DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 689 SP 029 862

AUTHOR Packard, Richard D.; Fargo, Steve

TITLE Diversity of Responses among Ten Arizona Pilot Test

District Career Ladder Plans.

INSTITUTION Northern Arizona Univ., Flagstaff. Center for

Excellence in Education.

PUB DATE 10 Nov 87

NOTE 31p.; For related documents, see SP 029 860-863.

Document presented to the Joint Legislative Committee on Career Ladders (Arizona State Capitol, House Wing,

November 10, 1987).

PUB TYPE Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

-- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Career Ladders; Educational Environment; Elementary

Secondary Education; Peer Evaluation; *Pilot

Projects; *Program Evaluation; *Staff Development;

*Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

Northern Arizona University's Arizona Career Ladder Research & Evaluation Project for teachers implements a procedure for rewarding teachers based on performance levels rather than on years of teaching experience and college credits. Research data is collected each spring, analyzed and fed back to the districts for improvement of key program components. This document shows percentages of agreement and disagreement on specific career ladder concepts, and weighted scores for high and low district rankings. Survey results from 10 districts on the following concepts are displayed in tables: (1) general career ladder concepts; (2) staff development and training concepts; (3) teacher evaluation system concepts; (4) peer evaluation concepts; (5) career ladder placement concepts; and (6) organizational climate survey. An outline of similarities and diversities in achieving performance targets and conditions of pilot test career ladder programs in Arizona is included. (JD)



DIVERSITY OF RESPONSES AMONG TEN ARIZONA PILOT TEST DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLANS

by

Dr. Richard D. Packard, Project Manager

The Arizona Career Ladder Research & Evaluation Project

&

Mr. Steve Fargo, Research Assistant

Center for Excellence in Education - Northern Arizona University

Box 5774 - Flagstaff, Arizona - 86011

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS

MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) "

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement Ph: (602) 523-5852

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- C This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
- ☐ Mino, changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
- Points of view or opinions stated in this documer do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Document presented to the

Joint Legislative Committee on Career Ladders

/ rizona State Capitol, House Wing

November 10, 1987



DIVERSITY OF RESPONSES AMONG TEN ARIZONA PILOT

TEST DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLANS

Dr. Richard D. Packard, Project Manager

On October 15, 1987, the <u>RESEARCH & EVALUATION: 1987 Preliminary Report for the Career Ladder Teacher Incentive and Development Program</u>, was presented to the Joint Legislative Committee on Career Ladders (Packard, 1987). Among several results taken from the 1987 evaluation cycle, and included in the report document, related to the following important finding - "There was a strong degree of difference among districts in teacher support for career ladder concepts." (p. 5)

Another related issue in the report, regards the factors of "change," and the idea that districts joined the career adder reform movement with a diversity of backgrounds, characteristics and levels of development. From the inning, some districts clearly required a much greater amount of change than did others. For instance, districts the already had a strong and validated evaluation process in place, experienced much less difficulty in implementing their career ladder plans than those who were in more of an advanced planning and developmental stage.

Districts should be aware that different developmental phases are natural and expected. The purpose of these is is not to cause any despair, in fact, the opposite should be true. The major reason for this position is that not pilot test provides a chance for all districts to improve their systems from whatever developmental stage they find themselves. Therefore, the district's career ladder leadership has great opportunities to enhance their educational system for a more effective influence on the goals of, "improvement in teacher and student achievement."

Comparisons of Agreement and Disagreement to Specific Career Ladder Concepts Within &

Among Pilot Test Career Ladder School Districts

The following tables compare agreement and disagreement responses of educators on specific career ladder concepts within and among pilot test career ladder school districts. The tables which follow show percentages of agreement and disagreement to career ladder concepts. Rankings are assigned scores, weighted high to low for each district. Document tables beginning on page 2 present items by survey categories on the following three scales:

- 1. Most-to-least favorable responses = (+3, +2, +1, -1, -2, -3)
- 2. Most favorable responses = (+3, +2, +1)
- 3. Least favorable responses = (-3, -2, -1)

For each item by district, +3 or -3 ratings indicate the most and least favorable responses to career ladder concepts, followed by +2 or -2 and +1 or -1 in descending order. The top three out of ten districts were assigned weighted scores on the positive side for each career ladder concept, with the highest agreement receiving a + 3, the second a + 2, and the third a + 1. The lowest agreement categories were assigned weighted scores on the negative side, with the bottom score receiving a - 3, the second a - 2, and the third from the bottom a - 1.

Pages 2, 7, 10, 14, 17 and 23, show composite "most and least" favorable responses for the five assessment subscales of, (1) General Career Ladder Concepts, (2) Staff Development and Training Concepts, (3) Teacher Evaluation System Concepts, (4) Peer Evaluation Concepts and (5) Career Ladder Placement Concepts. Following each of these summary tables are the "percentage agreement responses" for each subscale component by district.



GENERAL CAREER LADDER ()NCEPTS

Most and Least Favorable Responses

					Dı	stri	CI			
Items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7_	8_	9	10
Attracts Quality		+3		-3	+1		-2	+2	-1	
Retains Competence		+3		-3	+1		-1	+2	-2	
Improves Teaching		+3	-3	+1	+2		-1		-2	
Improves Achievement		+3	-3	+2	+1		-1	-1	-2	
Teacher Cooperation	-1		-3	+3		-1	+2		-2	+1
Helps Teacher Morale			-3	-2			-1	+3	+1	+2
Helps Teacher Status		+3	-3		+2		-2	+1	-1	+1
Financial Rewards		+3		-3		+1	-1		-2	+2
Personal Rewards		+2	-3	-1	+1				-2	+3
Clear Goals		+3	-2	-1	+1	+2	-3	+1		

Most Favorable Responses

					Di	stri	ct			
Items	1	2	3	4	5_	6	7	8	9_	10
Attracts Quality		+3			+]			+2		
Retains Competence		+3			+1			+ 2		
Improves Teaching		+3		+1	+2					
Improves Achievement		+3		÷ 2	+1					
Teacher Cooperation				+3			+2			+1
Helps Teacher Morale								+3	+1	+2
Helps Teacher Status		+3			+2			-1		∸ 1
Financial Rewards		+3				+1				+ 2
Personal Rewards		+2			+1					+3
Clear Goals		-3			+1	÷2		<u> </u>		

Least Favorable Responses

					D1	stri	Ct			
Items	1	2	3	4_	_ 5	6_	7_	3	9_	10
Attracts Quality				-3			-2		-1	
Retains Competence				-3			-1		-2	
Improves Teaching			-3				-1		-2	
Improves Achievement			-3				-1	-1	-2	
-	,		-3			_ 1	_	_	- 2	
Teacher Cooperation			•	_					-	
Helps Teacher Morale			-3	-2			-:		_	
Helps Teacher Status			-3				-2		-1	
Financial Rewards				-3			-1		-2	
Personal Fewards			-3	_ 1					-2	
			2	•			_ 2			
Clear Goals			- 2				3			





The Career Ladder Program (CLP) will attract high quality people into the teaching profession.

				Per	cent	age	Agre	emen	it		
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	£ 7	90	100
1				·		Х					47.3%
2								X			68.48
3						X					48.1%
4				X							36.78
5							Х				63.5%
6					X						45.5%
7					X						40.1%
8							X				€5.5%
9					X						41.7%
10						X					52.8%

The Career Ladder Program (CLP) will retain the most competent teachers in the classroom.

				Per	cent	.age	Agre	emen	t		
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
1		_			X			-			43.5%
2							X				61.0%
3					X						40.79
4			X								26.5%
5						X	•				54.3%
6				X							36.9%
7				X							31.0%
8						X					55.C%
9				X							30.8%
10						X					51.4%

The Career Ladder Program (CLP) will improve instruction.

				Per	cent	age .	Agre	emen	t		
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	03	90	100
1				_		X					57.5%
2								X			75.3%
3				X							33.9%
4							X				67.1%
5								X			69.48
6						Х					52.0%
7						Х					51.3%
8							X				61.7%
9					X						30.18
10							X				90.C%



The Career Ladder (CLP) will improve student progress.

				Per	cent	age	Agre	emen	t		
District	O	1 C	20	30	40	50	60	70	٤٥	9O	100
1						\overline{X}					51.2%
2								Х			72.08
3				X							31.6%
4							X				64.98
5							X				58.5%
6						X					47.0%
7					X.						45.6%
8					X						45.6%
9				X							33.1%
10						X	•				56.1%

The CLP encourages cooperation among teachers.

				Per	cent	age	Agre	emen	t		
District	O	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	စပ	100
1				<u> </u>		_					31.2%
2					X						37.6%
3		X									12.5%
4					х						43.5%
5					Х						36.7%
6				Х							32.28
7					х						40.08
8			:	X							25.9%
9			X								17.3%
10					X						38.5%

The CLP will improve teacher morale.

				Per	cent	ege	Agre	erren	t		
District	O	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
1			X								24.8%
2			X								26.3%
3	X										7.0%
4	X										8.3%
5				Х							35.0%
6			X								26.8%
7		X									11.98
8					X						36.68
9			Х								18.7%
10				X							36.2%



The CLP will improve the professional status of teachers in the eyes of the public.

	Percentage Agreement											
District	O	10	20	30	40	5 C	60	70	80	è0	100	
1						Х					52.5%	
2							Х				63.18	
3				Х							36.88	
4						Х					52.4%	
5							X				62.0%	
6						X					48.9%	
7					Х						43.0%	
3						23	,				55.0%	
9					х						43.5%	
10						Х					56.4%	

Monitary rewards available through the CLP are viewed as a significant incentive.

Percentage Agreement											
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
1	_							<u>X</u>			73.5%
2									Х		86.3%
3								X			70.7%
Ą					X						41.5%
5						Х	•				56.48
6								Х			75.2%
7							Х				61.5%
8								Х			70.5%
9							Х				59.48
10								х			76.1%

Intrinsic rewards (personal satisfaction) available through the CLP are viewed as a significant incentive.

	Percentage Agreement	
District		100
1	X	73.58
2	X	55.8%
3	X	26.3%
Ļ	Х	34.5%
5	X	48.0%
6	X	41.5%
7	X	39.08
٤	Х	45.8%
9	X	34.0%
10	X	61.6%
	5	



The district's career ladder goals and objectives have been clearly communicated to teachers.

Perce.	tage.	Largement	
LEICEI	Laue	NULCEMENT	

				1 0 1	CCIIC	.ugc	ngre	CHICLE	_		
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	60	90	100
1				-		X					54.3%
2								X			76.3%
3					X						37.9%
4					X						39.8%
5							X				60.78
6							Х	•			64.9%
7				×	[33.9%
8							х				60.98
9					У	•					47.6%
10					X	•					47.48



STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING CONCEPTS

Most and Least Favorable Responses

	Discrict								
Items 1	2	3	4	5	6	7_	8	-	10
Adequate Inservice	+ 3		+2			-1	+1	-3	-2
Administrators Well-									
trained in CLP	+3	-3	+2	+1		-]		-2	-1
Peer Evaluators									
Well-trained in CLP +3		-1	+2		+1	-2		-3	
Adequate District									
Support Resources		-3	÷2		+1	-1	+3		-2

Most Favorable Responses

	D: strict_											
Items 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10			
Adequate Inservice	+3		+2				+1					
Administrators Well-												
trained in CLP	+3		+2	+1								
Peer Evaluators												
Well-trained in CLP +3			+2		+1							
Adequate District												
Support Resources			+2		+1		+3					

Least Favorable Responses

	District										
Items	1	2	3	۲	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Adequate Inservice							-1		-3	- 2	
Administrators Well-											
trained in CLP			-3				-1		-2	-1	
Peer Evaluators											
Well-trained in CLP			-1				-2		-3		
Adequate District											
Support Resources			-3				-1			-2	



I have received adequate inservice on the CLP teacher evaluation system.

			_	Per	cent	age	Agre	emen	t		
District	O	10	20	30	4C	50	60	70	60	90	100
1	_	-				X					48.5%
2									X		79.7%
3						X					47.5%
4							X				63.2%
5						Σ.	2				54.9%
6							X				60.6%
7					X						43.5%
8							Х				61.48
9				X							35.6%
10					X						42.28

Administrators are well trained in the CLP evaluation system.

				Per	cent	age	Agre	emen	t		
District	0	10	20	20	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
1							X				58.1%
2									X		81.9%
3			X								25.4%
4									X		79.2%
5								X			73.1%
6							X				67.3%
7					X						42.3%
8							X				65.2%
9				X							31.5%
10					X						42.38

Peer Evaluators are well trained in the CLP evaluation system (if used).

	Percentage Agreement												
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	60	5 0	100		
1								X		_	73.48		
2							X				66.7%		
3				X							35.0%		
4								X			72.6%		
5							Х				60.08		
6								X			68.0%		
7				X							30.2%		
8						Х					50.0%		
9			Х								19.48		
10						X					52.4%		



The district provides adequate resources to help teachers gain the skills required for advancement on the ladder.

				Per	cent	ag e	Agre	emen	t		
District	_ 0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
1						<u>x</u>					52.0%
2							X				65.8%
3				X							33.9%
4									X		84.1%
5							Х				64 98
6								X			70.5%
7						Х					50.5%
8									X		86.0%
9						х					57.0%
10					X						37.3%



TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM CONCEPTS

Most and Least Favorable Responses

	District											
Items 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	- 6	-	10			
Teaching levels clear	+2	-3	-1		+1		+3	-2				
Fair Evaluations	+2	-3	+1	+3	+1	-1		-2				
Cc. sistent Procedures	+1	-3	+3	+2		-2		-2	-1			
Sufficient Observing	+2	-3	+3			-2	+1	٠ ٥	-1			
Worth the Benefits -1	+1		-2	+2			+2	-3				
Student Achieve ent -3	+1		-3	+2		-1	+3	-2				
Outcomes Reflect -1	+2	_ o		+2	+1			-2	+3			

Most Favorable Responses

	District											
Items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Teaching levels clear		+2				+1		+3				
Fair Evaluations		+2		+1	+3	+1						
Consistent Procedures		+1		+3	+2							
Sufficient Observing		+2		+3				+1				
Worth the Benefits		+1			+2			+2				
Student Achievement		+1			+2			+3				
Outcomes Reflect		+2			+2	+1				+3		

Least Favorable Responses

	District										
Items	1	2	3	4	5	_ 6	7	8	9_	10	
Teaching levels clear			-3	-1				_	-2		
Fair Evaluations			-3				-1		-2		
Consistent Procedures			-3				-2		-2	-1	
Sufficient Observing			- 3				-2		-3	-1	
Worth the Benefits	-1			-2					- 3		
Student Achievement	-3			-3			-1		-2		
Outcomes Reflect	-1		-3						-2		



The evaluation instruments clearly define the various levels of teaching ormance.

	Percentage Agreement												
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	ଓଠ	90	100		
ì							X				59.28		
2								X			74.4%		
3				43.9%									
4				50.6%									
5			72.48										
6								X			73.2%		
7						X					57.6%		
8								X			76.8%		
9						X					48.3%		
10							X				61.1%		

I feel that administrators evaluate teaching performance fairly for placement on the ladder.

	Percentage Agreement												
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
1							X				62.8%		
2								X			73.1%		
3			40.4%										
4			71.6%										
5			74.7%										
6								X			71.7%		
7						X					57.3%		
8							X				66.7%		
9						X					50.4%		
10							X				62.5%		

The CLP evaluation procedures are structured in such a manner to insure consistency among evaluators.

	Percentage Agreement														
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100				
1							X				58.38				
2				59.7%											
3		Х													
4		x													
5		X													
6						X					€1.3% 51.7%				
7				Х							33.8%				
8						}	ζ				53.7%				
9				x							33.4%				
10					X						45.4%				



The amount of time evaluators spend observing teachers is sufficient to ensure proper placements on the ladder.

Percentage Agreement												
District	O] ()	20	30	40	50	60	70	£,O	è.O	100	
1				_			X				64.68	
2								X			72.5%	
3				Х					30.5%			
4									X		79.2%	
5							X				66.88	
6						X					57.5%	
7					Х				39.7%			
8							Х				67.3%	
9				X							30.6%	
10						X					52.0%	

Time required for the CLP evaluation process is worth the benefits gained.

Percentage Agreement													
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
1					X	_				-	39.78		
2							X				62.7%		
3					X						43.1%		
4				X							33.6%		
5							X				58.4%		
6					X						41.3%		
7					X						43.3%		
8							X				61.2%		
9					X						29.0%		
10						X					49.5%		

An appropriate amoung of emphasis is placed on student achievement and its relation to my CLP evaluation.

	Percentage Agreement										
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	03	90	100
1					X					-	41.78
2							X				61.5%
3							X				58.9%
4					Х						41.8%
5								X			69.3%
6							X				59.2%
7							X				54.2%
8								X			72.1%
9					Х						44.68
10						:	X				55.2%



Student Outcomes required by the CLP are a good reflection of my teaching performance.

Percentage Agreement													
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
1				X					_	-	30.3%		
2					Х						46.7%		
3			X								23.5%		
4		X											
5					Х						46.8%		
6					х						44.5%		
7					X						41.5%		
8					X						38.6%		
9			х								26.1%		
10						Х					56.4%		



PEER EVALUATION CONCEPTS

Most and Leart Fryorable Responses

	District									
Items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	ક	ā	10
Chosen for Qualities	+1	_	+2	+3	+2		-1	- 3	-2	
Well Trained										
Evaluators	+2			+3	+1		-3	-1	-2	
Enough Teacher Input										
In Peer Selection		+1	+1		+2 .		-1	-3	+3	-2
Evaluation Only for										
Improvement	-2	+3					+2	41	-1	- 3
Evaluation Only for										
Placement		-1	+1				-2	-3	+2	+3
Peer Evaluation Helps	3									
Cooperation	+1	-1		+2	+3				-3	-2

Most Favorable Responses

	District									
Items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Chosen for Qualities	+1		+2	+3	+2		-			
Well Trained										
Evaluators	+2			+3	+1					
Enough Teacher Input										
In Peer Selection		+1	+1		+2				+3	
Evaluation Only for										
Improvement		+3					+2	+1		
Evaluation Only for										
Placement			+1						+2	+3
Peer Evaluation Help	s									
Cooperation	+1			+2	+3					

Least Favorable Responses

					Dis	stri	ct			
Items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	3	9	10
Chosen for Qualities Well Trained			_				-1	-3	-2	
Evaluators							-3	-1	-2	
Enough Teacher Input In Peer Selection							-1	-3		-2
Evaluation Only for Improvement -:	2								-1	-3
Evaluation Only for Placement		-1					-2	-3		
Peer Evaluation Helps Cooperation		-1							-3	-2





Peer evaluation is only being used formatively (to assist teachers in the improvement of instruction.

	Percentage Agreement											
District	\circ	3 C	20	3 0	40	50	60	70	୧୦	90	100	
1				X		_	_				27.38	
2									X		83.9%	
3						Х					50.0%	
4							X				62.3%	
5							X				58.9%	
6							X				64.1%	
' '								X			69.2%	
ខ							X				66.7%	
9				Х							32.9%	
10			Х								26.1%	

Peer evaluation is only being used summatively (to make decisions about placement in the CLP).

Percentage Agreement												
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
1					X						43.98	
2				X							31.7%	
3					X						45.5%	
4				X							32.2%	
5					X						38.3%	
6					X						38.9%	
7				X							27.6%	
8	X											
9					X						47.7%	
10								X			70.8%	

I believe peer evaluation in my district encourages cooperative staff efforts.

				Per	cent	age	Agre	emen	t		
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	/0	80	90	100
1						X		-			48.08
2					X						41.0%
3					Х						41.7%
4							X				66.78
5								X			73.48
6					х						47.28
7					y.						46.5%
8					Х						42.98
9			x								24.9%
10			X								26.5%



CAREER LADDER PLACEMENT CONCEPTS

Most and Least Favorable	Res	pons	es	Di	stri	ct			
Items 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Fair Appeal Process	+2		- 3	+1	+3	-2		<u>-1</u>	
Criteria Understood	+3	-1	-2		+2	- 3	 1	-2	
Present Level OK +1			-2		+3	+2	-3	-3	-1
Challenging Criteria	+1	-3		+2		-1	+3	-2	
Specific Standards +1		- 3	-1	+3		-2	+2		
Enough Material Help	+2	-1	+3		+1	- 3			-2
Promotion Opportunity	+2	-3	-1	+1			+3	-1	-2
Involvement in Dev.	-3	+1	-1		+2	-2	+3		
Significant Benefits	+3	-1	+1	+1			+2	-3	-2
Clear Non-Tchr Stand.	+3	-3		+1		-1	+2		- 3
Level Responsibility -3		- 3		+2		-1	+3	-2	
Resources to Place		-2		+2	+1	-3	+3	-1	-1
Input for Revising	-2	_		÷1	+2	- 3	+3	-1	
11,540 201 1.012511.9	_			•	-	J	. •	-	
Most Favorable Responses				Di	stri	ct			
Items 1	2	3	4	5	6		8	9	10
Fair Appeal Process	+2			+1	+3				
Criteria Underst.ood	+3				+2		+1		
Present Level OK +1					+3	+2			
Challenging Criteria	+1			+2			+3		
Specific Standards +1				+3			+2		
Enough Material Help	+2		+3	_	+1				
Promotion Opportunity	+2		_	+1	_		+3		
Involvement in Dev.		+1		_	+2		+3		
Significant Benefits	+3	-	+1	+1	-		+2		
Clear Non-Tchr Stand.	+3			+1			+2		
Level Responsibility	+1			+2			+3		
Resources to Place				+2	+1		+3		
Input for Revising				+1	+2		+3		
input for kevising				7.7	72		٦ ٦		
Least Favorable Response	s			Di	stri	ct			
Items 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Fair Appeal Process			-3			-2		-1	
Criteria Understood		-1	-2			-3		-2	
Present Level OK		-	-2			•	-3	-3	-1
Challenging Criteria		- 3	-			-1	•	-2	_
Specific Standards		- 3	-1			-2		-	
Enough Material Help		-1	- 1			- 3			-2
Promotion Opportunity		-3	-1			-3		-1	-2
Involvement in Dev.	-3	-3	-1			-2		-1	- 2
	-3	-1	-1			- 2		-3	-2
Significant Benefits		-1 -3				-1		-3	-2 -3
Clear Non-Tchr Stand.		-3 -3				-1 -1		-2	-5
Level Responsibility -3		-3 -2				-1 -3			-1
Resources to Place	^	- 2				-		-1	-1
Input for Revising	-2					-3		-1	



The CLP includes a fair appeal process for disagreements over placement on the ladder.

				Per	cent	age.	Agre	emen	t		
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	6C	70	୧୦	90	100
1						Х					48.68
2								X			73.4%
3						Σ.					50.08
4			X								25.9%
5							X				64.0%
6								X			77.68
7					X						39.2%
8							Х				60.0%
9					X						42.78
10							X				61.6%

Teachers clearly understand what is expected of them in order to advance on the ladder.

				Per	cent	age .	Agre	emen	t		
District	o	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
1						X					56.3%
2								X			74.7%
3					X						46.78
4					X						42.5%
5						X					55.0%
6							X				66.8%
7					X						40.78
8							X				58.3%
9					X						42.3%
10					X						47.2%

Teachers can feel comfortable about choosing to remain at the same level on the ladder.

				Per	cent	age	Agre	emen	t		
District	O	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
1	•					X					57.1%
2						х					51.4%
3					x						45.6%
4						х					49.28
5						x					51.9%
6								X			74.78
7							Х				61.88
8					x						45.3%
ò					x						45.1%
10						X					50.6%



The criteria for career ladder levels are challenging enough so that only the most competent teachers advance.

				Per	cent	ag e	Agre	em e n	t		
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	6.0	90	100
1						Χ					48.18
2							X				58.4%
3				X							32.7%
4					X						43.5%
5							X				61.6%
6					Х						39.1%
7				Х							35.6%
8							X				65.3%
9				Х							33.3%
10						X					52.4%

The CLP clearly specifies standards for judging the contents of material submitted for CLP evaluation (portfolio, growth plan, etc.).

Percentage Agreement

rerechted in the comment											
0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
						X				60.48	
						X				59.4%	
			X							33.9%	
				X						44.68	
						X				63.48	
						X				59.2%	
				X						42.3%	
						X				61.9%	
					X					51.8%	
					X					52.€%	
	0	0 10	0 10 20	0 10 20 30	0 10 20 30 40 X	0 10 20 30 40 50 X X X	0 10 20 30 40 50 60 X X X X X X X X X X X X X	0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 X X X X X X X X X X X X X	0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 X X X X X X X X X X X X X	0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	

Adequate assistance is being provided to teachers regarding the development of materials submitted for CLP evaluation.

				Per	cent	age	Agre	emen	t		
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
1					X						41.6%
2						×					55.7%
3				X							35.8%
4							Х				65.1%
5					X						43.5%
6						X					52.48
7				X							28.0%
8					X						40.78
9					X						45.48
10				X							29.0%
					1	a					



Our CLP provides teachers with opportunities for continued advancement without leaving the classroom on a full-time basis.

	Percentage Agreement											
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	60	90	10C	
1							X			_	62.78	
2								X			74.5%	
3					X						44.6%	
4							X				58.1%	
5								X			72.2%	
6								X			70.6%	
7							X				63.1%	
8									X		£0.08	
9							Х				58.9₹	
10					X						46.3%	

Teachers are adequately involved in the development of the district career ladder program.

	Percentage Agreement												
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
1						X					47.6%		
2				Х							35.9%		
3				65.5%									
4		Х Х											
5				58.9%									
6								X			72.4%		
7					X						38.3%		
8								Х	•		75.4%		
9						X					49.7%		
10						X					51.4%		

The positive effects of higher level responsibilities (teacher mentor, etc.) outweigh the possible disadvantages of being released part-time from classroom assignments.

	Percentage Agreement										
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	60	90	100
1					X						45.28
2							X				62.3%
3					X						42.3%
4						X					53.6%
5						X					53.8%
6						X					50.3%
7					X						45.3%
8							X				60.48
9					X						39.3%
10					Х						40.28
					20)					



Clear criteria for CLP participation have been established for personnel whose job description differs from a regular classroom teacher.

				Per	cent	age	Agre	70 80 90 100 39.48 52.98							
District	O	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	6,0	<u> 90</u>					
1					<u>x</u>						39.48				
2						X					52.9%				
3			X								20.4%				
4					X						41.8%				
5						X					47.88				
6				X							37.1%				
7			Х								22.6%				
8						X					50.08				
9			х								27.0%				
10			X								24.4%				

Higher level responsibilities in the CLP are appropriate assignments for whose teachers selected for advancement.

Percentage Agreement

				LET	Cenc	aye	nyre	emen			53.6% 69.6% 53.8% 61.7% 73.6% 61.9% 60.1% 80.4%							
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90								
1						X					53.6%							
2								X			69.68							
3						Х					53.8%							
4							X				61.7%							
5								X			73.6%							
6							х				61.9%							
7							х				60.1%							
8									X		80.48							
9						X	[54.6%							
10							X				66.3%							

The district has an adequate number of trained personnel to effectively place candidates on the career ladder.

		X 53.99 X 38.99 X 00.99											
District	C	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
1						X					54.98		
2						X					53.9%		
3					X						38.98		
4							X				60.98		
5							X				65.6%		
6							X				61.9%		
7				X							28.1%		
8								х			75.0%		
9					Х						39.1%		
10					X						39.6%		



The district has established a means for adequate teacher input concerning possible revisions.

	Percentage Agreement											
District	C	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	60	90	100	
1		_				X					50.08	
2					X						12.68	
3						X					51.8%	
4						X					50.08	
5							Χ				58.3%	
6							X	•			64.5%	
7				X							27.9%	
8								X			72.3%	
9					X						43.2%	
10					X	•					46.8%	



ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE SURVEY

Most-to-Least Favoral	hle	Resn	0756	G	Di	stri	ct			
Items	1	2	3		5,	6	7	8	9	10
Feeling of Belonging			-1		$-\frac{1}{+2}$	+3	-2			$-\frac{1}{3}$
Feel ng of Success	+1		- 3	+1	٠ ـ	2.5	-1	+2	+1	-2
Feel Rewarded		+2	-1	-3		- 3	-2	+1	• -	_
Clear Purpose	+2		-3		-1	+1	-1	+3	+1	-2
Consistent Feedback			-2	+3	-	+1	-1	+2	• -	-2
Supportive Setting		-1	-2	+2	+1	+3	-1		+1	-3
Leadership Mode_s		-1	-2	+3	+1	+2	-1		7 1	- 3
Less Stress			-2 -1	- 2	T.	+3	-1	. 2	4 O	-3 +1
			_		2			-3 +3	+2	
Feel Important	+2	_	-1	+1	-2	+3		5-۳	+1	-3
Feel Job Secure	+1	-2	-3			+3	-1		+2	_
Clear Goals			-3	+3	+2	_	-1	_	+1	-2
Good Social Network			-2		+1	+3	-1	-2	+2	-3
Good Communication			- 3	+3		+2	-1		+1	-2
Most Favorable Respon	nse	2			Di	stri	ct			
Items	1	2	3	4	5		7	8	9	10
Feeling of Belonging		+2			+2	+3				
Feeling of Success	+1	72		+1	72	+3		4 0	. 1	
Feel Rewarded	±1			Τ1				+2	+1	
		+2				+3		+1		
Clear Purpose	+2					+1		+3	+1	
Consistent Feedback				+3		+1		+2	_	
Supportive Setting				+2	+1				+1	
Leadership Models				+3	+1	+2				
Less Stress						+3			+2	+1
Feel Important	÷2			+1		+3	+1	+3	+1	
Feel Job Secure	+1					+3			+2	
Clear Goals				+3	+2				+1	
Good Social Network					+1	+3			+2	
Good Communication				+3	_	+2			+1	
Tarak Basasa Na Basas	_									
Least Favorable Response	_		_	_		stri		_	_	
Items	1_	2	3	4	<u>5</u>	6_		8	9	10
Feeling of Belonging			-1				-2			- 3
Feeling of Success			- 3				-1			-2
Feel Rewarded			-1	- 3			-2			
Clear Purpose			- 3		-1		-1			-2
Consistent Feedback			-2				-1			-2
Supportive Setting		-1	-2				-1			-3
Leadership Models			-2				-1			-3
Less Stress			-1	-2				- 3		
Feel Important			- 1	_	-2			_		-3
Feel Job Secure		-2	-3		~		-1			-
Clear Gcals			-3				-1			-2
Good Social Network			-2				-1	-2		-3
Good Communication			-2 -3				-1 -1	- 2		-3 -2
Good Communication			- <i>3</i>				-1			-2



I have a feeling of belonging.

				Per	cent	age	Agre	emen	t				
District	0]()	20	3C	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
1		_					-		$\overline{\mathbf{x}}$		78.78		
2									X		82.2%		
3		X											
4		Х											
5		X 69.0 X 82.											
6									X		84.68		
7						X 65.9							
8								X			71.2%		
9									X		77.7%		
10							X				63.7%		

I have feelings of being successful in my job assignment.

Percentage Agreement												
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70_	80	90	100	
1										X	91.8%	
2										X	88.9%	
3								X			77.2%	
4										X	91.7%	
5										X	89.8%	
6										X	93.7%	
7									X		86.1%	
8										X	92.1%	
9										X	91.7%	
10									X		82.2%	

I have a feeling of being rewarded for a job well done.

_	Percentage Agreement												
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
1					_		Σ	_		_	57.6%		
2								X			68.3%		
3						X					51.7%		
4				X							36.1%		
5							X				59.6%		
6								X			69.7%		
7						X					51.0%		
8							X				63.5%		
9							Х				62.08		
10						X					52.9%		



I feel my work has a clear purpose.

				Per	cent	age	Agre	emen	t		
District _	O	10	50	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
1										X	93.0%
2										X	94.0%
3									X		80.7%
4										X	90.5%
5										X	87.5%
6										X	92.0%
7									X		87.4%
8											X 98.48
9										X	92.28
10									X		86.7%

I am consistently provided knowledge of progress.

Percentage Agreement

				Per	X 59 X 39 X 71 X 61 X 66 X 55 X 67								
District	C	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
1						-	X		_		64.7%		
2							X				59.0%		
3													
4													
5													
6							X				66.3%		
7						2	ζ				55.6%		
8								X			67.8%		
9							Х				63.8%		
10						X					47.6%		

I am provided a cooperative working environment.

Percentage Agreement

				rei	Cent	-aye	MOTE	emen	L		
District	0	_10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
1									X		82.48
2								У.	•		76.4%
3								Х			75.9%
4									>	(86.9%
5									Х		83.7%
6										Х	88.0%
7								Х			76.2%
8									x		78.3%
9									Х		83.9%
10						X					50.5%



I am provided good leadership models.

Percentage Agreement												
District	O	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
1	_							X.			70.1%	
2								X			70.8%	
3						X					53.6%	
4									X		83.3%	
5									X		79.2€	
6									X		81.38	
7								X			67.7%	
8								X			70.0%	
9								X			75.98	
10					X						46.3%	

I work in an environment free from excessive stress.

				Per	cent	age	Agreement 60 70 80 90 100									
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100					
1				<u>_</u>							34.78					
2				X							30.2%					
3		X 29.3%														
4		Х 2														
5				31.8%												
6						X					51.3%					
7				Х							34.3%					
8			X								21.0%					
9					X						47.0%					
10					X						43.4%					

I feel my job has functional importance to the organization.

•											
Percentage Agreement											
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	60	90	100
1										X	90.0%
2										X	88.98
3										X	87.7%
4										X	89.38
5									Х		86.48
6										Х	91.3%
7										X	89.3%
8										Х	91.8%
9										X	89.98
10									Х		84.6%



I feel secure about my job status.

District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	୧୦	90	100
1									X		85.28
2								X			74.18
3								X			70.7%
4									X		84.5%
5									X		84.8%
6										Х	91.18
7									X		78.9%
8									X		83.9%
9										X	89.1%
10									X		80.4%

Organizational goals are clearly communicated.

Percentage Agreement											
District	0	10	20		40	50	_	70	80	90	100
1		-						X			71.6%
2								X			68.1%
3				X							35.1%
4									X		85.5%
5									X		77.7%
6		X									73.2%
7							X				58.7%
8							X				60.7%
9								X			74.9%
10						X					48.6%

I feel there is a strong social network in my organization.

	Percentage Agreement											
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
1							X				63.5%	
2							X				59.98	
3		X 48.2										
4							X				62.7%	
5		X									64.6%	
6								Х			73.1%	
7		X 55.2										
8						X					48.3%	
9								X			69.98	
10					X						41.2%	



I feel good about the communication level in my organization.

	Percentage Agreement											
District	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
<u> </u>							X				59.1%	
2							X				58.0%	
3				Х							35.7%	
4								X			72.8%	
5							X				66.9%	
6								X			68.5%	
7						X					49.25	
8						;	X.				55.7₹	
9								x			67.5%	
10					X						39.6%	

Conclusion

This document showed percentages of agreement and disagreement on specific career ladder concepts, and weighted scores for high and low district rankings. Districts are advised to study the findings in this report and focus on pursuit of any needed improvements.

Because districts began their programs from different levels of development, there is little advantage to compare their own total positive and negative rankings with other districts. Although, if a school should desire to make improvements in certain areas of concern, contact with a district or school which is clearly showing success, would follow the intent of the pilot test evaluation model. As a brief reminder, that model is one in which districts plan, and study their developmental needs over the period of the pilot test and continue to improve career ladder plans all the way through to project completion.

REFERENCES

Packard, R. D. (1987, October 15). RESEARCH & EVALUATION: 1987 Preliminary report for the Career Ladder Teacher Incentive and Development Program. Document presented at the October 1987 meeting of the Joint Legislative Committee on Career Ladders, Arizona State Capitol, House Wing.



OUTLINE OF SIMILARITIES & DIVERSITIES IN ACHIEVEING PERFORMANCE TARGETS & CONDITIONS OF PILOT TEST CAREER LADDER PROGRAMS IN THE STATE OF ARIZONA

Two all encompassing performance targets involved in the Arizona Career Ladder Research and Evaluation Project (CL) have been identified. These are, enhancement of "Teacher Performance," and the overriding issue of improvement in "Student Academic Achievement."

- A. Improvement in Student Academic Achievement is the priority target for the career ladder program.
 - 1. All career ladder district plans have student achievement goals as a top priority.
 - 2. All districts are in the process of establishing unique and specific ways of developing student achievement objectives as one of the central components of teacher evaluation input and for determination of placement levels on the ladder.
 - 3. Important to the research and evaluation project efforts is the study of the diversity and adequacy of ways student achievement is being developed and utilized as a part of teacher evaluation within districts.
 - 4. The CL evaluation project is beginning an extensive study involving the association between career ladder teachers and student academic achievement. Mapping of teacher progress, as it relates to student achievement, is an important part of the pilot test program.
- B. All CL districts have individual plans and models for the evaluation and development of teacher performance.
 - Past research has established positive relations between levels of teacher performance and student
 achievement. Furthermore, research has found that there are many diverse teaching methods which are
 related to improving student achievement and that there are differences in the levels of expertise teachers
 have in delivery of these methods.
 - 2. All districts are in the process of developing and implementing unique and specific ways of teacher evaluation for enhancement of teacher performance and for placement on the career ladder.
 - 3. Study of the diversity and adequacy of ways teachers are evaluated and how district plans are enhancing teacher performance are very important considerations for the research project.
- C. In addition to this report, three manuscripts have been distributed to the Joint Legislative Committee on Career Ladders and to participating career ladder school districts. They are listed as follows:
 - 1. Packard, R., Dereshiwsky, M., Groenendal, J. & Kundin, K. (1987). <u>Descriptive & analytical results for the 1986-87 career ladder data cycles</u>.
 - 2. Packard, R. & Nichols, W. (1987). Qualitative analysis & results for the 1987 data cycle by career ladder program strengths & weaknesses.
 - 3. Packard, R. & Fargo, S. (1987). Diversity of responses among ten Arizona pilot test district career ladder plans.

