

Merit Salary Programs

in Six Selected School Districts

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Office of Education

ERRATUM

Re "Merit Salary Programs in Six Selected School Districts," OE-23026

At the upper right of the title page, please change "Bulletin 1963, No. 5" to
"Bulletin 1963, No. 22." Thank you.

Merit Salary Programs

in Six Selected School Districts

By

JAMES P. STEFFENSEN, *Specialist*
Employed School Personnel Administration

Bulletin 1963, No. 5

22

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION,
AND WELFARE Anthony J. Celebrezze, *Secretary***
Office of Education . . . Wayne O. Reed, *Acting Commissioner*

Contents

	Page
FOREWORD.....	V
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Some Major Considerations.....	7
III. The Salary Schedule.....	19
IV. Evaluation Procedure.....	31
V. Summary.....	45
VI. Extracts From Programs.....	49

Foreword

A VARIETY of proposals exists for the improvement of the teacher salary structure so that the schools can compete more realistically for new staff and can encourage and reward the growth of the existing staff. The need to elevate the maximum salaries to which teachers may aspire is frequently basic to such proposals. The desirability of recognizing superior teaching performance on a differential salary basis is also cited. One proposal, which is periodically offered as a resolution to these concerns, is the adoption of a merit salary policy for teachers.

This bulletin is an examination of the practices and procedures for the administration of a merit salary policy as part of the teacher compensation program. It analyzes the procedures for the implementation of a merit salary policy in six school districts which are prominent examples in this field. In addition, it touches upon a few basic points on which some agreement and conflict are apparent. The advisability of a merit salary policy is a rather controversial question, and this report is presented only as a description of the six programs. It concentrates on the administrative features and refrains from value judgments relating to policies among the six as well as with respect to the pros and cons of merit rating.

The Office of Education wishes to extend its sincere appreciation to the school systems and their superintendents who cooperated in the preparation of this bulletin.

*ERIC R. BABER, Assistant Commissioner,
Division of Elementary and Secondary Education.*

*FRED F. BEACH, Director,
Administration of State and Local School Systems.*

Chapter I

Introduction

THE SCHOOLS of the Nation face many problems which are a direct result of the lack of sufficient financial resources available to those schools. These problems would include adequate instructional material, buildings, and staff. For those affecting the staff, teacher compensation is of major concern.

Beyond the critical issue of the appropriate means through which sufficient funds to support salaries might be established, there is also the issue of the policies through which these funds should be distributed for the compensation of teaching services. Currently, the most common method of administering a teacher compensation program is through the use of a single salary schedule which differentiates salaries only on the bases of years of experience and level of training. Other factors for differentiation which are presently being utilized include sex, dependents, test scores, extra assignments, and promotion to positions involving additional responsibilities.

There are at least three other bases for differentiation which receive some attention. First, there is the suggestion that the salary schedule for teachers should reflect the current imbalance of supply and demand in particular areas of college study. Physics and mathematics teachers, for example, are not available at current salary rates to meet the demand in our secondary schools. Hence, it is argued there should be a salary differential which enables the schools to compete with other employing groups for the most capable college graduates in those fields.

The second proposal is to provide greater differentiation of assignments within the teaching staff. With such a differentiation—e.g., team teachers, teaching aides—there can be provided position specifications which establish different degrees of responsibility and, hence, a differentiated salary on the basis of the level of responsibility. The use of an extended contract to provide compensation for professional activities conducted during the summer, such as teaching or curriculum development, is another example of such additional salary for additional responsibilities.

But over and above these practices and proposals, one of the most publicized issues in salary policy development is that of differentiating

salaries on the basis of differentiated levels of teaching effectiveness, with that effectiveness to be defined through an evaluation of the teacher's level of performance with respect to certain locally established criteria. This is the definition of a merit salary program used throughout the remainder of this publication.

Purpose of This Bulletin

A good deal of interest currently exists in the merit salary programs for teachers. This interest is not at all confined to those individuals—the teachers—so directly affected by such salary policies. A number of statements on merit programs have appeared recently in current literature which have contributed to the discussions by the lay citizen as well as the professional educator.

The Office of Education receives a large number of requests for information on salary programs for teachers. This is a result of the national interest in improving the quality of education through salary programs for teachers. The Office of Education has little material available through which requests concerning merit programs can be satisfied. It is the purpose of this bulletin to provide a ready reference for those individuals who are interested in the policies and procedures which describe a few selected merit programs as they are now operating.

Six school systems,¹ each receiving a high degree of national attention on their existing merit programs, have cooperated in this endeavor. These districts have been queried as to the types of requests for information which they receive. The material which follows attempts to answer the more common questions which are raised and to provide at least a minimal understanding of the policies and regulations under which current plans are administered. The absence of such a statement as this has apparently forced many groups to become involved in the pros and cons of the desirability of a merit program, with little understanding of the actual practices within merit programs or of the controversies and agreements existing within and among such plans as they actually operate.

Finally, it must be emphasized that it is not the purpose of this bulletin to enter the merit vs. nonmerit controversy over salary policies. The analysis is purely internal, within school merit programs which are now in operation.

¹ Canton, Conn.; Ladue, Mo.; Rich Township High School, Park Forest, Ill.; Summit, N.J.; Weber School District, Ogden Utah; and West Hartford, Conn.

Some Definitions

It is assumed that many of the readers of this publication are not familiar with the terminology commonly utilized to describe procedures for the development and administration of teachers' salary schedules. Also, a few such expressions are unique to merit schedules. For these two reasons, the following definitions, not necessarily standard but applying to this text, are given:

Merit salary program.—A procedure for differentiating salaries on the basis of demonstrated performance between two or more teachers with similar instructional assignments. Thus, a salary differential paid to a departmental chairman or to team teaching leaders is not considered, within these districts, to be a part of a merit salary program. Persons receiving such a differential in salary would be selected for the assignment on the basis of an appraisal, but the additional pay would be for the performance of additional duties. A salary differential based upon a performance appraisal between two third-grade teachers, for example, with similar experience and education would be considered as a merit salary. The merit program consists of two basic parts—the evaluation or rating and the merit award or salary based upon that rating.

Single salary schedule.—The structure through which salary policies are currently administered in the vast majority of the school districts of the Nation. It is based upon two elements—experience and preparation. It does not distinguish on the bases of grade levels or subjects taught, marital status or number of dependents, or sex. Typically, there will be a specified number of years in which the maximum salary can be attained, and there will be one or more classifications or columns which recognize the earning of additional degrees or hours of course work.

Basic salary schedule.—A district with a merit salary program may administer two separate schedules. The first is the basic and generally single salary schedule. The second is the schedule which provides for the merit awards. Several of the six districts discussed here have only one and hence a basic schedule. Within the text, the basic schedule refers to the single salary schedule for the teachers not receiving merit awards.

Minimum beginning salary.—The minimum starting salary for a teacher new to the district, with a bachelor's degree, but no previous teaching experience.

Maximum salary attainable.—The highest salary which the teacher can attain in the district without being assigned additional duties. A degree above a bachelor's may or may not be a prerequisite.

Minimum years to maximum.—The shortest possible time span in which a beginning teacher with a bachelor's degree only can advance to the maximum salary attainable.

Recognition of advanced degree.—The attainment of an automatic salary award on the basis of an earned advanced degree. This may be in the form of an additional column on the schedule providing for a higher salary and/or it may result in a provision permitting a higher maximum through an additional number of steps on the schedule.

Salary schedule steps.—Normally, each step is 1 year on the movement from the minimum to the maximum salaries. However, there may also be acceleration in which multiple steps are attained in 1 year.

Increments.—Each step is assumed to have a monetary value approximating an annual raise exclusive of any general elevation of the salary schedule. This is true of the single salary schedule. It may or may not be true of the merit schedules described here. Within these schedules, the increment may vary from year to year or between different classifications of merit teachers.

A numerical rating.—The result of a procedure which reduces the formal and informal evaluation processes to an arithmetical score and from which the amount of the merit increment is determined.

Voluntary participation.—A provision by which teachers are evaluated for the merit salary program only with their prior consent. This does not, of course, apply to the standard staff evaluation program. Only one district in the six studied has such a provision.

A quota on merit awards.—A limitation on the number of teachers who can be receiving a merit award at any one time. The standards of "superior" or "competent" are based solely upon the district norms and do not relate these standards to any national, professional, or other norm.

The limits of the teaching role.—The evaluation program may be limited to the classroom, or it may be expanded to include the teacher's responsibilities and contributions to his school, district, community, profession, and the Nation.

The evaluator.—The individual(s) maintaining the responsibility for the preparation of statements describing the performance level of the teaching staff for the purpose of salary determination. This responsibility need not necessarily, but ordinarily would, include any remedial or developmental work with the teacher. Within this text, the primary evaluator is, with one exception, the teacher's principal.

Classification of performance levels.—Within this text, the variations in performance levels as determined by the evaluation of the staff are determinants of the annual salary which the staff members receive. These performance levels might be considered correlative with such descriptive phrases as superior, competent, and outstanding. Since three of the six districts do not use the term "merit" to describe their programs, a merit vs. nonmerit classification would be misleading. However, within the chapter on salary programs, performance levels are classified according to placement on the salary schedule.

Final evaluation conference.—The conference between the teacher and the principal at which time the final appraisal which determines the salary is developed and/or reported to the teacher. This should not be confused with the periodic formal or informal principal-teacher conferences which take place throughout the year.

The merit award—also merit increment.—Generally, the merit award refers to the annual increase in salary beyond that which is received by those teachers on the basic salary schedule or the nonmeritorious teacher. However, the award may also be in the form of acceleration upward on the schedule (2 or more steps in 1 year), or it may be in the form of supermaximum, a step or more beyond that attainable on the basic schedule. (The withholding of the annual increment is, in a sense, a form of a merit schedule.)

Rating procedure.—Examination of the procedures utilized in the six selected school systems will reveal two rather contrasting approaches to the evaluation process. One is to place great emphasis upon the development of specific,

detailed, evaluative criteria which may be checked or rated and then weighted in the summation of a final numerical score. The other is to rely almost entirely upon descriptive statements of the evaluator and evaluatee—statements which are based upon some prescribed criteria but which are narrative in nature rather than statistical and which do not produce a final numerical rating.

It would be inappropriate to use the terms "objective" and "subjective" to contrast these two approaches. A subjective evaluation is, by definition, inclusive of personal bias. An objective one is, by definition, impersonal and unprejudiced. Each of these six districts would accept the apparent fact that a degree of subjectivity must exist within their evaluation procedures, regardless of the degree of specificity of criteria. Each would also stress the effort to be as unprejudiced and consistent as possible, regardless of the absence of measurable data upon which the evaluation might be based.

The evident contrast between the two evaluation approaches might be stated as one of "quantification" rather than subjectivity or objectivity. Within this text, then, quantification is used to describe the extent to which an arithmetical score is compiled, weighted, and summed as an indication of the performance level of the teacher.

Six School Districts Studied

A brief description is given here of each of the six school systems having a salary policy which recognizes competency on the basis of an evaluation of past performance and whose merit programs are studied. The superintendents, or their representatives, met twice in the spring of 1962. The Office of Education was invited to have a representative attend each of these meetings. At the conclusion of the second meeting, these six districts agreed to cooperate in the preparation of this publication. Their cooperation was defined as (1) the provision of the necessary informational material for the compilation of a statement, and (2) a review of the data in regard to omissions, additions, and corrections of factual statements relating to each individual school district's merit program. The six school systems include:

Canton, Conn.—The Canton schools are located at Collinsville, a Hartford suburb. The enrollment is approximately 1,200 with an instructional staff of 55. The present salary policy has been in effect since 1957.

Ladue, Mo.—Ladue is a St. Louis suburb. The enrollment is approximately 5,000, with an instructional staff of 300. The present salary policy has been in effect since 1954.

Rich Township High School, Park Forest, Ill.—Park Forest is a Chicago suburb. Rich Township High School is a separate high school district, grades 9–12, with an enrollment of approximately 2,300 and an instructional staff of 125. The present salary policy has been in effect since 1953.

Summit, N.J.—Summit is a suburban community west of Newark. The enrollment is approximately 4,200, with an instructional staff of 240. The present salary policy has been in effect since 1959. (An informal procedure dates as far back as 1937.)

Weber School District, Utah.—Weber is a county district surrounding the city of Ogden. The enrollment is approximately 14,000, with an instructional staff of 560. The present salary policy has been in effect since 1958.

West Hartford, Conn.—West Hartford is a suburban district. The enrollment is approximately 12,500, with an instructional staff of 700. A merit salary policy has been in effect since 1953. The current program, however, was initiated in 1960.

Organization of the Bulletin

The six merit programs are presented through an analysis of three major topics. First, attention is given to the goals of the salary program. Second, the salary schedule itself is examined, including the provisions for the merit awards as well as the basic salary schedule. Third, the evaluation procedure through which the merit award is determined is discussed. In addition, one chapter is devoted to extracts or examples of material and forms currently utilized within these six districts.

The major portion of the material is, of course, a collection of direct statements from pamphlets and regulations prepared for use within each of the six districts. The reliance upon such a source has resulted in a highly mechanical approach to staff personnel administration. Therefore, the description of the evaluation procedures in impersonal terms should be viewed in light of the source of the information—the printed materials—which are in themselves impersonal. The salary schedules listed are for the 1962-63 school year.

Chapter II

Some Major Considerations

MUCH OF THE MATERIAL in the chapters to follow describes the six merit programs in such a way as to point up differences in policy and regulations. It should be emphasized, however, that above and beyond these obvious differences, some of which are of fundamental importance, there is one major area of agreement—the commitment, in each of the six districts, to a salary policy which attempts to differentiate salary on the basis of superior performance—a search and a subsequent reward for meritorious service. Subsidiary to this commitment is the belief that only through a merit salary program is it possible for a school to offer the type of maximum salaries which can place the school in a defensible competitive position for the selection and retention of highly qualified college graduates.

Within the areas of major salary policy disagreement, as evidenced within the selected systems, there are two of critical importance. The first is the purpose of the merit salary program. Although this is a, or rather *the*, basic question facing all salary policies, including those of nonmerit as well as merit districts, the policies as stated within these six districts establishing the goal of the merit program are of particular significance.

The second major concern is more of an internal question within districts operating merit programs. This question is one of the feasibility as well as the desirability of attempting to define teaching effectiveness in rather specific statistical terms. This attempt to quantify the evaluative criteria underlies the vital issue of measurement versus evaluation.

There are several issues of importance which also need some examination but which are of lesser concern than these two. These include the definition of the limits of the teaching role which are to be evaluated for merit-rating purposes. The use of a single column schedule, negating the importance of an advanced degree, is another example. These, and a few other such issues, are examined in this chapter.

Purpose of the Merit Salary Program

The purpose for which each of these six districts maintains a merit program has been ascertained only through examination of the written

statements available from each of the districts. The most obvious purpose, of course, is to replace or supplement a single automatic salary schedule policy which has been deemed, by the particular district, to be unsatisfactory for the needs of that district. This purpose also applies, in an inverse sense, to other schools which have abandoned merit programs for a single salary schedule. However, within these six districts the goals are examined in a positive sense of addition rather than negation.

It is appropriate to emphasize again the distinction between the merit salary and the evaluation through which the merit salary is established, the merit rating. The need for this emphasis is apparent as one attempts to differentiate the goals of a merit salary program which are unique from those of a single salary schedule. For example, "An orderly plan for the compensation of teaching services" is not unique to a merit program. The payment of salaries "commensurate with performance" is a goal which may be considered unique. Yet, these two goals are both listed within the objectives of a merit program in the same district.

Within these six districts, the stated goals of the merit programs tend to fall within three classifications. The first—individual initiative—would relate the existence of a merit program with the preservation and growth of an economic system in a democratic society, holding that salary recognition of performance is an axiom of the American way of life. The second stresses the instructional improvement objective. The third relates the goal to the recruitment and retention of superior teachers.

Individual Initiative

The term "individual initiative" is used to include a variety of goals, or principles, upon which merit programs may be justified. One such goal would be the importance of paying individuals on the basis of their contribution to society. Such a justification is difficult to accept as a principle because of the practical matter of determination of the value of the contribution, not only for teachers but for all individuals. It is more justifiable to consider a wider concept of compensation for services rendered which stresses the traditional American principle of individual initiative, with freedom of the individual to pursue his livelihood, restrained only by the laws and moral codes of his society, and with a reward system which does not negate the importance of that initiative and freedom.

Only one of the six districts has included this factor of individual initiative with the written material describing the goals of its merit

program. Ladue has done this by defining the purposes of American education rather than the purposes of the merit program. The Ladue statement notes that a goal of American education is the promotion of democracy as a "way of life" and a plan of government. This plan has certain delineated political, social, economic, and moral aspects.

Since the economic aspect is significant for the salary program, with the emphasis upon a competitive economic system which rewards and encourages individual initiative, the position is that a single salary schedule stifles such initiative, slows the pursuit of excellence, and encourages the transfer of personal responsibility from the individual to the State.

Although this position is related to the frequently stated principle of equating merit salary plans with a pure free enterprise system, such a relationship is not basic to the Ladue statement. If teachers' compensation programs were to be conceived in terms of a free enterprise philosophy, it could logically result only in an individual bargaining arrangement between the teacher and the board of education or, in the absurd extension, between the teacher and each individual parent, as Lieberman¹ has pointed out.

The Ladue position would deny any such goal of individual bargaining for salaries. Instead, it argues that (1) teachers are not unique in their desire for recognition of superior performance; (2) teachers are no less motivated by the economic reward as a form of recognition than individuals in other occupations; and (3) a basic principle of American society is to encourage such superior performance through the absence of any governmental restraints. Thus, this position would ultimately rest upon the belief that a merit salary plan is consistent with the economic system of this Nation and that it is difficult for our youth to accept this principle if their instructors are, through their daily existence, denying its vitality, just as it is difficult for the instructors to teach effectively about an economic system to which they are not a contributor nor a recipient of its strength.

Ladue would not, of course, deny that the instructional program would be improved through a sound merit program. Certainly better teachers may be recruited and retained in the classroom. However, Ladue would argue that these factors are extraneous in the more basic position and, hence, can ignore any "burden of proof" question. They are considered extraneous to the goal of providing an absence of governmental restraint on the individual's personal aspirations and ability. The automatic single salary schedule is viewed as providing both a governmental and a moral restraint.

¹ Myron Lieberman, *Education as a Profession*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1966. p. 402.

This position may be criticized in its suggestion that the teachers must, in their daily existence, provide models of the types of citizens who are being developed as a goal of the instructional program. If, for example, this model is important in the economic sphere, is it not also important in other areas of our society? Ladue would answer in the affirmative, that the teacher is expected to be such a model. Teaching is accomplished through practice as well as precept. This is apparent in an examination of criteria developed for the description of the "superior teacher." There is considerable emphasis upon the teacher's moral, social, and political responsibility and behavior within the school as well as within the community. This responsibility must include the freedom necessary to exercise it.

Improvement of Instruction

Since the improvement of instruction is an objective of all evaluation programs, regardless of the salary proposal, it is difficult to make a one-to-one relationship between evaluation and merit salaries. Like many purposes for which school funds are expended, the improvement of instruction is a worthy goal. The difficulty in assigning instructional improvement as a unique goal of a merit salary program is that the existence of evaluation programs, of inservice training, of sound personnel practices, or even the entire area of curriculum development is indispensable to the nonmerit as well as the merit schedule. In addition, to use instructional improvement as a salary goal would logically imply that the salary differential was the significant factor and that the amount of the differential was of lesser importance, or that the same result could not be obtained through a differential based upon a differentiated assignment. Lastly, such a goal overlooks the alternatives through which a similar expenditure of funds might be utilized for the improvement of instruction. Thus, a 10 percent merit increment must be weighed against, say, a 10 percent reduction in class size, or the installation of air conditioning, or floor carpeting—all have instructional improvement as a goal—funds utilized for merit programs must be evaluated against such other expenditures.

The foregoing statements on the attempt to justify merit salary programs on the basis of a unique contribution to instructional improvement are made only to point up the need for a careful distinction between merit pay and the evaluation, or merit-rating, procedure through which the salary differentiation is determined. They do not deny the instructional improvement goal—it is simply ignored.

However, to ignore the issue is not to suggest that a position for a unique relationship between merit salaries and improvement of instruction cannot be stated. This position, as evident in most existing merit programs, assumes a strong relationship between motivation and monetary reward. For, with few exceptions, merit salaries become part of the teacher salary policy with a view toward improving the performance of the staff members. Certainly, a corollary goal is the recognition of past, superior performance. But the emphasis is upon a stimulus toward future excellence. The monetary award is only one segment of the total reward system. That it is, however, a significant factor is well accepted, and within the monetary reward program, most proponents of merit salary programs would argue that the differential salary, based upon an evaluation of performance, is also a significant factor.

If this incentive is assumed, then it becomes possible to argue the uniqueness of a merit salary program in terms of staff evaluation, supervisory, and developmental programs. That such programs may and do exist apart from a merit schedule can be granted. However, through acceptance of the validity of the assumption that such a salary-motivation relationship exists, it is then possible to assume a relationship between the differential and *better* staff evaluation, supervisory, and developmental programs.

Thus, the uniqueness of a merit salary program as being contributory to the improvement of instruction is based upon the principle of salary differentiation as well as in the amount of the differential. Not only is the teacher motivated toward more effective teaching practices and toward stronger personal and professional growth programs, but also the evaluator performs at a higher level of appraisal as well as leadership. No denial is made of the importance of non-monetary rewards toward motivation, since this is apparent in non-merit schedule districts. Instead, the differential is viewed as one additional incentive, provision for which can be found only in a merit salary policy.

This, then, becomes the alleged unique characteristic of a merit salary program as related to a positive change in the quality of the instructional program. Whether it is indeed unique depends upon one's acceptance of the validity of the assumption as to the motivation and salary differentiation for individuals in nonprofit-making organizations. Yet, as suggested above, to deny its validity need not necessarily indicate a commitment in opposition to a merit salary policy. Its value may be sought in other goals.

Recruitment and Retention of Superior Teachers

Although many factors other than salary enter into a teacher's decision to seek employment in one rather than another school district, certainly the salary minimums and maximums are important. Therefore, if a district is able to elevate these salaries to a degree not possible under a single salary schedule, it should increase its attractiveness to the superior teacher seeking a position. This is particularly true if (a) the merit principle applies to the recruitment period; (b) the amount of the salary differential for superior service is significant; and (c) the time interval between the minimum and maximum salaries can be significantly reduced. Thus, the merit salary program may have implications for the selection process through which a high quality staff is procured.

A merit program is also advocated as a positive step toward the retention of a superior staff. At the present time, upward salary movement for classroom teachers is basically one of geographical mobility. Higher maximums for superior service can frequently be obtained only by changing school districts, either within or between States. If a provision for selective treatment of these maximums exists, then this turnover factor for the superior teacher might be reduced.

Next, the use of a merit salary program is advocated by these districts as a means of retaining superior teachers in the classroom, rather than using an administrative assignment as the sole means of increasing the annual salary. (This assumes, of course, that administrative positions are sought solely because of the financial gain associated with such an assignment.) Although theoretically this particular goal might be accomplished by a reduction in the differential between administrative and teaching positions as established on a single salary schedule, such a procedure would contradict the basic goal which is sought in a merit program—reward for superior performance on a selective basis.

The opposing view to the importance of a merit program to recruitment and retention of superior staff does not negate the need to provide for a salary differential for superior service. However, it is stated that this differential should be on the basis of differentiated assignments rather than upon a merit award. Thus, the teachers who have been identified as providing particularly effective teaching services may receive additional salary for additional services. These would include activities as a department chairman, a team teacher, summer assignments in teaching or curriculum development, or released class duties for individual study or research. The importance of a strong evaluation program is not minimized. However, the emphasis is upon the

reward for additional responsibility rather than upon the determination of more effective services in a given responsibility.

Degree of Objectivity Sought in the Evaluation Procedure

The extent to which subjective evaluations are used in the determination of teaching effectiveness is a critical issue in the question of merit vs. nonmerit salary programs. The position of the National Education Association, for example, is that the "use of subjective methods of evaluating professional performance for the purpose of setting salaries has a deleterious effect on the educational process. Plans which require such subjective judgments (commonly known as merit ratings) should be avoided."² Other portions of the resolution call for continued research and experimentation to develop objective means of evaluation of performance. Not unassociated with the subjective vs. objective issue is the apparent concern within these six districts over the need to attempt a quantification of the evaluative criteria as well as their application in the evaluation process. This concern can be illustrated by the following two quotations from statements prepared by Ladue and Weber.

The Ladue statement is:

A questionnaire has revealed some concern that the evaluation procedure is too subjective. The committee working on the original program, after consideration of other merit plans, recognized that effective teaching cannot be reduced to objective data. Effective teaching is not only a skill but also an art. Any judgment of teaching or behavior must be determined in terms of the values held by the person making the judgment—hence, its subjectivity.

Opposed to this is the Weber statement:

Just as we are confident that we have described distinguished teaching service in the foregoing pages, we are also convinced that we can objectively measure distinguished teaching performance both in and out of the classroom.

The appraisal policies as implemented within these two districts reflect, of course, the above two quotations. Ladue develops criteria for the description of effective teaching behavior in Ladue. The presentation of evidence of teaching effectiveness is, however, in a narrative form, including both a recommendation for placement on the salary schedule and for continued growth and improvement programs for the teacher. Weber uses a detailed classroom observation code, with a two-observer team, recording observations which are tabulated and then become part of the basis for the final evaluation report.

² National Education Association. Handbook 1961-62. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1961. p. 60.

Since the Weber code records certain conditions, the existence of which is deemed a prerequisite to learning, the criteria are not considered unique to Weber.

The other four districts show similar differences in the attention to quantification as a necessary part of the evaluation program. Canton, West Hartford, and Summit produce numerical ratings based upon numerical weights to the different evaluation items. Park Forest, like Ladue, relies upon a narrative record. West Hartford uses a highly statistical procedure, with the annual selection for a merit award being based upon a normal curve distribution of the total teacher ratings obtained in each of several categories of teachers.

This question of the desirable degree of measurement is debatable. On one side is the position that teaching and other professional occupations are too complex to be susceptible to definition in statistical terms. The position that certain teacher behavior will inevitably produce certain known changes in pupil growth is refused.

The advantages of seeking a high degree of measurement in merit rating programs are stated to be at least two. First, it may permit a more defensible position for the teacher and his evaluator if specific items can be described which were determinants of the final evaluation. Thus, teacher-evaluator conferences can be concerned with rather specific behavioral factors. Second, the high degree of specificity is felt to diminish the opportunity for individual bias on the part of the observer.

This issue of quantification of the criteria is concerned with the feasibility as well as the desirability of attempts to develop objective procedures for determining teaching effectiveness. It is presumed that objective "ratings" should have as their base the establishment of certain teacher actions— x —which when completed, could be predicted to bring forth result— y —in terms of some change in pupil behavior. And, that as frequently as action x is repeated, then change y will result. Whether this concept or goal of personnel rating is one of evaluation or of measurement is more than a question of semantics. For, as Paul Woodring has pointed out in regard to evaluation of teacher education programs—

A compilation of factual data, however accurate and comprehensive the statistics may be, is not evaluation but only a step toward evaluation. The word evaluation implies a system of values, and decisions about values involve human judgment. The actual evaluation must always require decisions by human beings as to what is most worthwhile.³

³ Paul Woodring. *New Directions in Teacher Education*. New York: The Fund for Advancement of Education, 1957. p. 82.

Limits of the Teaching Role To Be Evaluated

A certain degree of discussion properly centers around a definition of the performance sphere in which the teacher is to be evaluated. The major area of concern is, of course, the classroom. But there are several other areas in which evaluation potentially might be made. One is the teacher's responsibility to the school and the faculty of which he is a member. The second is the teacher's relation to the community, both that of the school and of the district. Third, there is the responsibility to the profession itself, to which every teacher belongs by nature of his occupation.

The extent to which any school district may wish either to include or weigh these extraclass responsibilities will vary with the individual district. This variance may be the result of the community expectations for its schools; it may be the effect of working conditions within the schools. In this latter instance, for example, the teacher's opportunity to participate in community or professional activities may be determined by the nature of the classroom assignment, including the teacher load.

But of undoubtedly greater importance to a definition of the limits of the teaching role is the assumption as to the degree of variation of levels of classroom performance between the experienced staff members. It can be assumed, for example, that with a strong recruitment program and a thorough evaluation program prior to placement on tenure, a district can establish a core of highly competent teachers. And, that after x number of years, the performance levels of these teachers are not distinguishable within the classroom. As a result, it is both necessary and desirable to recognize the teacher's contributions outside the classroom, to the school, the district, the community, and the profession if a range in effectiveness is to be identified. The validity of this assumption will be accepted in some schools—denied in others. The New England School Development Council's statement on teacher competence emphasized the point of view that a differentiation of effectiveness based solely upon classroom performance is difficult after a short period of years if a sound program for selection and placement on tenure exists.⁴

One of the difficulties with an extension of evaluation beyond the classroom or school activities is the potential validity of the evaluation. In all evaluation programs, it is axiomatic that the teacher has a right (1) to be evaluated and (2) to expect the evaluator to be in a position in which a valid appraisal can be conducted. Ladue and Rich, while

⁴ David V. Tiedeman. *Teacher Competence and Its Relation to Salary*. Cambridge, Mass.: New England School Development Council, 1966. p. 85-106.

emphasizing classroom performance, also place considerable emphasis upon nonclassroom responsibilities of the teacher. They also place heavy reliance upon the integrity of the self-evaluation. They would then feel that the self-evaluation is obtained from an individual in a sound position to make a valid observation.

Lastly, of course, the limits of the teacher role to be evaluated cannot be disassociated from the purposes of the merit program. If it is heavily oriented toward classroom effectiveness, such as in Weber, the role can be defined rather tightly. If the purpose of the program is related to a broader concept, such as in Ladue, then the teacher is viewed as having certain responsibilities to the society in which he lives and for contributions which should be made to that society both as a professional educator and citizen within it.

Recognition of Advanced Degrees Within the Salary Schedule

The typical single salary schedule has a provision for adding an increment to the schedule for an earned graduate degree. Frequently, there may be additional increments for a specified number of credit hours beyond each degree. In addition, the teacher possessing an advanced degree may be able to achieve a higher salary, through additional annual steps, than the teacher with only a baccalaureate.

Within these six school systems, three—Canton, West Hartford, and Summit—provide for a salary increment based solely upon the earning of an additional degree. The others may, of course, offer some recognition at the time of initial salary placement.

The reasons stated for not recognizing the degree for salary purposes are based upon the focal purpose of the merit program—the salary award being dependent upon teaching performance. Therefore, such factors as degrees, sex, dependents, and years of experience have no place in a merit schedule.

The recognition of the advanced degree can be justified on at least two counts. First, it is traditional with most of the salaried professions, including education and Government. Ignoring the additional degree becomes uncomfortable to those teachers who accept it as having historical justification. Second, if the M.A. degree is not to be recognized, why require the B.A.? Or, does not such a position refute efforts of teachers to encourage students to receive a diploma and then a college education?

Within these six districts, as well as many without merit salary programs, there has been an effort to accommodate these two points of view. The result is the requirement, in terms of salary increments, that the degree or credit hours be related directly to the assignment

which the teacher currently holds within the school system. Weber is particularly specific on this point. Thus, a physics teacher lacking sufficient background in his major is not expected to major in administration if the degree is to be recognized in the salary schedule. And, certainly, within these merit districts which do not include the advanced degree in the salary program, a provision exists for a program of professional development which may well include the pursuit of an advanced degree.

Chapter III

The Salary Schedule

THE TYPICAL SINGLE SALARY SCHEDULE consists of several columns, with each column representing additional graduate degrees or a specified number of credit hours of course work. In addition to this columnar effect, there is also a horizontal stratification which represents the number of years of creditable teaching service within the school district. There is, thus, provision for vertical movement on the schedule in accordance with experience and horizontal movement in accordance with preparation.

The schedules in use in these six districts are of two types: First, there is the basic, single salary schedule, with the merit schedule being supplementary to the basic schedule. The usual provisions for horizontal and vertical movements still exist. Second, several of the schedules have no provision for either years of service or additional degrees. These are, in essence, single column schedules. The various maximum salary levels are "stopping points" along the single column, with the point being determined by a formal evaluation of the effectiveness of the teacher's performance.

It should be emphasized that within each of these six districts, the merit salary program is basically one of a "reward" rather than a "punishment." There is, of course, provision for the withholding of an annual increment as well as a possible reduction in salary. However, these provisions, as well as the critical decision to terminate a teacher's services, are a function of the evaluation program and should not be confused with the salary program.

This chapter attempts to point up and answer the following questions in regard to the administration of the salary schedules within the six districts studied:

1. *What is the basic salary plan?*

It is a tenet of merit salary programming that an adequate, equitable basic salary schedule must exist prior to, and supplementary with, the adoption of a merit schedule. The merit schedule is considered to meet a need for a reward system beyond the basic schedule rather than in lieu of it. The pattern of this basic schedule, as contrasted with the merit schedule, is most readily apparent in the case of West Hartford or Summit

2. *Is the annual merit award for superior service a set, predetermined amount, or is it flexible within certain limits?*

Within these six districts, there are two patterns: One is to provide for acceleration on or supermaximums to the basic schedule. The merit increments are functions of the basic increment. This is illustrated in the programs of Summit, West Hartford, Canton, and, to some extent, Weber. The other procedure is to leave flexible the annual merit increment which may be received in any one year. Ladue states the limits of the annual increment which may be granted; Rich does not. They both have stated maximums.

3. *Is there a quota on the number of teachers who may receive a merit award in any one year?*

A restriction on the number of teachers who can be judged as superior implies the use of local norms upon which a normal distribution of judgments of effectiveness can be developed. It is, in essence, the use of a forced choice procedure through which the number of "superior" teachers is predetermined at a set proportion of the total staff. None of these districts has a quota which limits the number of teachers who may be receiving a merit award at any one time.

4. *Is a probationary period required for the establishment of eligibility to receive a merit award?*

A merit probationary period is considered exclusive of that required for attainment of tenure status in terms of the teacher's contract with the board of education. Two of the districts—Ladue and Rich—have no such probationary requirement for the merit award and, instead, apply the merit principle at the earliest possible date, which is during the recruitment and selection process. The other four require a probationary period of 2, 2, 4, and 7 years—not necessarily all within the district itself.

5. *Is there an automatic salary differential for the earning of an advanced degree?*

The use of an automatic increment for an advanced degree is characteristic of most single salary schedules. There may or may not be a stipulation as to the major area of study within the degree program. Three of these six districts—Canton, Summit, and West Hartford—recognize the earning of a degree through an automatic salary increment. The other three may, of course, include the degree as part of the planned professional growth program, but it is not an automatic salary determinant. Weber requires the degree, for salary purposes, to be related directly to the teacher's assignment.

6. *Is there a prescribed minimum number of years in which the teacher can reach the maximum attainable salary?*

Ladue and Rich, with no predetermined annual increment, obviously have no stated minimum time period in which the top of the schedule can be reached. Canton's period is somewhat flexible since the superior teacher can be accelerated on his movement up the schedule. West Hartford has established such a minimum period. In Summit, the merit increments may continue on until retirement.

7. *Is placement on the merit schedule dependent upon the teacher's voluntary consent to participate in the merit rating program?*

The provision which makes participation in the merit salary program voluntary on the part of the teacher does not, of course, apply to the general concept of staff evaluation. Much of the attention to the voluntary provision in merit programs has arisen from the recent Florida State Career Increment Program which included the feature within the statewide merit program. Only one of these six districts—Weber—has adopted the provision.

8. *Is there a provision for continued annual or periodic increments for the teacher who has reached the top of the merit schedule?*

A characteristic of most teacher salary schedules, merit or nonmerit, is that the maximum attainable salary level is set at a relatively early point in the teacher's career. However, it is not uncommon to find a longevity or career increment at the 20th or 25th year of service. Within these six districts, only one—Summit—has extended the merit schedule up to the time of retirement. The other five do not have at the time of writing any provision for additional increments, merit or longevity, beyond the stated maximums.

9. *What is the size of the salary differential between the maximum basic schedule and the maximum merit schedule?*

Examination of the six schedules indicates that it is difficult to define the magnitude of the merit award over the basic schedule. However, a numerical estimate of this differential is made through the development of a 40-year-earning potential, assuming the current salary level remains constant.

Highlights of the Six Salary Schedules

Canton

Salary Policy

1. Credit is given on the initial placement on salary schedule according to the number of years of prior teaching experience. The maximum placement for the experienced teacher new to Canton, with a bachelor's degree only, is \$7,800, or \$3,300 above the minimum.
2. The earning of an advanced degree in itself results in a salary differential. The differential is in the amount of a double increment the year each such degree is earned.
3. A probationary period to establish eligibility for consideration for a superior service award is required. The period is 4 years of service, of which the last 2 must be in Canton.
4. There is no quota for the number of individuals on the various salary maximums which are established.
5. The amount of the annual merit increment is predetermined and currently is \$300.

Basic Elements of the Salary Schedule.

1. The minimum beginning salary for the B.A. teacher is \$4,500, and the annual increment is \$300. There are four levels of maximum attainable salaries, with these levels corresponding to four classifications of teacher

effectiveness. The satisfactory teacher can reach \$7,500 in 11 years; the competent teacher, \$8,100 in 13 years; the highly competent, \$8,100 in 11 years and \$8,700 in 20 years; and the superior teacher, \$9,000 in from 11 to 16 years.

2. The merit schedule has the features of both supermaximums, as described immediately above, and acceleration. Through acceleration, the superior teacher advances at the rate of 2 increments a year from step 4 until step 13, when the single increment is resumed. Thus, the 16 steps can be satisfied in 11 years.
3. The five competency classifications which determine the salary level are directly related to a numerical score which summarizes the evaluation made of the teacher. The teacher receives the evaluation report, however, in terms of the five classifications rather than in terms of a numerical score.

A teacher entering Canton at age 25, receiving a master's degree in 5 years and remaining constantly on the "satisfactory" level, would reach his maximum salary of \$7,500 in 10 years, and over the 40-year period until retirement at age 65 would earn a total salary of \$283,000 or an annual average of \$7,100. The same teacher who received the superior rating at the earliest possible date and retained it until retirement would receive \$335,000 over the 40-year period, or an annual average of \$8,400.

Salary Schedule

Step	Scale	Step	Scale	Step	Scale
1.....	\$4,500	7.....	6,300	13.....	8,100
2.....	4,800	8.....	6,600	14.....	8,400
3.....	5,100	9.....	6,900	15.....	8,700
4.....	5,400	10.....	7,200	16.....	9,000
5.....	5,700	11.....	7,500		
6.....	6,000	12.....	7,800		

1. Teachers rated *satisfactory* advance one step a year until 11 (\$7,500). They cannot pass that, even by getting a new academic degree, until they get a rating higher than satisfactory.
2. Teachers rated *competent* advance one step a year as far as step 13 (\$8,100).
3. Teachers rated *highly competent* advance one step a year to step 13. But five consecutive highly competent ratings entitle a teacher to at least one double increment if he is below step 13 or to one single increment after that, up to step 15.
4. Teachers rated *superior* advance one step a year until the 4th year and then two steps a year until step 13. After that, they advance one step a year to step 16. A consistently superior teacher can reach \$9,000 in 11 years.
5. There is no separate scale for teachers with advanced degrees. In the year they achieve a new degree, teachers receive a double increment. Aside from that, progress is determined by a detailed evaluation of each teacher, each year. The teacher who earns a degree after having reached step 16 remains at step 16.

- The board of education may vote additional salary grants for superior teaching and may withhold increments for cause.

Ladue

Salary Policy

- Credit for prior service to determine initial placement on the salary schedule is not on a numerical basis which equates placement with years of experience. Instead, an evaluation is made of various factors which determine the placement, including the application of the merit principle. The maximum placement for the teacher with a B.A. only, new to Ladue and with prior experience, is \$6,700, or \$2,100 above the minimum of \$4,600.
- The earning of an advanced degree is a direct determinant of the salary level only at the time of initial employment or placement on the schedule.
- There is no probationary period for the establishment of eligibility to receive a merit award. All teachers are on the merit schedule, beginning with the time of selection.
- There is no quota for the number of individuals on the various salary maximums which are established.
- The amount of the annual increment is flexible but is stated within broad dollar limits.

Basic Elements of the Salary Schedule

- The minimum beginning salary for the B.A. teacher is \$4,600; for the M. A., \$4,800; and for the Ph. D., \$5,600. These may be adjusted upward to allow for prior desirable experience and training, as deemed necessary to meet competition for staff. The maximum attainable salary is \$12,600 which on the basis of current practices would be obtainable in a minimum of 15 years.
- Steps or years of experience are not formally recognized in the schedule. Instead, there are three broad classifications of performance, each having a separate "schedule." The maximums for these three schedules are \$6,700, \$9,500, and \$12,600. The amount of the annual increment averages about \$200, \$400, and \$500, respectively, with the ranges being \$100 on each side of these averages.
- The movement of a teacher from one schedule to a higher one is not based upon a numerical score derived from the evaluation procedure.

A teacher entering Ladue at age 25 and reaching the top of his schedule in 15 years would receive, by age 65, the following total salary: Schedule 1, \$254,000, or an annual average of \$6,350; Schedule 2, \$342,500, or an average of \$8,550; Schedule 3, \$443,000, or an average of \$11,100.

Salary Schedule

Schedule	Minimum	Annual Increment ¹	Maximum
1.....	\$4,600-\$5,200	0-\$100-\$200-\$300	\$6,700
2.....	-----	0-\$300-\$400-\$500	\$9,500
3.....	-----	0-\$400-\$500-\$600	\$12,600

¹ The amount of the increment is determined annually as a result of the evaluation program.

MERIT SALARY PROGRAMS

1. Incentive for movement from Schedule 1 to Schedule 2 is \$600. Incentive for movement from Schedule 2 to Schedule 3 is \$800.
2. Increments are granted and advances to higher schedules made on the basis of competency, overall value to the school system, experience, training, and potential value.
3. Increments within schedules are granted or withheld annually.
4. Teachers new to the system with experience would ordinarily be placed on Schedule 1 at a point to be agreed upon by the teacher and the employing official. It would be possible for superior teachers with experience to be placed on any of the schedules in order to compete with salaries elsewhere.

Rich

Salary Policy

1. Credit for prior service to determine initial placement on the salary schedule is not on a basis which automatically equates placement with years of prior experience. However, a higher starting salary may be set on the basis of quality of experience. The maximum initial salary for a teacher with prior experience is \$6,500, or \$1,300 above the minimum of \$5,200.
2. The earning of an advanced degree is not in itself a determinant of salary differential.
3. There is no probationary period for the establishment of eligibility to receive a merit award.
4. There is no quota on the number of individuals on the various salary maximums which are established.

Basic Elements of the Salary Schedule

1. The minimum beginning salary for a teacher with no prior experience is \$5,200. The maximum salary attainable is \$10,400 which on the basis of current practice would be obtained in a minimum of 7-10 years.
2. In the absence of a formal salary schedule, only the minimum and maximum salaries are specified. The significant feature is the separation of the schedule or teachers into two divisions, not unlike Ladue's three schedules. However, Division I teachers are on a 9½-month contract and have a maximum salary of \$8,000. Division II teachers are on a 12-month contract, including a 1-month vacation. This Division II contract should not be viewed as the assignment of additional responsibilities, in the usual sense. Instead, it provides the teacher with additional funds through which to support a planned four summers' program of professional and personal growth. This summer program might include travel, study, research, or appropriate employment. One of every four summers is to be devoted to direct service to the district through such activities as teaching, curriculum design, and other related planned activities.
3. A teacher entering Rich at age 25, progressing to the top of Division I after 10 years, would receive \$305,000 by the age of 65 or an annual average salary of \$7,600. The same teacher who received a Division II contract after 5 years and was at the top of the schedule in 5 more years

would receive a total salary of \$385,000 over the 40-year period, or an average of \$9,600.

Salary Schedule

	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
Division I Teacher.....	\$5,200	\$8,000
Division II teacher.....	7,200	10,400

1. The salary for beginning teachers is \$5,200. A higher starting salary may be set for experience, upon recommendation of the administration.
2. Salaries of all teachers are reviewed at least annually, prior to March 15. Salary increases are based solely upon merit as determined by evaluation of individual performance.
3. Teacher classifications
 - A. *Division I teachers*—All teachers employed on a 9½-month contract basis.
 - B. *Division II teachers*—Teachers who upon recommendation of the administration and approval of the board of education are employed on a 12-month basis. The following rules govern appointment to Division II:
 - (1) Only those teachers who are capable of carrying on a program of special contribution and potential advancement on a yearly basis, and whose performance has been appraised by the administration and found to be outstanding, will be considered for appointment to Division II.
 - (2) Teachers shall confer with the administration to plan a program of at least 4 years' duration of personal and professional growth.
 - (3) Teachers who are appointed to Division II but whose affairs cannot easily be arranged during the first year of appointment may be given 1 year to get their affairs in order.
 - (4) One month's vacation is granted to all Division II teachers.

Summit

Salary Policy

1. Credit for prior service to determine initial placement on the salary schedule is on a basis which equates placement with years of prior experience. The maximum placement for a teacher with a B.A. only and prior experience is \$8,100, which is \$3,200 above the minimum of \$4,900.
2. The earning of an advanced degree is in itself a determinant of a salary differential—one increment. To retain the differential, the teacher must be selected for the merit program.
3. There is a probationary period for the establishment of eligibility to receive a merit award. The period is 2 years of service in Summit.
4. There is no quota on the number of individuals eligible to receive the merit increments.
5. The amount of the merit increment is predetermined and is not flexible. The amount is one additional increment, currently \$220, every 3 years.
6. There is a provision for continuance of salary increases through the entire duration of the teacher's career. However, it applies only to teachers on the merit schedule, as described below.

Basic Elements of the Salary Schedule

The basic schedule calls for 13 increments of \$220 and a 14th and final one of \$340, thus reaching a maximum of \$8,100 after 14 years of creditable service. The meritorious teacher receives the same basic \$220 increments plus one additional one of \$220 every 3 years for the first 14 years, at which time his maximum salary attainable would be \$9,200. After 14 years, and until retirement, additional merit increments may continue at the rate of 2 every 3 years, approaching a terminal salary of over \$13,000 after 40 years. There is provision for sporadic movement on and off the merit schedule, but any merit increments missed 1 year are not retroactive if gained during an ensuing year.

A teacher entering Summit at age 25, progressing to the top of the basic schedule in 14 years, would receive total earnings of \$300,000 prior to retirement at age 65, or an average salary of \$7,500. The merit teacher, who received the first increment and each subsequent one at the earliest possible date, would receive \$420,000 over the same 40-year period, or an average of \$10,500.

Salary Schedule

Step	Basic Scale	Step	Basic Scale	Step	Basic Scale
0.....	\$4,900	5.....	6,000	10.....	7,100
1.....	5,120	6.....	6,220	11.....	7,320
2.....	5,340	7.....	6,440	12.....	7,540
3.....	5,560	8.....	6,660	13.....	7,760
4.....	5,780	9.....	6,880	14.....	8,100

1. Upon joining the school system in Summit, each teacher is assigned an equivalent date of service to be determined by the superintendent with approval by the board of education.
 - A. The equivalent date of service for an inexperienced teacher is the actual date of employment.
 - B. For experienced teachers, the equivalent date of service reflects the applicability of earlier service to conditions in Summit.
 - C. At any time the teacher's years of service is the number of years since the equivalent date of service. Each year, except as noted below, a teacher will receive the basic annual increment corresponding to his equivalent length of service. Qualifying teachers will receive additional increment as described below.
2. A teacher is eligible for a merit increment after 2 years of service in Summit.
3. During the progression period (to the top of the scale), a teacher qualifying for a merit increment receives, in addition to his basic annual increment, one equal to the pattern increment (\$220).
4. While all teachers will be appraised annually, a meritorious teacher (one who has received a merit increment) will, in general, not again be eligible for a merit increment until 3 years have passed.
5. A meritorious teacher who consistently performs at that level may receive a merit increment every 3 years up to and including the terminal

- point of the basic pattern. Additional increments may be given under unusual circumstances.
6. If a meritorious teacher fails to qualify at the end of 3 years for another merit increment, he forfeits the merit increment for that year. His performance is then appraised annually with all other teachers and he can, if his performance warrants, again receive a merit increment.
 7. If a teacher's performance is rated unsatisfactory, he will forego any increment for that year. (A nontenure teacher whose performance is rated unsatisfactory will not be reappointed.)
 8. All teachers who have reached the terminal point of the progression period become eligible for the rating of Master Career Teacher. (As with previous merit increments, in general, a 3-year waiting period will follow the last such increment.)
 9. A teacher is reviewed annually for the rating of M.C.T.
 10. Upon receipt of a rating of M.C.T., a teacher will receive an increment equal to two times the pattern increment, or \$440 every 3 years.
 11. A M.C.T. shall, in general, not again become eligible for another M.C.T. increment until 3 years have passed. Additional increments may, however, be given under unusual circumstances.
 12. If, at the end of any 3-year period an M.C.T. fails to requalify for M.C.T., he receives no additional increment but reverts to the annual review for eligibility to reinstatement as M.C.T.

Weber

Salary Policy

1. Credit for prior service to determine initial placement on the salary schedule is on a basis which equates placements with years of prior experience. The maximum placement for a teacher with a B.A. only, and prior experience, is \$5,475 which is \$1,225 above the minimum of \$4,250.
2. The earning of an advanced degree is a determinant of a salary differential. However, the degree must be in a field of study which is directly related to the teacher's present, or probable future, assignment.
3. There is a probationary period for the establishment of eligibility to receive a merit award. The period is 2 years of service in Weber.
4. There is no quota on the number of individuals who may receive a merit award.
5. Participation in the merit schedule is voluntary, dependent upon a contractual agreement by the teacher.
6. The amount of the annual merit award is predetermined. Currently, it is \$500. These awards do not accumulate in the sense that those in the other five districts do. Each \$500 award is for the basis of 1 year.

Basic Elements of the Salary Schedule

1. The schedule consists of three columns—the B.A. column, the B.A. plus 30 quarter hours, and the M.A. column. The respective minimums are \$4,250, \$4,350, and \$4,450; with maximums being \$6,255, \$6,405, and \$6,555. The maximums are reached in 14 years.
2. The above figures constitute the base salary. Weber also lists a total salary which includes an additional item for health insurance and a de-

MERIT SALARY PROGRAMS

pendency allowance, if appropriate, as part of the salary schedule, totaling \$271.44.

3. The merit award of \$500 annually is entirely supplementary to the salary schedule.
4. A teacher entering Weber at age 25, receiving an M.A. after 5 years and receiving no merit awards, would earn a total salary of \$243,000 over the 40-year period, and an annual average of \$6,100. The teacher who received a merit award each year would, of course, receive an additional amount of \$19,000, or an average salary of about \$6,600.

Salary Schedule

Step	B.A.	B.A.+30	M.A.
0.....	\$4,250	\$4,350	\$4,450
1.....	4,300	4,400	4,500
2.....	4,350	4,450	4,550
3.....	4,455	4,555	4,655
4.....	4,620	4,720	4,820
5.....	4,755	4,855	4,955
6.....	4,910	5,010	5,110
7.....	5,045	5,145	5,245
8.....	5,180	5,280	5,380
9.....	5,335	5,435	5,535
10.....	5,475	5,575	5,675
11.....	5,695	5,755	5,855
12.....	5,830	5,930	6,030
13.....	6,255	6,355	6,455
14.....		6,405	6,555

- a. Add \$210 to above, if appropriate, for dependency allowance.
- b. Add \$500 to each figure for the merit increment, after two steps.

The salary schedule recognizes the additional hours beyond the B.A. only if they are in the teacher's teaching field. A master's degree in administration, for example, entitles the teacher to be placed on the third column, but he cannot advance vertically with such a degree. Weber urges the teacher to take administrative courses only after the master's in the teacher's major area of study has been earned.

West Hartford

Salary Policy

1. Credit for prior service to determine initial placement on the salary schedule is on a basis which equates placement with years of prior service. The maximum placement for a teacher with a B.A. only, and prior experience, is \$7,410, which is \$2,860 above the minimum salary of \$4,550.
2. The earning of an advanced degree is in itself a determinant of a salary differential, both at the initial salary placement and during the teacher's career in West Hartford.
3. There is a probationary period for the establishment of eligibility to receive a merit award. This is 7 years for the first merit increment, of

which the last 3 must be in West Hartford, thus meeting the tenure requirement. Four additional years are required for the second increment for which the first award is a prerequisite.

4. The number of individuals eligible to receive each of the two merit awards annually depends upon the deviation of the individual appraisal scores from the mean of the particular group of teachers. For merit award purposes, there are two groups upon which these deviations are computed, those with experience of 12 years and over and those with from 8 to 11 years. Thus, there are two separate eligibility groups upon which the distribution of appraisal scores are analyzed. Each year, approximately 25 percent of each group is eligible for the first merit award, and approximately 5 percent is eligible for the second. These two groups should include those teachers already on the first or second merit schedules and progressing satisfactorily toward the top of that schedule. However, since it is possible for some, and theoretically all, of the group on the schedule to fall below the 25 percent and 5 percent figures on any given annual appraisal, and yet remain on the merit schedule, the number receiving the merit awards at any one time may be substantially above 30 percent. (These percentage figures are rough approximations of .75 and 1.75 standard deviations.)
5. The amount of the annual merit increment is predetermined. This amount is \$230 each for the first and the second such awards.
6. There is no provision for the continuance of salary increases for either the merit or the basic schedules or into the latter stages of the teacher's career.

Basic Elements of the Salary Schedule

1. There are two separate salary schedules, the basic and the merit schedule. The basic schedule consists of two columns—the B.A. and the M.A. Within each of these two columns, eligibility for the first merit award of \$230 is established after 7 years of service. Eligibility for the second merit award of the same amount is established after an additional 4 years of service in West Hartford. The maximum salaries attainable in each column are \$9,020 and \$9,940, including the two merit awards. Without the merit awards, they are \$8,100 and \$9,020. The first merit award column is one step longer than the basic schedule. The second award column is two steps longer than the basic schedule. With an M.A., the basic schedule is 16 steps.
2. At the top of the schedule, the differential between the basic and the second merit schedule is \$920 for the B.A. column, as well as the M.A. column.

A teacher entering West Hartford at age 25, receiving an M.A. after 5 years and receiving no merit awards, would earn a total salary of \$328,000 over the 40-year period, an average salary of \$8,200. The same teacher who received the first and second merit awards at the earliest possible date would receive \$354,000 over the 40-year period, an average salary of \$8,850.

Salary Schedule

1962-63 salary schedule for teachers and librarians (3d year of implementation)

Step	B.A.			M.A.		
	Basic	1st merit	2d merit	Basic	1st merit	2d merit
1	\$4,550			\$4,780		
2	4,780			5,010		
3	5,010			5,470		
4	5,470			5,930		
5	5,930			6,270		
6	6,270			6,610		
7	6,610			6,950		
8	6,950	\$7,180		7,180	\$7,410	
9	7,180	7,410		7,410	7,640	
10	7,410	7,640		7,640	7,870	
11	7,640	7,870		7,870	8,100	
12	7,870	8,100	\$8,330	8,100	8,330	\$8,560
13	8,100	8,330	8,560	8,330	8,560	8,790
14		8,560	8,790	8,560	8,790	9,020
15			9,020	8,790	9,020	9,250
16				9,020	9,250	9,480
17				9,250	9,480	9,710
18				9,480		9,940

The salary policy is based upon a numerical rating score, as follows:

A tenure teacher on the seventh or higher step, scoring 0.75 sigma units or more above the mean shall qualify for the first merit classification for the following year. [Author's note: These standard deviations are computed on four different teacher groups, classified by experience. For salary purposes only, the 8-11 and 12 years and over groups are relevant.]

A tenure teacher on the 11th or higher step, having been previously selected for the first merit classification and scoring 1.75 sigma units or more above the mean, shall qualify for the second merit classification for the following year. [Author's note: The 1.75 sigma units would be equal to approximately 4 percent of the teacher's eligibility group.]

Once a teacher has been placed on the first merit track, he will continue to progress on that track if his work is satisfactory, until he receives a salary equal to the maximum for his basic salary schedule. Progression beyond this point (on the basic scale) will be dependent upon his achieving a score of 0.75 sigma units or more above the mean each year. A person will not be removed from the merit track for failing to qualify in any 1 year.

The same principle will apply to the second merit track, namely that a teacher will have to requalify in order to go beyond the maximum established for the first merit classification (rather than the basic schedule), but once having received it, would not have his salary reduced.

Chapter IV

Evaluation Procedure

The importance of a sound staff evaluation program to a growing school system is well established. The recognition of this importance, as well as the existence of excellent evaluation policies and procedures, should not be considered to be unique with any particular salary program.

Nor are the problems associated with staff evaluation programs, like many other problems, unique to education. Examination of personnel and management journals oriented to business, industrial, and governmental organizations will make evident their concern over appraisal concepts and techniques.

It would appear that one practice which would appear to be more common outside of educational organizations is the unification of staff appraisal and staff development programs. This may be the result of the greater possibility of assignment differentiation and the subsequential need for the inclusion of a promotability feature within the appraisal program. However, there are school systems which are striving for this unification of appraisal and development. It would appear that, when this is done, there is a tendency to shift from "appraisal" to "analysis" to examine closely those factors which determine the teacher's effectiveness over which he has control, and those over which he has none. The appraisal process is concerned with all of those individuals who have some responsibility for providing the teacher with the support necessary for him to reach his potential effectiveness.

A critical point with staff evaluation programs, with or without merit salary schedules, is the validity of the assumption that the teacher really wants to know how he stands rather than merely to be assured. For the teacher who wishes the latter, the importance of relating evaluation to professional growth is considerable. These districts indicate a difference in view on this assumption. The merit evaluation program is viewed in one instance as providing a base point in time for a personal and professional growth program. In the other instance, it is a means of reporting the teacher's performance level as against some established standard. In either situation, there must eventually be some consideration of the procedures and

assistance necessary which will influence the rate and direction of the desired changes. It is for this reason that a significant relationship between the staff evaluation and the staff development programs would appear to be necessary unless evaluation is viewed as being in itself contributory to a positive change in behavior.

The typical evaluation program at the elementary-secondary level has as its principal goal "the improvement of instruction," a rather nebulous term. More specific objectives which are frequently cited would include the identification of staff members who will be selected for tenure status, for promotion, or for dismissal. The "promotability" feature of any evaluation program is particularly significant. And most important, as mentioned above, the evaluation program may have as its goal the formation of a base point for the professional growth program.

A major difficulty in all evaluation programs is the establishment of a rationale to determine the limits of the role which is to be evaluated. In the case of teachers, this role may be assumed to center upon the classroom. And this focus is particularly important for the beginning teacher. But for the experienced teacher, there is a possibility of justifying an appraisal of additional responsibilities which lie beyond the classroom. These would include the contributions made to the school, its staff, the community, the total school system, and the profession itself. This determination of the limits of the teaching role as well as the question of attempting a measurement approach to evaluation present two major controversies within the various evaluation programs now in operation both with and without merit salary policies.

But despite the many features which are common to evaluation programs in all school districts, there are at least two which are unique to districts with merit salary policies. First, and most important, a goal of evaluation in a merit district is to "implement provisions in the salary schedule which reward superior service on the basis of the level of performance."

The second unique characteristic of evaluation in a merit salary program is the apparent greater tendency to produce a numerical score as a summary statement of the evaluation. Although such a score may be developed in a single salary schedule district, its prevalence would probably be higher in merit salary programs. However, the use of a numerical score is not necessarily a characteristic of a merit program.

Effort has been made to point up and answer the following questions in regard to the evaluation procedure:

1. *Is a numerical score or rating developed which is a significant factor in the determination of the amount of the merit award?*

Three of the districts—West Hartford, Summit, and Canton—arrive at a numerical score which is decisive in the determination of the award. Ladue and Rich do not. West Hartford bases the increment upon the number of standard deviations above (or below) the mean score of the teaching staff. Summit uses a critical score which is obtained through a summation of a cluster of weighted factors. Canton also weighs a series of items and arrives at four critical figures, each of which determines the maximum salary level. Weber produces a numerical tabulation of "incidents" recorded during the classroom observations but does not develop a critical score which determines the eligibility for a merit increment, solely from these observations.

2. What is the nature of the formal evaluation or rating form?

Ladue and Rich prepare guides for evaluation and rely heavily upon classroom observation, but the written evaluation statement is more in the nature of an anecdotal record. Canton and Summit require that a numerical score be assigned to each of several items describing teaching behavior, but this need not be completed as part of the classroom observation. West Hartford uses a check sheet upon which each of 20 evaluative items is marked according to five possible degrees of fulfillment. Weber has a detailed classroom observation procedure, utilizing an "observation code" broken down into 5-minute time intervals during the observation period. West Hartford is unique in that no descriptive information for the elaboration of the evaluative criteria is provided, a procedure which is intentional.

3. Who does the rating?

The principal is the primary evaluator in each instance. Of those having department chairmen at the high school, Summit and West Hartford rely also upon that person. Summit places considerable reliance upon the department chairman. Weber has evaluation teams consisting of two members from the administrative staff of principal or district supervisors. One of the two observers usually will be the teacher's own principal. Rich has a chairman for each of four curriculum divisions. This division chairman maintains considerable responsibility for evaluation of staff within his division. Weber alone as a matter of policy does not involve the department chairman in the evaluation program. None of the six involve other than professional staff members in the evaluation.

4. How frequently are classroom observations made?

Canton: The minimum requirement is four major classroom observations per teacher per year; at least one of these is for one full class period and each of the others is no less than 20 minutes. The observations may be made by any member of the administrative staff authorized in the evaluative procedure.

Summit: The evaluation is based upon, among other items, a minimum of 500 minutes of classroom observation, with at least one observation a year from the principal or the department chairman (or principal and elementary coordinator at the elementary level).

West Hartford: No specified number of minutes of classroom observation.

Weber: Each teacher in the merit program is observed at least seven times a year by two observers in the classroom. Each observation is a minimum of 30 and a maximum of 40 minutes. The total annual period is about 250 minutes of classroom observation.

Ladue: No specified number of minutes of classroom observation.

Rich: No specified number of minutes of classroom observation.

5. *What factors other than the direct interaction between the teacher, his student, and/or their parents enter into the evaluation process?*

Note: Each of these six districts emphasizes the classroom role as the major area of performance evaluation. However, each also includes certain nonclassroom criteria.

Canton: Participation in, and contributions to, other than formal teaching activities within the school is weighted at approximately one-sixth of the total evaluation score. Professional contributions and growth constitute an additional one-sixth. Thus, classroom behavior is rated at about two-thirds of the total teacher behavior.

Summit: Within the maximum possible score, the following weights are suggested: Curriculum development, 5 percent; public relations, including extracurricular as well as community affairs, 5 percent; school and systemwide contributions, 10 percent. Thus, classroom behavior is rated at 80 percent of the total teacher behavior.

West Hartford: The weights assigned to the various rating items are kept confidential from the staff, including both the teachers and their evaluators. Their original weighting was, however, determined by the staff. Of the 60 items on the three alternative rating scales, 20 are concerned with teacher characteristics which can be described in other than a classroom situation. On this basis, the classroom behavior would be rated at two-thirds of the total teacher behavior.

Weber: Weber describes the effective teacher primarily in terms of classroom behavior. Activities evaluated outside of the classroom consist only of certain managerial functions within the school, such as additional assigned duties, recordkeeping, and the PTA. Strong parental relations and loyalty to the school are also cited. Unlike each of the other five districts, no mention is made of the teacher's responsibilities or contributions to the community. Classroom behavior is considered to offer a nearly complete description of effective teacher behavior.

Ladue: Ladue uses criteria for the identification of effective teacher behavior which include certain nonclassroom qualities. These would include responsibilities to the community and profession as well as certain personal characteristics, such as a breadth of personal interests, a strong basic character, and a sense of social appropriateness.

Rich: The criteria for the evaluation give considerable attention to the teacher's responsibilities and professional contributions to the school and the district. Participation in community activities is encouraged. However, performance in the classroom is of prime consideration, just as in the other five districts.

Highlights of the Evaluation Programs

Canton

Evaluation Policy

1. Develops a numerical score as a summary of the teacher evaluation.
2. Places considerable emphasis upon responsibilities of the teacher for contributions outside of the classroom.
3. Has little provision for self-evaluation as part of the formal evaluation which determines the salary level.

Canton has developed a set of criteria to serve as guides for the evaluators. They consist of five major areas, major headings within each area, and then subheadings. A numerical score, which is weighted for each major area, is the result of a summation of the heading scores. The subheadings are not scored and serve only as guides for the scoring of the heading. The final score is the summation of the five major area scores. The major areas and the major headings are:

- I. Provides for the learning of students. (Weighted at 55 percent)
 - A. Uses psychological principles of learning.
 - B. Uses principles of child growth and development in learning situations.
 - C. Manages the classroom effectively and maintains an atmosphere that is conducive to learning.
 - D. Organizes the classroom for effective democratic living.
 - E. Plans effectively.
 - F. Evaluates pupil achievement.
- II. Counsels and guides students effectively. (Weighted at 10 percent)
 - A. Maintains effective relationships with students individually and in groups.
 - B. Makes significant use of counseling materials.
 - C. Maintains effective relationships with parents.
 - D. Maintains appropriate relations with guidance personnel.
- III. Aids students to understand cultural heritage. (Weighted at 5 percent)

Transmits to students our cultural heritage, recognizing that most of such heritage is embodied in the school curricula.
- IV. Participates effectively in other than formal teaching activities of the school. (Weighted at 15 percent)
 - A. Works with others to maintain a unified learning process.
 - B. Assumes a full part of the responsibility for school activities.
 - C. Maintains harmonious personal relations with colleagues.
- V. Works on a professional level. (Weighted at 15 percent)
 - A. Gives evidence of the importance of its members, students, parents, and others in the community—importance to man, his culture, and his way of life.

- B. Assists in maintaining good relations between the school and the rest of the community.
- C. Contributes to the profession by membership in professional organizations and participates in their activities.
- D. Assumes responsibility for his own professional growth.
- E. Aids in orientation of teachers coming into the Canton system.
- F. Complies with rules and administrative requests.

Each of these headings is marked as Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Competent, Highly Competent, or Superior. The numerical equivalent of each of these five classifications varies with the weighting assigned to the major area. The Competent rating, for example, is assigned a value of 6 for the first major area, 1.5 for the second and fifth, and 3 for the other two. The result is a maximum possible score of 21 for the Unsatisfactory, 42 for the Satisfactory, 63 for the Competent, 75 for the Highly Competent, and from 84 to 100 for the Superior.

The Classification Scale upon which the salary is based is:

Superior.....	80-100	Steps 1 through 16.
Highly competent.....	70-79	Steps 1 through 15.
Competent.....	60-69	Steps 1 through 13.
Satisfactory.....	40-59	Steps 1 through 3; raise minimum 2 points each step from step 3 through step 11. The maximum of 59, of course, remains the same. At step 11, this is 56-59.
Unsatisfactory.....	20-39	Step 1 only.

The final teacher-principal conference is conducted on the basis of descriptive statements, rather than numerical scores. The numerical score is viewed as a tool to simplify the administrative procedure of salary determination.

Ladue

Evaluation Policy

1. Does not produce a numerical score as a summary of the teacher evaluation.
2. Places considerable emphasis upon the responsibilities of the teacher for contribution outside of the classroom.
3. Contains a strong element of self-evaluation.

Ladue does not use either a formal rating sheet or a numerical score—nor are the various criteria for guidance of the evaluator assigned any recommended weights. The final teacher-principal conferences following the evaluations are for the purpose of appraising problems and progress as well as making suggestions for future growth.

The criteria developed by the staff for the guidance of the evaluation process are stated in a positive sense as characteristics which identify the superior teacher. These criteria include:

- I. Personal qualities
 - A. Strong basic character.
 - B. Good mental and physical health.
 - C. Understands the importance of social amenities in personal relationships.
 - D. Possesses the personal qualities which promote good human relations.
- II. Professional training and growth
 - A. Basic training, including humanities, child development, subject matter, and practice teaching.
 - B. Experiences that contribute to effectiveness of teaching.
 - C. Additional experiences, such as travel, reading, and work.
 - D. Professional organizations.
 - E. Observance of professional ethics.
 - F. Awareness by the teacher's family or other close associates in their responsibilities toward the profession and the school system.
- III. Evidences of superior teaching
 - A. Pupils are led to govern their own behavior in a constructive manner and act in accordance with democratic ideals.
 - B. Learning situations are organized and objectives classified so pupils understand the purposes of a course or activity.
 - C. Activities and opportunities are provided to help pupils achieve planned goals.
 - D. The needs of the individual pupil (retarded, normal, gifted) are recognized and met.
 - E. The classroom and school environment is conducive to learning.
 - F. Wholesome and friendly relationships with the school and community are developed.
 - G. There is cooperation and communication with all staff members to achieve stated goals and objectives and to meet the needs of children.
 - H. There is constructive evaluation of the pupil's growth.

Ladue does not use a statistical approach to its evaluation program. However, this does not mean that a recording of the evaluation is not made. Instead, it is emphasized that the evaluation must be amenable to a recording. The responsibility for the submission of materials upon which the evaluation is made is shared by both the teacher and the evaluator. The evaluative material as filed would include the narrative records of classroom observation, summaries of the teacher-evaluator conference, plans for professional growth and the progress of those plans, and other material descriptive of the teacher's contributions to his school, community, and profession.

Rich

Evaluation Policy

1. Does not produce a numerical score as a summary of teacher evaluation.
2. Evaluates the contributions outside the classroom, particularly the teacher's responsibility to his own building and system staff.
3. Emphasizes the importance of self-evaluation.

Rich uses a self-evaluation approach to a greater extent than any of the other five districts. One of the stated principles of merit pay in Rich is that "The integrity of the evaluators must be unquestioned, including the self-evaluation of the teacher." The teacher annually prepares written comments on his:

1. Classroom performance.
2. Teaching improvements.
3. Extraclass assignments.
4. Community and parental relations.
5. Plans for further personal and professional growth.

The evaluator prepares a statement also, using a similar outline. There is an evaluation guide for use by both the teacher and the evaluator which includes:

1. Ability in instruction.
2. Use of effective class techniques.
3. Attention given to individual pupils.
4. Achievement of pupils.
5. Achievement, respect, and control of pupils.
6. Academic scholarship.
7. Professional interest and growth.
8. Initiative for self-improvement.
9. Attitude toward out-of-class activities.
10. Cooperation with other staff members.
11. Personality.
12. Constructive interpretation of school program and policies.

Concise descriptive statements of amplification for each of the above 12 criteria are provided.

The teacher-principal interview is an integral part of the evaluation program. This includes a review of past progress, possible plans for the future, and an analysis of potential obstacles to the satisfaction of those plans. Following the interview, the principal forwards a summary and recommendation to the superintendent. Decision is then made as to the placement of the teacher into Division I or Division II. The entire evaluation procedure places heavy reliance upon the professional and personal skills of the principal and the division chairman in their ability to point up specific factors within the evaluation, without using a numerical approach to measurement of performance.

West Hartford

Evaluation Policy

1. Produces a numerical score as a summary of the teacher evaluation.
2. Includes an evaluation of the teacher's contributions outside the classroom and school.
3. Provides little provision for self-evaluation as part of the merit-rating program.

The Teacher Evaluation Form consists of 20 items. (There are three alternate forms, with a different one used each year or in the same year if a reappraisal is necessary.) Each of the 20 items is scored on the basis of its prevalence, or frequency of occurrence, as an indication of the teacher's effectiveness. The evaluator is offered five choices as an indication of fulfillment of the criterion. He places a numerical symbol in the appropriate column which follows each statement as follows:

T—Far exceeds the basic performance of the typical West Hartford teacher, consistently creating and taking advantage of opportunities to fulfill this item

I—Intermediate performance between T and R.

R—Basic performance of the typical West Hartford teacher who is expected to and does perform at a very commendable level without regard to experience.

E—Intermediate performance between R and M.

M—Below expected performance level of the typical West Hartford teacher. Not aware or does not take advantage of opportunities available. This may be due to lack of experience.

T=5, I=4, R=3, E=2, M=1.

One of the three alternate evaluation forms includes the following items to which the above scores of prevalence are to apply:

1. Helps children develop poise.
2. Works on professional committees.
3. Correlates subject matter with other areas of work.
4. Delegates responsibilities with adequate follow-up.
5. Creates atmosphere conducive to learning.
6. Instructs in effective study skills.
7. Shows proficiency in subject matter.
8. Adapts to new situations.
9. Guides rather than directs.
10. Supports school functions.
11. Keeps up with latest developments in field related to his teaching.
12. Is firm.
13. Gets pupil to realize purpose of what he learns.

14. Provides enrichment through field trips.
15. Commands respect of professional associates.
16. Returns students' assignments promptly.
17. Provides opportunity for student creativity.
18. Uses to advantage skill in pupil grouping.
19. Shows creativity in preparation of daily work.
20. Seeks assistance from others.

Each of these items is weighted relative to each other. Neither the teacher nor the appraiser knows the value of these weights at any time. Theoretically, such a procedure could result in a one-item evaluation. The evaluation is made on score sheets adaptable to mechanical marking, and the item weights as well as the final score are produced upon data-processing equipment. The translation of the teacher appraisal summary into a final rating score is a rather complex statistical manipulation. The goal is, through the use of the appropriate statistics, to adjust all appraisal scores to a single uniform scale which will:

1. Equalize the standards held by the various appraisers.
2. Maintain relative weights between each of the 20 items.
3. Equalize the effect of varying years of teaching service upon the rating received.

West Hartford, unlike any of the other five districts, provides no descriptive statements of the criteria items. This omission is intentional and is based upon the fact that the items were developed on a basis of a prior agreement among the teachers as to the importance of each item. It is stressed that a common understanding of the meaning of the item does exist between the appraisee and the appraiser. The addition of terminology to elaborate the item would, it is felt, alter the original meaning as agreed upon by the teachers during the original process which established these three lists of criterial items from some 400 which were considered. Thus, each item means to either the appraiser or the appraisee whatever he, in each case, thinks that it means.

Means and deviations are computed on four teacher groups, classified by the number of years of experience. Only the 8-11, and 12 and over, are applicable for merit salary purposes.

Again, it is emphasized that the deviations from the mean determine the number of annual increments. They do not determine the number or proportion of the staff which may be receiving the merit awards at any one time.

Teachers eligible for the first and second merit awards are those who score not less than 0.75 and 1.75 standard deviations above the

mean, respective of their own experience group. Percentagewise, this is approximately 25 percent of the group for the first merit award and an additional 5 percent for the second. The top 5 percent are described as superior teachers, the next 25 percent as considerably or moderately above average.

Summit

Evaluation Policy

1. Produces a numerical score as a summary of the teacher evaluation.
2. Evaluates the teacher's contribution to activities outside the classroom.
3. Makes no provision for self-evaluation as a part of the merit rating.

The Summit evaluation program is marked by its emphasis upon (1) a need for uniform techniques and standards which are agreed upon and understood by both the teacher and the evaluator, and (2) a comprehensive position analysis of the public school teacher.

Certain characteristics are apparent as a result of these two emphases. The recording of factual data, the preparation of a final rating, and the evaluator-teacher interview are considered to be amenable to rather formal, standard, and uniform procedural instructions. Second, the performance appraisal manual used in Summit indicates that the rating should precede the interview. This would appear to be a denial of the importance of a self-evaluation approach. Lastly, the appraisal guide is quite detailed in terms of format and stresses the importance of a position analysis or job description of the teacher. This position analysis is not, however, basically different in substance from the criteria used in Canton, Ladue, or Rich.

Major responsibilities of the teacher and their relative weights for evaluation purposes are:

<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Relative weight</i>
Character development.....	2
Classroom management.....	2
Curriculum development.....	1
Daily preparation.....	2
Knowledge of subject matter.....	3
Public relations.....	1
Pupil evaluation.....	1
Pupil-teacher relationships.....	3
Schoolwide and systemwide effectiveness.....	2
Techniques of instruction.....	3

From these 10 criteria, Summit produces a total rating score. Critical scores are established, and the achievement of a sufficiently high rating score enables the teacher to be eligible for the merit awards as well as the Master Teacher Classification.

Weber

Evaluation Policy

1. A final numerical rating score critical for salary determination is not developed. However, a numerical summation of the classroom observation part of the evaluation is produced.
2. Evaluation for merit salary is limited to classroom and extraclass school activities.
3. Little provision for self-evaluation is made.
4. Participation in the merit program is voluntary on the part of the teacher.

Although Weber does not develop a final numerical rating for salary purposes, it does make a strong effort to quantify, or measure, teaching effectiveness. The classroom observation procedure which produces a numerical score is the most highly structured of the six districts. The observations approach the critical incidence procedure. For those who agree in a formal statement in writing to participate, classroom observations are made about 8 times a year. Two-man observer teams are used, with one of the observers usually being the teacher's principal. These teams are not permanent and consist of principals, supervisors, and consultants. Each observation lasts a minimum of 30 and a maximum of 40 minutes.

The observation instrument is divided into sections, with each section corresponding to a 5-minute time interval, the instrument making provision for 8 such intervals. A code is then provided for the observer to mark the occurrence of certain specified behavior as it occurs, or does not occur, during each 5-minute interval.

One observer makes the coding; the other maintains a record of verbal and nonverbal interaction between the pupils and the teacher. Following the termination of the observation period, the second observer also codes the observation instrument and from the two a consensus observation code is prepared. All notes and records are then given to the Merit Study Office for inclusion in the teacher's evaluation file. Following the observation, the teacher has an interview with one of the observers, and any comments which he wishes to have inserted into the file are then prepared. This interview is restricted to the observation report. Remedial and growth programs are not discussed.

The classroom observation recordings thus become the most important base for the final evaluation summary. Additional information which is used includes:

1. National Teacher Examinations.
2. Pupil Achievement Tests.
3. A recorded statement of time spent in out-of-class activities.
4. A personnel data sheet of education, experience, writings, etc.

5. A teacher's "List of Imposed Variables," which includes factors which tend to limit the teacher's degree of effectiveness and over which he has no control.

The observation code plus the "List of Imposed Variables" constitute the major determinants for consideration in the development of the final merit rating. A final interview is held with the Merit Salary Study Director.

The Weber definition or standard for effective teaching is based upon the seven conditions for effective learning as outlined by Frandsen.¹ They equate effective teaching with adequate consideration by the teacher to:

1. Maturity and abilities of the child.
2. Teacher-guidance in showing or in arranging conditions for self-discovery or how to accomplish goals effectively.
3. Goal-directed drill and practice.
4. Perception of the effects of provisional trials.
5. Provision for generalization and transfer.
6. Motivation.
7. Freedom from anxiety and distorting activities.

These seven conditions then become the basis for a tabulation or frequency count of the number of coded incidents occurring during the observation period, or the total of the "critical incidents" recorded during the 5-minute time segments.

Finally, it should be noted that the teacher's effectiveness is evaluated almost solely in terms of classroom behavior. Extra-class activities are evaluated on a defined time variable, but these are exclusively school activities.

¹ Arden N. Frandsen. *How Children Learn: An Educational Psychology*. New York, McGraw-Hill 1957. p. 46-47.

Chapter V

Summary

THERE ARE several major points which may be discussed in terms of the material presented in the preceding chapters. Basically, these points are concerned with the need for a careful delineation of goals, policies, and procedures through which merit salary programs emerge from the area of principle into operational existence in a given school system. And as has been suggested, the value of a merit policy over any other salary policy should be determined by the goals of that policy. Thus, there must be a careful distinction between accepting or rejecting merit salary policies on the basis of (1) merit programs as opposed to (2) the merit salary principle. The future of merit salary programs as being a partial, or total, solution to the entire teacher compensation problem might better be discussed on the basis of the goals of the merit salary program rather than upon the program itself.

The Distinction Between Merit Programs and the Merit Principle

Certainly a good deal of the controversy which surrounds discussions of merit salary programs for teachers centers on the techniques and devices through which a teacher is rated and then paid in accordance with that rating. The rating procedure, the amount of the salary differential, and the frequency of the observations exemplify such program characteristics. Although these regulatory tools are important and necessary, they are only a method of implementation and must follow rather than precede any discussion over the need for a merit salary program. It is assumed that merit salary programs are established because of a need which has arisen out of a dissatisfaction with current salary policies.

And, too frequently, dissatisfaction with current salary policies has centered on characteristics of the school program whose causal relationship with salary policies is open to question. It has been stressed within this text that the need for and the existence of sound staff evaluation, supervisory, and development programs are not necessarily a function of the salary program. It is true that one procedure for the improvement of these programs may be a change

in salary policy. However, this change need not be viewed as the sole alternative.

A second major dissatisfaction with current salary policies has been stated as their inability to reward superior service. Merit salaries are then proposed as a means of encouraging, identifying, and rewarding such service on a differential basis.

In both of these two areas of dissatisfaction, there may exist a lack of distinction between merit salaries and the rating, or evaluation, through which the salary is determined. If this distinction is accepted, it becomes possible to look at the merit salary policy concept as something discrete from other reward programs. The question then centers around the nature of the uniqueness of a merit salary program which no other salary structure has to offer and to which there is no alternative. The issue of merit salaries becomes solidified.

The acceptance of the uniqueness of the principle of merit salaries for teachers may take the following route. First, it may deny the previous refutation of a one-to-one relationship between improvement of instruction and differentiated salaries on the basis of performance. The relationship is accepted through the assumption that such a salary differential does indeed motivate superior performance. Second, and perhaps more important, is the effort to establish the goal of a merit policy outside the instructional improvement area. This, of course, is exemplified by the position which views the automatic salary schedule as being contradictory to the economic system of this Nation and for which the teacher should serve as a model. This is not a position frequently utilized during salary discussions. Yet, one interesting feature of it is that in a Nation with a highly decentralized educational system, relying upon the resources and aspirations of the individual community, it has received little attention as a support for a position favorable to merit salary programs. It has the advantage of providing both the uniqueness which is necessary for a justification and it also is outside of the "burden of proof" question.

The issue of merit salary programs for teachers becomes more solidified as this question of uniqueness is resolved. Their value can be better discussed when, or if, such a uniqueness can be established and then weighed against the alternatives.

The Search for Objectivity in Evaluation

The effort by many districts with merit salary programs, and this may well apply to those without, to strive for a high degree of specificity in their evaluation procedures is apparent when these procedures are examined. Perhaps this effort is associated with the rather

large testing programs carried on in the schools, or with the developments in more efficient teaching devices. And, certainly, salary advances in industry have been closely related to increased productivity per employee. To assume that teacher performance can be measured may be the reflection of a need for greater efficiency in the educational system. To implement this assumption, there must be developed descriptions of the goals of education as well as the responsibilities of the teacher in fulfilling those goals. Whether this can, or more important should, result in the development of measurable criteria of teacher effectiveness as has been suggested is a question worthy of study.

A criticism of the attempt to measure teacher effectiveness does not in any way suggest a lack of importance of staff evaluation programs or that differences in effectiveness are not identifiable. Yet, the apparent difference in approach to determination of effectiveness as evidenced within the preceding chapters is a significant one. Whether one is to be considered as an "interim" procedure en route to the other is a proposition which was not discussed within the text. But for any group considering teacher evaluation programs, an early decision on which of the two approaches to follow should be quite necessary.

The Future of the Teacher Salary Structure

The entire reward system for teachers is a complex of such factors as salaries, fringe benefits, status, class load, responsibility, and security, among others. The salary structure is obviously an important segment of this total structure. The need for a general elevation of salaries as a means of improving instruction through the recruitment and retention of capable teachers is well known. The directions which these improvements should take are of local, State, and national concern.

Of important concern within the total teacher compensation problem is the provision of adequate maximum salaries for teachers which will serve as one incentive to the extent that the schools can compete more satisfactorily than now for their staff. One solution would be to elevate the maximums for the entire profession, assuming that the Nation would be able to support such an effort. If this elevation is to be of a significant amount, it is apparent that necessary funds would be of a prohibitive amount, even if it were a desirable goal.

One alternative to this general raising of the maximums is to provide for some differentiation on a selective basis, presumably according to the performance level. It is at this point in the much larger problem of teacher compensation that the issue of merit salaries enters the discussion. The fact that the encouragement and rewarding of

superior performance on a differential salary basis may be accomplished through means other than merit salary policies has been previously stated. Which is the best means is another question. The school districts cooperating with the preparation of this bulletin have accepted the merit salary approach as the most appropriate salary policy. Other districts have approached the problem of salary differentiation through other means.

The merit salary question is but one part of the entire reward system and of the total salary structure. However, it is of sufficient interest as an innovation to warrant its inclusion as one part of any discussion of the total teacher compensation problem.

Chapter VI

Extracts From Programs

THERE ARE certain features which particularly highlight each of these six districts. One such feature from each program has been selected for presentation in the form of a reproduction of written material from each district.

Canton

History of the Development of an Evaluation Program for Teachers in Canton, Conn.

A few years ago the teaching staff in Canton, Connecticut, considered at some length the relative merits of an evaluation system for teachers; that is, a system enabling the responsible powers not only to reward more adequately those who do an excellent job and those who are competent as the years go along, but also to improve teachers who are not doing satisfactory work or otherwise to release them.

A few meetings were held involving the superintendent, the principals, and representatives from the teachers group. A considerable amount of spade work was done and a draft of an evaluation sheet was drawn. After further analysis it was decided by all concerned—board of education, school administration and teaching staff—that the town was not ready at that particular time to incorporate a system of evaluation which would be reflected in salary.

In the next next two or three years, evaluation was discussed informally but no particular progress was made. Nevertheless, a representative group from the teachers and the board of education did meet periodically to discuss various personnel problems. Such meetings established a closer relationship and brought about a clearer understanding of the functions of each in the operation of a school system. (Understanding is of primary importance before evaluation of teaching personnel can be seriously considered.)

In the latter part of 1956, the teacher-board committee met again to discuss future salary adjustments. Part of the discussion centered about teacher evaluation and the effect it would have upon the system. Both the board of education and the teacher representatives agreed that two factors form a basis from which merit springs—one, an *adequate salary base*, and the other, *useful and sound criteria* that define the attributes of a competent teacher. It was considered paramount that the evaluation should not, and could not, be placed on a competitive basis. Teachers would have to be evaluated in relation to established criteria and not in relation to each other.

An adequate salary base, meeting with the approval of the board of education and the teachers, was established. An Evaluative Criteria Committee, consisting of seven teachers, four board members and four administrators, was formed to

carry on research and to construct the evaluative criteria. The teacher members of the committee were elected by the teachers' association and represented all grade levels; the administrative representatives included the superintendent of schools and the three principals; the board representatives were selected by the board of education.

At the first committee meeting, it was decided that the minutes of each meeting would be made available to all staff members and that other staff and board members could attend any meetings. Various merit plans were presented, reviewed and considered. At one of the early meetings a paper entitled "The California Statement of Teacher Competence" was presented. The areas identified with competency were not only clearly defined but also broad in scope. Because this statement dealt directly with teaching competence it was accepted as the basis for the development of evaluative criteria.

As the material for the criteria was worked and reworked, the committee members realized that this task was indeed a challenge, with many ramifications and of serious consequence. Careful scrutiny became the by-word. As each area of the criteria was presented, committee members were almost hypercritical of the content, interpretation and wording.

Finally, the criteria were completed and ready for presentation. A copy, with a form enclosed for comment, was sent to every teacher in the system and to all board members. Each was urged to consider these criteria most carefully and to make general or specific comments or suggestions. A reply was requested from all staff members to insure each teacher the opportunity to state his position. Almost all teachers returned the comment sheets with observations. The comments were most favorable, changes suggested were made, and the new ideas incorporated.

The committee next set about the task of classifying the various major areas of the criteria, computing rating scores and weights, and determining the way in which the criteria would be associated with salary. It was unanimously agreed that the Building Principals would assume the major responsibility in the evaluation of teachers and that a Personnel Review Board would be established to review any situation where it was felt necessary by a faculty member.

After thirty meetings, the Evaluative Criteria Committee had completed its assignment and presented the finished product to all concerned. Both the board of education and the teachers accepted the criteria and evaluative procedures. Thus, in September of 1957 the evaluation of teachers began. It has continued successfully ever since.

What has been our experience over a period of five years? One, in the first three years it was essential to make revisions in the criteria and procedures for better understandings. Two, approximately 21 percent of the staff received superior ratings each year, 20 percent during the first three years, 24 percent the fourth year and 22 percent in 1961-62, the fifth year. Three, instructional leadership and supervisory service increased substantially. The principals not only became more closely associated with their respective staff but also with their programs and the attendant results.

The development of our evaluation program has been given in some detail. This detail is required to demonstrate that the process must be a careful one and that it is at times lengthy and laborious. Our experience has shown that three important facts must be understood if success is to be achieved. One, an evaluation plan must not be instituted overnight, nor can it be thrust upon the staff.

Preferably, it should come from the grass roots level and be arrived at cooperatively. Two, its goals must be to improve teachers and to provide better instructional services; and certainly not be punitive in nature or intent. Three, the policies, procedures and machinery for implementation must be clearly understood by all concerned. If these factors are taken into account and if patience and understanding are exercised, then an evaluation plan related to teacher salary can become a reality.

Ladue

Ladue has based its salary policy of merit pay upon its statement of the purpose of public education. The purpose is defined as follows:

The fundamental purpose of public education in this country is to promote the total development of children and youth so that they may adjust and contribute to the democratic way of life. Two concepts are involved: First, a concept of human development which pertains to the "whole individual," and, second, a concept of democracy as a "way of life."

The "whole individual" idea is based upon sound psychological principles and holds much promise for the success of democratic living. It takes account of the fact that human beings grow as integrated wholes rather than by parts and that the intellectual, social, emotional, physical, and moral aspects of their development are all dependent upon one another. Strong school programs provide for all aspects of growth at the same time, although emphasis is placed upon intellectual development which includes the knowledges and skills necessary for good social adjustment. Intellectual, social, emotional, physical, and moral growth all contribute to the total development of children and youth and make it possible for them to live better with other people.

The "democratic way of life," as exemplified in this country, is a plan to govern the affairs of the people. The political, social, economic, and moral aspects of the plan require definition in terms of popular concepts so that the purpose of public education can be more clearly understood.

The political aspect may be defined as, "A form of government in which supreme power is retained by the people and exercised indirectly through representatives of the people." Laws are made by the people or by their representatives rather than by an individual.

The social aspect includes two basic tenets. The first pertains to social position. It holds that our society is dynamic rather than static and contains no permanent ruling class by virtue of heredity or inheritance. An individual may move from one strata of society to another depending upon his desires, capabilities and efforts.

The second tenet deals with human relations and pertains to the method through which people are governed. It holds that those affected by a policy should share in formulating that policy. This does not mean that those affected by a decision should share in making the decision. It does mean that either someone in a status position or one of the group affected should assume the responsibility of making decisions in terms of the policy formulated.

The economic aspect is conceived to be a capitalistic system of economy based upon competitive endeavor which permits freedom of choice in selecting a means of livelihood. Individual initiative and enterprise are encouraged and rewarded. Except for controls imposed by law, determined through democratic political processes, and for the restraints of social and moral codes set by society and

dictated by his own conscience, an individual may conduct his affairs as he chooses.

The moral aspect is based upon the ethics of the Judaeo-Christian culture and should govern political, social, and economic affairs. It relates to the conscience of an individual which affects his personal life as well as his relationship with others.

An individual who deviates from the Ethic unknowingly may be considered to be amoral and is not affected by a conscience since he is not aware of wrong conduct. An individual who knowingly deviates from the Ethic may be considered to be immoral and is affected by conscience.

The democratic way emphasizes "the freedom and dignity of the individual," "equality of opportunity," and "the individual's responsibility to his fellowmen." Its success or failure depends upon the people who are a part of it. The function of the public schools is to perpetuate and work to improve democracy by developing in children and youth the ability, understanding, and willingness to make it work.

Rich

Rich has endeavored to relate the merit salary program and evaluation procedure with a professional and personal growth program. It has done this through the provision of an extended contract which invites the teacher to participate in a district-financed, long-range program of professional development. An example of such a program, as submitted and approved at Rich, follows. It is not reproduced in its entirety, but includes certain pertinent sections of a 4-year program as outlined by a Division II teacher currently on the Rich faculty.

Some aims for the forthcoming 4 years which have grown out of experience and opportunity at Rich follow:

Programs of Activities

Summer 1960

A John Hay fellowship at Bennington College. A discussion of a few great books. Courses in American philosophy and the criticism of poetry.

Summer 1961

A summer of travel, including a visit to the Soviet Union if visas are available.

Summer 1962

A contribution to the Rich summer program teaching in the humanities or in language, working out an "unschoolish" course appealing and appropriate in a relaxed summer atmosphere.

Summer 1963

A summer of study at a Russian institute sponsored by the National Defense Education Act, or at the University of Indiana or Middlebury College.

Sabbatical Year 1963-64

A selection among these possibilities:

Exchange teachership to Russia, Britain, or France

John Hay fellowship at Yale

Travel to Europe, Africa, Asia, Australia

Some Specific Contributions for Which To Strive*Literature*

To expand the insights gained and the techniques of selectivity and discovery applied in the English honors program

To direct a more discriminating and appealing program of reading and discussion of literature

To encourage a greater interest in literature among students of all levels by urging not formal analysis but the test of subjective experience

History

To refine the course in modern history, urging that history be viewed as the vital and corrective study behind current affairs

To promote the sense of discovery in the study of modern history and give it the vitality and popularity it currently enjoys at Oxford and Cambridge

Language

To strengthen the Russian program by a cautious expansion of techniques related to the particular bent and skills of the class and by developing material for advanced classes and individual and adult students of Russian

The humanities

To urge not only the distinctions but also the unity of literature and history

To excite incoming freshmen with the enjoyment of learning

By an imaginative selection of books to read and ideas to explore, to give them a good start toward a program of substance in the humanities

Composition

To create the proper atmosphere and offer abundant opportunity to practice good writing

By constructive criticism of student writing to eliminate the gross, the redundant, the affected, the sensational, the ornamental in their writing and save only the sensitive

The Area of Student Responsibility

To encourage among students self-discipline and a sense of responsibility rather than mere obedience to rules

To encourage in class and in student council a greater participation in school and classroom life

To encourage among students a more constant, enlightened, and constructive system of evaluation and self-evaluation

Summit

Summit developed its personnel appraisal program through the employment of a management consultant firm. As previously noted, the program is marked by a position analysis of the teacher. This position

analysis includes 10 major responsibilities, with each major responsibility being divided into a series of key duties.

One such major responsibility is *Daily Preparation*. The standard of performance for this responsibility is met when the preparation is adequate to achieve the objective of the day's lesson.

Key Duties

1. Prepares and writes daily lesson plans which will contribute to effective teaching.
2. Develops, plans, and provides learning situations for simultaneous group activities.
3. Devises and develops a variety of activities and resources to assure stimulation in the teaching process.
4. Enlists pupil participation in the planning process as required by the situation.
5. Fits daily plan into established teaching unit within the course of study.
6. Procures and organizes in advance materials, equipment, and supplies for use in class.
7. Plans activities to meet individual needs and differences for the slow, average, and gifted learner.
8. Makes appropriate arrangements in order to use effectively resource people, community organizations, field trips and excursions to stimulate the learning process.
9. Makes daily lesson plans, seating charts, and teaching materials available for substitutes.

Weber

The Weber evaluation program is characterized most significantly by its Teacher Observation Code. The columns in the top section are coded by one observer in accordance with classification guide for numerical coding developed at Weber. Each column represents a 5-minute period of observation in the classroom. The lower section is also coded, with the code representing an ordinal number corresponding to the 5-minute observation period in which the particular teacher behavior was noted. The narrative part of the form (on pages 55 and 56) is compiled during the observation by the second of the two observers.

Weber—1st Grade—Random Grouped

January 25, 1962.

1:15—Orientation. Has 32 1st grade students, large mural on wall of penguin and boys and girls sleigh riding, snowman, snowflakes, numbers chart, stories printed on charts, igloos and eskimo, science corner, country store, farm animals.

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION SCHEDULE--WEBER

Teacher _____ Date _____ Time _____ To _____ From _____ Subject _____ Other _____
 Observer _____ Report Desired _____

NOTES OR COMMENTS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
A. TEACHER ASSISTANCE								
B. DIFFERENTIATION								
C. CLASS LEADERSHIP								
D. STUDENT INTERACTION								
E. PUPIL INITIATIVE								
F. CONTEXT								
(Identify codes that make up a Code 6)								
G. VARIETY								
1. Teacher lectures, reads, relates story								
2. Teacher gives directions or makes assignment								
3. Teacher questions, pupil answers								
4. Teacher makes suggestions on class activity or student progress								
5. Teacher relates subject matter to "everyday" situations.								
6. Teacher works at blackboard or overhead projector								
7. Teacher gives other demonstrations								
8. Teacher uses slides, movies, recording or T. V.								
9. Outside resource person used								
10. Student initiated discussion								
11. Class goes on field trip								
12. Pupils work in small discussion groups or activity groups (Identifiable groups with positive interaction.)								
13. Pupils engage in role playing or present play								
14. Pupils act as group leaders (P.E. team captains, music leaders, etc.)								
15. Pupils give talks, report, or solo music rendition								
16. Pupils read text (also sheet music, folios, etc.) silently								
17. Pupils read other books silently								
18. Pupils work problems (workbook or other teacher approved problems)								
19. Pupils read aloud (does not include student prepared reports.)								
20. Pupils study charts, drawings, maps, etc.								
21. Pupils work at blackboard or other large writing surface								
22. Pupils work experiments or perform demonstration								
23. Pupils inspect materials other than books (objects, periodicals, teacher devices, etc.)								
24. Pupils draw, paint, or decorate room								
25. Pupils construct things								
26. Pupils operate mechanical devices, drive automobile								
27. Pupils participate in vocal music activity								
28. Pupils play musical instruments								
29. Pupils participate in physical exercises (non-team)								
30. Pupils play team games								
31. Pupils demonstrate or participate in other social activity								
32. Pupils take or correct test.								

E. COMPETENCY

Positive

- The teacher:
1. was thorough in explanation.
 2. provides complete and satisfying answers to student questions
 3. encouraged or initiated classroom discussion that was supportive to the learning activity. (student or teacher initiated.)
 4. directed the complete and relevant use of time.
 5. tried to make generalizations about the learning activity or showed implications for "life" situations or explained the purpose of the learning activity to students
 6. suggested aids to learning and study hints.
 7. brought in physical non-verbal examples and experiences.
 8. tried to clarify by restating ideas in different contents; pointed out implications and relationships.
 9. made provisions for student perception of progress in activity.
 10. provided for review (must be deliberate review.)
 11. accepted or encouraged student academic curiosity.

1. TEACHER CLIMATE PositiveThe teacher:

1. made courteous remarks or gave stereotyped student support.
2. respected pupil opinion or tried to see pupil point of view.
3. complimented pupils. (specific student support.)
4. used humor as part of learning situation.
5. gave special evidence of patience. (must be extra effort.)
6. expressed sympathy. (Student embarrassment, failure, injury, etc.)
7. helped student with some non-academic (personal) problems.
8. attempted to recognize all students who desire to make a positive contribution to the learning activity.
9. supported and aided pupils who experience difficulty in communicating ideas and concepts. (must be verbal communication.)
10. kept all students involved in a learning activity.
11. accepted criticism well.
12. teacher functioned as a genuine member of the learning group. However, maintains position of respect and authority. (must be involved with learning activity.)

3. PUPIL CLIMATE PositiveThe pupils:

1. response in verbal discussion was relevant, positive and constant.
2. solved problems or studied with little sign of attention wandering.
3. were prompt in taking part in new activities
4. paid close attention to teacher and/or other pupils.
5. made courteous remarks.
6. received suggestions and constructive criticism well.
7. seemed to display self confidence in the learning activity by active participation

Negative

- The teacher:
1. communication to students seemed to be above or below their level of comprehension. (Explanation seemed to leave pupils puzzled or bored.)
 2. answers to questions seemed incomplete or inaccurate.
 3. allowed discussion to wander from subject.
 4. avoided or failed responsibility.
 5. was unoccupied; had difficulty keeping attention on activity in progress.
 6. appeared uncertain of self in classroom situation.
 7. showed evidence of lack of planning for classroom work.
 8. showed evidence of limited background in subject taught.

* Please write a brief description of circumstances responsible for all negative codings.

NegativeThe teacher:

1. "Laid down the law." (Not supportive to learning situation.)
2. Was intolerant of pupil suggestions that may have been supportive of the learning activity.
3. interrupted speaking pupil without justification.
4. corrected or criticized excessively.
5. lacked sympathy with pupil failure.
6. used threats (frequent and excessive.)
7. was cross, lost temper.
8. permitted pupils to laugh at the mistakes of others.
9. made sarcastic remarks, used ridicule (without humor)
10. seemed disturbed in situation (enough to influence classroom climate)
11. used first and second person singular predominantly.

NegativeThe pupils:

1. were restless, gazed about, day dreamed (were bored).
2. were slow in reacting to the new learning situation. (Teacher request, did not volunteer, reluctant to recite, etc.)
3. whispered or showed other signs of substituting behavior
4. were quarrelsome, irritable, made rude remarks.
5. appeared insecure in making statements or asking questions.

1:15—Teacher asks class what we were talking about yesterday. Teacher holds up chart displaying money. Teacher and class count aloud number of pennies make a dime. Teacher questions, pupil answers. Teacher structures class. Teacher points to various coins and class tell what it is. Teacher has table with items to sell. Toy doll, 10¢, buttons, 1¢, box, 14¢. As Teacher holds up item class tells how much it costs. 1:17—Boy acting as storekeeper. Girl goes to store and buys item and makes right change. Teacher comments on items, various ones will buy and class laughs.

1:20—Class continues to go to store to buy items from storekeeper. This continues. Teacher assists various pupils to make right change in money. Teacher asks pupil to help a boy buy pig and wolf at store. Class enjoy this means of teaching money and value. Boys go to store with money and buy items at store. Teacher orients class members. Teacher comments about boy having to go home for more money to buy what he wanted. Class laughs. Teacher points to chart on money to explain problem. Pupil acting as storekeeper gives right change back to buyer.

1:25—Class move into new activity. Each table goes to shelf and gets work book. Unit in work is on money. Teacher tells class page number to work on. Teacher moves about assisting individuals. Teacher questions, pupil answers on first picture of money. Class holds up hands to answer. Teacher uses blackboard to write 5 cents to show class how to do work. Teacher questions, pupil answers. Teacher says all right. Right answer on line. Teacher questions, pupil answers. Teacher says "Good". Teacher cautions class not to tell answers aloud unless called on. Teacher questions, pupil answers how many pennies make a real nickel. Teacher shows real nickel. Teacher shows one nickel and three pennies. Calls for someone to give right answer. Pupil does this. This continues.

1:30—Teacher calls for answer. Class gives answer aloud. Teacher questions, pupil answers. Pupil raises hand to answer. This continues. Teacher question, pupil answers. Pupil says yes. 1:31—Teacher has class change activity and put work book away. Teacher hands out paper to group leaders of each table. Teacher moves table out of way. Teacher structures class on next assignment. Teacher asks class to put papers and pencils down. Teacher says "We are waiting for everyone."

1:33—Teacher structures class. Teacher orients class. Teacher asks what is a penguin. Pupil says it is white and black, has beak, etc. Has orange beak. Teacher continues to have class tell all they know about penguins. Teacher questions, pupil answers. Discussion continues.

1:35—Teacher and class continue to discuss about penguins. Teacher compares penguins to size of little girl. Class laughs about penguins waddling when they walk. Teacher asks class to get ready to write.

West Hartford

West Hartford has made a great effort to provide an objective, statistical measurement of teaching behavior. A summary of the West Hartford merit appraisal program was presented to the 1962 meeting of the American Education Research Association by the West Hartford superintendent of schools. This summary included the following material:

Safeguards

To insure the greatest possible degree of accuracy in appraisals, a number of special features were built into the new plan.

First, the items selected for use were those on which 400 teachers and administrators showed a high degree of agreement as to relative importance. Via a modification of Thurstone's equal-appearing-interval rating procedure, 60 items out of an original list of 140 were retained.

Second, three alternate forms, 20 items each, were prepared. These are to be rotated in use yearly, but any teacher may request a second appraisal by a second appraiser on either one of the two non-currently used alternate forms.

Third, each appraiser must discuss results with the teacher before submitting the form for scoring. Further, he must secure signature from the teacher to show that such conference was held. Neither the teacher nor the appraiser has knowledge of the item values (even though these were assigned, in the first instance, on the basis of teacher and administrative opinion).

Fourth, appraisals for all teachers are made annually. This insures the collection of the necessary norms and lets all teachers, once a year at least, know where they stand.

Fifth, item ratings are adjusted for differences in rater discriminability. To each item any one of five responses may be given. One principal may see many differences among teachers. Another may see few. To make final appraisal results independent of differences in rater discriminability, each appraiser's item ratings are transformed to a distribution with a predetermined common mean, standard deviation and variance.

Sixth, teaching merit is determined by the extent to which each item response differs from the mean item response for all teachers in an appropriate experience reference group. Teachers are divided into four experience groups: (1) 0-2 years; (2) 3-7 years; (3) 8-11 years; (4) 12 years and over. The West Hartford teacher salary plan assumes gradual increase in teaching effectiveness with experience.

On a preliminary (and anonymous) trial of the appraisal forms, teachers with greater experience did, in general, receive the higher ratings. Adjustment for this fact was made in a manner analogous to that used in developing the Stanford-Binet intelligence test. Item weights are adjusted so that a teacher's performance is compared only with that of other teachers in a comparable experience group. This is done in such manner, however, that the final appraisal score can be co-mingled, for comparative purposes, with scores of all other teachers regardless of experience. This adjustment, which is one of the two most distinctive features of the West Hartford appraisal plan, lies at its very heart or core. The fact that there was a change in proportion of favorable response according to experience, and the fact that this development sequence could be utilized as a basic criterion in terms on which to validate or standardize the appraisal forms is one of the most significant outcomes of our West Hartford studies.

Seventh, the final and effective item weights are those assigned collectively by teachers and administrators. As stated earlier, all appraisal items had to survive a modified equal-appearing-interval sorting procedure. By advance agreement with teachers, the mean item ratings resulting were to become the effective scoring weights. Therefore, once the adjustments for experience had been made, item response variances were multiplied by the agreed-upon effective weights.

This caused each item to contribute to the total appraisal score in accord with its own variance, this variance having been made proportional to the desired effective weight.

Eighth, all appraisal scores were adjusted for variation in rater leniency or severity in rating. West Hartford has, in general, one appraiser per school. On the assumption that schools are staffed equally, the appraisal scores for each school were transformed to a distribution having a predetermined common mean (100) and predetermined common standard deviation (.20).

Ninth, teachers to qualify for merit awards must secure appraisal scores which deviate by stipulated amounts from the mean appraisal score of 100. This is the second of the two most distinctive features of the West Hartford appraisal plan. All teachers with tenure are eligible for one or two merit award increments. The first can be secured at the eighth step or anytime thereafter when earned. The second can be secured at the twelfth step or anytime thereafter when earned, provided that he has previously qualified for the first merit increment. To qualify for the first increment, a teacher must secure an appraisal score 0.75 standard deviation units above the mean appraisal score of 100, i.e., 115. To qualify for the second merit increment, a teacher must secure an appraisal score 1.75 standard deviation units above the mean appraisal score of 100, i.e., 135. When appraisal scores are normally distributed, approximately 23 percent of the teachers can qualify for a first merit increment; about 4 percent for the second. The important feature is that the greater the pressure for high appraisal scores, the greater the leftward (or low-score) skewing of the distribution and the less the proportion of teachers who qualify for merit increments. In most appraisal systems penalties, if any, seem to accrue to teachers with severe appraisals. In the West Hartford appraisal plan penalties, if any, will accrue to teachers with the more lenient appraisers. There is already ample evidence that this device worked as intended. Principals who were over-lenient in 1961 have vowed that they will not make this mistake when preparing their 1962 appraisals.

Tenth, all results are subjected to thorough and continuous analysis. These are reviewed at weekly meetings held by a central committee with teacher representation. This committee invites, receives, and acts on suggestions and makes recommendations whenever appropriate. These are submitted to the Superintendent of Schools for his and, if necessary, for Board of Education approval.

Principles of Merit Salary and Evaluation Programs

Several of these six districts have prepared statements of principles necessary for the establishment and development of a merit program. These statements include:

Ladue

Principles of a Salary Schedule

- a. The schedule should be adequate to maintain a professional standard of living. Every teacher needs a salary sufficiently large to provide proper food, attractive clothing, comfortable shelter, and security for the future.

A subsistent salary is not adequate. Teachers must find it possible to utilize more fully cultural and educational resources if the children with whom they work are to have school experiences which are rich, wholesome, and in keeping with their out-of-school experiences.

- b. The schedule should provide for remuneration and advancement on the basis of competency, experience, training, and overall value to the school system.
- c. Competency should be determined by the administrative staff on the basis of criteria developed by teachers and administrators.
- d. The schedule should provide salaries which will attract outstanding people and encourage them to remain in the school system.
- e. Increments leading from minimum to maximum salaries should be large enough to serve as incentives for improvement.

Evaluation—Recommended Procedures

- a. Evaluation must be made by professional persons who—
 - (1) Are trained in educational administration, educational methods, and have developed a philosophy of education consistent with that of the school system.
 - (2) Are in direct professional contact with persons being evaluated.
 - (3) Understand the role of the teacher in the total school program and evaluate, without bias or prejudice, the effectiveness of that individual.
 - (4) Have adequate time available for classroom visitations and conferences.
 - (5) Are adept in the methods of counseling.
 - (6) Are familiar with the objectives and the traditions of the school system.
- b. Evaluation must be continuous.

An evaluation should be a continuous process, rather than a periodic procedure, and should call for constant appraisal of aims and techniques with recommendations for future progress. Self-evaluation is a vital part of this process. Such continuous evaluation demands a clear understanding between the evaluator and the teacher of the many factors involved. In order to develop and maintain such understanding, the following techniques are suggested:

 - (1) Orientation conferences
 - (2) Subsequent conferences
 - (3) Meetings concerning the evaluation program
 - (4) Classroom visitations and general observation
- c. Evaluation must be amenable to record.

Rich

Some Principles of Merit Pay

1. Any statement concerning merit pay must be simple, direct, and concise. The program clearly stands alone. There is no room for "merit plus

- base pay." The entire program must be merit, and each teacher must be "on merit."
2. The program must be based entirely on teacher effectiveness. It is not how many items or activities the teacher covers, but rather how well he does in those to which he was assigned, whether or not by mutual consent.
 3. Merit pay may include effectiveness (a) over greater numbers, (b) in key positions, (c) in one-of-a-kind position, (d) degree of replacement possibility; but the main emphasis must remain on teaching and in the school as a whole.
 4. The teacher must have an effective part in all merit rating.
 5. The merit program must be designed specifically for each school system. It is virtually impossible to select a program from another system and expect it to be completely effective.
 6. The merit program costs money. In the natural process of selection, the poorer teachers are sloughed off and the staff is upgraded substantially.
 7. The normal curve of probability ceases to exist after the fifth year of the program; the "average raise" ceases to be meaningful after the third year of existence.
 8. The integrity of the evaluators must be unquestioned, including the self-evaluation of the teacher.
 9. Rating checklists are virtually useless in the merit evaluation plan. Summary *anecdotal* techniques appear to be the most trustworthy approach at the present time. Merit rating demands a broad program of live observation of the classroom procedures and provision for easy conferences with immediate supervisors.
 10. The program must have avenues of appeal. Every person whose progress appears to be less than his expectation quotient deserves lengthy, warm, cordial conferences concerning his evaluation. Every person hired into the system must have the merit plan explained fully to himself and to his wife.
 11. The entrance salary program must be flexible to allow for experience or special fields. It must not specifically count credits, experience, or degrees in some places *other* than the school system in which the candidate proposes to teach. It should permit the doubling of the entrance salary within 10 years, preferably 7.
 12. A merit program may include those teachers who are invited to teach for 9½ months and those who are invited to plan for a 12-month program. The latter may be one in which the teacher indicates professional growth rather than continued employment for the school district on a time basis.
 13. The program should provide for rapid increases to the top of a dollar level. Teachers should recognize then that salary increments in the 15th, 20th, or even 30th year will be smaller and come less often than for those below the 10-year level. Teachers who show early that they are outstanding may be appealed to, through the laws of reason alone, not to expect the doubling of salary in fewer than 7 years.
 14. Evaluation of a total teaching staff must be done regularly, perhaps every 3 years, with supplemental evaluations more often. A variation is to evaluate annually in the first 10 years of service, and every 3 years thereafter, with supplemental evaluation.

15. The basic principle underlying the merit program assumes that differences in teaching effectiveness are discernible and ought to be subject to differential salary awards.

West Hartford

The following statement of guiding principles was presented by the superintendent of schools at the 1959 Merit Workshop held at Syracuse University.

1. *A merit pay plan is not likely to succeed unless a good basic professional salary schedule is maintained.*—It is an illusion to think that introduction of merit pay will correct an inadequate basic salary plan or that it can be used as a scheme to reduce teachers' pay. Compensation for meritorious service should be something "over and beyond" an already good schedule.
2. *The merit principle must operate in all administrative actions pertaining to personnel—including initial selection, evaluation for tenure, advancement on the schedule, promotion within the system, etc.*—The professional administrative staff must have freedom to operate the school system on a merit basis and be free from outside interference by politically minded board members or others who may try to exert pressure or control.
3. *The prime principle underlying any merit pay plan should be the improvement of instruction.*—A merit schedule should be based on the assumption that instruction is the chief function of the school and that what happens to children in the teaching-learning process is all-important. Any plan for increasing the ceiling of opportunity should result in the recruitment of more of the able minds into teaching. Furthermore, it also offers a way of keeping superior teachers in the classroom where they can continue to grow and make their major contribution. Merit incentives are justifiable only to the extent they reward superior service.
4. *A merit system should not be adopted until after sufficient study, and then only upon thorough understanding and acceptance of a substantial majority of the staff.*—The climate for development of a merit pay plan is important. Teachers themselves must be involved in the process. It should be a cooperative program developed by all who are concerned. The staff must be open-minded and willing to examine evidence and give careful study to all proposals, rather than being forced to develop a plan under pressure. Failure is inevitable if an unwilling staff adopts, prematurely, an unsound program impossible to administer.
5. *A merit pay plan must be adapted to local conditions.*—There is no assurance that a successful plan in one school system can be transplanted to another. There is no universal pattern. The philosophy behind the plan and its method of operation must be worked out by those concerned.
6. *Any merit pay plan must have the complete understanding and support of the administrative personnel, the board of education, and the public.*—Because the superintendent, the principals, and other administrative officers will be chiefly responsible for the administration of a plan, it is essential that the procedures proposed will be workable. In addition, the board of education will have to approve the necessary funds to operate the program. Consideration should also be given for informing the public and enlisting their understanding and support.

7. *There should be well-defined standards of evaluation agreed to and understood by those who are to be evaluated.*—The key to the successful operation of a merit pay schedule is judgment based on evidence. Teachers should know the criteria by which they are to be judged. They should know where they stand and should be aware of their strengths and weaknesses. Opportunity should be given, through conference, for teachers to review the facts.

8. *Extra merit awards should be commensurate with the value placed on superior service.*—They should be large enough to offer a real incentive. It is ridiculous to go through the process of selection only to offer a paltry sum to those chosen.

9. *Teachers must have confidence in the competence and integrity of the administrative staff or others responsible for evaluating teachers for merit pay.*—Programs are most successful where good teacher-administrator relations exist. Good teacher rapport with administrative personnel and staff harmony in the school system are essential.

10. *Sufficient administrative and supervisory personnel should be provided to insure adequate time for evaluation.*—Boards of education cannot expect already overworked superintendents and principals to do an adequate job in administering a merit program without offering them sufficient administrative help. It is more difficult to evaluate teaching service and relate it to the salary schedule than it is to advance teachers automatically on schedule in terms of credits earned and years of service.

11. *Final selection should be entrusted to more than one individual.*—Rotating membership on a representative committee is more acceptable because it tends to minimize individual prejudice and bias.

12. *Teachers should be given the right to appeal.*—They should know wherein they failed to measure up to established criteria. Procedures should be established for review by the superintendent or the board of education.

13. *Merit awards should be based on predetermined criteria and not on percentage quotas.*—A teacher who is eligible and qualified should not be denied a merit award because of some arbitrary limitation.

14. *Adequate safeguards should be established to provide continuity of program from one year to the next.*—Except in unusual situations, thoroughly understood by the staff, failure to grant merit awards because of budget limitations will weaken staff morale and confidence in the merit program.

15. *Plans should be made for the continuous re-evaluation of any merit pay plan.*—In spite of how carefully a plan is developed, imperfections will be indicated. Procedure should therefore be established for periodic review and modification in the light of experience.

16. *Provision should be made for informing new staff members regarding the philosophy behind the merit plan, its application and the rights and obligations of all for whom it is intended.*—This is especially true in a growing school system where many new teachers are added each year. A plan can be well-conceived and approved by a staff and later lost because of failure to maintain understanding and support by new members joining the staff.