleted, but also "retroactive" modifications, mostly minor, that needed to be made on the TTLS test specifications.

When CCSD had approved all items, a field-test of the items was carried out in Charleston on November 16, 1983. In all, 938 teachers participated in the field-test. Based on the responses of the field-test participants, using both Rasch procedures and conventional item analyses, two equivalent forms of the TTLS reading test were prepared by IOX. Those test forms were submitted to CCSD in March, 1984.

Because the writing portion of the CCSD involved constructed (as opposed to selected) responses, it was believed important by both CCSD and IOX personnel that the scoring of the field-test papers, that is, the writing samples and the "correcting" assignments, be done jointly. Accordingly, in December, 1983, two representatives of CCSD met with seven IOX staff members in Los Angeles to score all of the field-test writing responses. There were approximately 900 writing samples (10 prompts) and 900 correcting responses (10 prompts). Following the scoring of the writing responses, IOX relayed to CCSD the summary data plus several equidifficult prompts for both writing tasks.

Long Distance Collaboration

As was noted several times earlier in this analysis, the frequent interplay between CCSD and IOX staff reflects a somewhat typical working relationship between school district personnel and an external contractor. Original plans, both by CCSD as well as IOX, were substantially modified or totally scrapped as a consequence of letters, conference telephone calls, or face-to-face meetings between IOX and CCSD representatives.

Several of the modifications originated from insights acquired by the collaborators; others were based upon logistical considerations or recommendations made by the District Superintendent. In situations where we felt the Superintendent's recommendations could jeopardize the legitimacy of the test, implications of his position were discussed with him. This procedure ensured that the Superintendent understood relevant issues and, as chief defense witness,

could justify his decision in a court of law. Luckily, CCSD staff were fortunate to have a Superintendent who has a background in testing and was acutely aware of political issues.

Given the sensitive nature of the test being developed, both CCSD and IOX staff displayed frequent symptoms of "warranted paranoia" during the project. Members of the project staff, whether in Charleston or Los Angeles, constantly contemplated that "day in court" when a teacher (or teachers' organization) would challenge the legitimacy of the TTLS as an instrument which could lead to teacher termination. Both IOX and CCSD staff recognized that the TTLS, given the high likelihood of litigation regarding the test and its use, had to be above reproach, both psychometrically and legally. The quest was for a test of teachers' language skills so patently defensible that it could withstand the expected legal assault.

Every step of the test-development enterprise had to be conducted openly with the involvement of concerned constituencies. Every important decision, had to be documented with supporting evidence. Just as fear often galvanizes one's effort, the prospect of a legal calamity with the TTLS spurred both CCSD and IOX to carry out the test development endeavor with consummate care.

Happily, during the entire test development extravaganza, CCSD and IOX staff were able to function as true collaborators. This was not a project characterized as "us" against "them." Perhaps the prospect of a courtroom catastrophe stimulated the various individuals involved to function as co-workers in the truest sense of that word. Whether or not the threat of judicial jeopardy created the collaborative spirit is not clear. Hopefully, that spirit was simply a function of the individuals involved and their common perspectives regarding the nature of the test development task. The prospect of peril, however, surely was an incentive to effective collaboration.

References

Armiger, M. L. (1981). The political realities of teacher evaluation. In J. Millman (Ed.), Handbook of teacher evaluation (pp. 292-302). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

Chance v. Board of Examiners, 330 F. Supp. 203 (S.D.N.Y. 1971).

Debra P. v. Turlington, 644 F.2d 397 (5th Cir. 1981).

Harris, W. U. (1981). Teacher command of subject matter. In J. Millman (Ed.), Handbook of teacher evaluation (pp. 58-72). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

McNeil, J. D. (1981). Politics of teacher evaluation. In J. Millman (Ed.), Handbook of teacher evaluation (pp. 272-291). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

Strike, K., & Bull, B. (1981). Fairness and the legal context of teacher evaluation. In J. Millman (Ed.), Handbook of teacher evaluation (pp. 303-343). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

Trachtenberg, P. (1981). Legal issues and implications in South Carolina's Act 1987. In J. S. Stulac (Ed.), The Charleston conference of South Carolina's Act 187 on teacher evaluation (pp. 15-23). Columbia, S.C.: The South Carolina Educator Improvement Task Force.

Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978). Federal Register, 43 (166).

Walston v. County School Board of Nansemond, 492 F.2d 919 (4th Cir. 1974).

APPENDIX A

TEACHER'S TEST OF READING SKILLS

1. Details. Given a selection from job-relevant materials, the teacher can locate important details in a selection.

   Likely Content: Teachers' guides for student textbooks, student textbooks, professional journals, curriculum guides, memoranda from administrators, policy statements from school boards, administration manuals for standardized tests, college-level textbooks dealing with curriculum and instruction, emergency instructions (such as for fire drills), educationally focused sections of news magazines and newspapers, instructional materials catalogues.

2. Main Idea. Given a selection from job-relevant materials, the teacher can identify a statement that best represents the main idea of the selection.

   Likely Content: Teachers' guides for student textbooks, student textbooks, professional journals, curriculum guides, memoranda from administrators, policy statements from school boards, administration manuals for standardized tests, college-level textbooks dealing with curriculum and instruction, emergency instructions (such as for fire drills), educationally focused sections of news magazines and newspapers, instructional materials catalogues.

3. Inference. Given a job-relevant selection from which a reasonable inference (for example, a conclusion or a prediction) can be drawn, the teacher can identify a statement which best represents that inference.

   Likely Content: Teachers' guides for student textbooks, student textbooks, professional journals, curriculum guides, memoranda from administrators, policy statements from school boards, administration manuals for standardized tests, college-level textbooks dealing with curriculum and instruction, emergency instructions (such as for fire drills), educationally focused sections of news magazines and newspapers, instructional materials catalogues, district policies and procedures manuals or related documents.

4. Reference Usage. Given an excerpt from a reference tool typically employed by educators, the teacher can use that excerpt to locate needed information.

   Likely Content: Class schedules, library card catalogues, indexes, tables of contents, dictionaries, curriculum guides, Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, thesauri, BSAP Testing

and Teaching Guides, district policies and procedures manuals or related documents.

5. Analysis of Job-Related Literature. Given an excerpt from a publication apt to be used by educators in their work, the teacher can identify (a) a statement of fact, (b) a statement of opinion, or (c) a logically fallacious statement.

   Likely Content: Journals and magazines of subject-matter associations (e.g., National Council of Teachers of English), educationally relevant magazines (e.g., Psychology Today), publications of teachers organizations (e.g., teachers union brochures), college-level textbooks dealing with curriculum and instruction.

TEACHER'S TEST OF WRITING SKILLS

1. Mechanics. The teacher can display correct use of spelling, capitalization, and punctuation.

   Likely Content: Letters to parents, memoranda to school administrators, letters of recommendation, notes to students, letters to community organizations, announcements for school bulletins.

2. Word Usage. The teacher can display correct and effective us of words for a given context.

   Likely Content: Letters to parents, memoranda to school administrators, letters of recommendation, notes to students, letters to community organizations, announcements for school bulletins.

3. Sentence Formation. The teacher can display correct construction of simple, compound, and complex sentences.

   Likely Content: Letters to parents, memoranda to school administrators, letters of recommendation, notes to students, letters to community organizations, announcements for school bulletins.

4. Organization. The teacher can display effective structuring of elements in a communication.

   Likely Content. Letters to parents, memoranda to school administrators, letters of recommendation, notes to students, letters to community organizations, announcements for school bulletins.

5. Critiquing Student Writing. The teacher can detect errors in student compositions.

Likely Content: A real or fictitious writing sample containing errors in mechanics, word usage, sentence formation, and organization.