This was an historical study which described the procedures used by a thirteen-member committee in an attempt to develop a merit-evaluation program for a middle-sized school district in Oregon.

A random sample of 33.5% of the certificated staff of School District 9 were interviewed in May, 1969. The results of those interviews indicated that 61.4% of the staff favored the development of a merit-evaluation program. Based on those results, a thirteen-member committee was elected to develop the program. Criteria for a merit-evaluation program were developed in the course of 20 meetings over a seven-month period of time.

The composition of the committee, their procedures and the results of their efforts were reported in three phases.

Phase I describes the eleven certificated personnel and two Board members who made up the Committee.
Phase II reports the procedures used by the Committee members. All statements made by the members were classified according to the twelve categories of the Bales Interaction Process Analysis system. The twenty meetings were divided into five Sets of four meetings each. Set I was used as a prototype with which to compare the mean frequencies of each category in Sets II, III, IV and V.

The $t$-test was used to determine significant change in the rate of verbal interaction. All test results which showed a significance probability of .10 were reported and representative statements in the categories were presented. Fourteen of the forty-eight categories showed a significant change in rate of classified responses.

Phase III of the study reports the results of the Committee's efforts. Criteria adopted for the merit-evaluation program included; (1) the evaluation instrument; (2) the necessary qualifications of the evaluators; and (3) the evaluation procedures.

The evaluation instrument contained 98 separate items which were divided into three major sections. Each item had a weighted value of 1 to 5 points. The three major sections of the instrument included (1) Personal Fitness; (2) Attitudes and Services; and (3) Teaching Power. The weighted values of the three sections ranged from 15 to 75, 14 to 75 and 69 to 345 respectively.

Results of the Committee's action were as follows:

1. Evaluators would include all principals, department heads and interested persons who complete a training workshop.
2. Training, by competent instructors, would include the use of the adopted instrument as well as other criteria considered to be effective in measuring teaching competencies.

3. Teachers would have two plans for choosing their evaluators. Plan I included an evaluation by the principal and/or department chairman. Plan II provided a means for a team to do the evaluating. The members of the evaluating team would be selected by the teacher, the principal and/or the department chairman.

4. All evaluation ratings were to be decided only after classroom observation and a conference between the evaluator(s) and the teacher.

5. Provisions were made for one to advance on the district's salary schedule, three steps, two steps, one step or to remain at the present salary. The position on the salary schedule would be determined by the total number of points received on the evaluation instrument.

6. All administrators, supervisors and directors would be evaluated by the Superintendent's staff. The Superintendent's staff would be evaluated by the School Board.

The program was accepted by the certificated staff and School Board in June, 1970.
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A DESCRIPTION OF THE PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES USED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MERIT-EVALUATION PROGRAM FOR A MIDDLE-SIZED SCHOOL DISTRICT

I. INTRODUCTION

The Nature and Purpose of the Study

This is an historical descriptive study which describes the processes and procedures used by a single elected committee in their attempt to develop a merit-evaluation program for School District #9, Coos Bay, Oregon. The study was concerned with all meetings of the committee. The meetings began October 8, 1969 and continued through April 20, 1970. A total of 20 meetings were held.

All data was collected from primary sources. The procedure involved in doing this is more thoroughly described in Chapter III.

Importance of the Study

A review of the literature on merit-evaluation programs points out a high degree of inconsistency with respect to the concept of evaluation for merit pay. Studies are presented which conclude that merit ratings work, that they do not work, that one type is better than another, that no type is better than any other. To sum it up, articles can be found to reinforce nearly any opinion of merit evaluation programs.

Because little educational research has been done that describes procedures used in developing merit-evaluation programs, a study of
the guidelines used in group discussion and research to develop such programs is needed. This study should identify those common elements used in a group process; it should point out patterns which evolve in making decisions; and it should report these findings in a chronological order.

The importance of more studies relating to merit-evaluation programs in education was stressed by the National Education Association through its National Committee on Teacher Education and Professional Standards report.

The National Education Association believes that it is a major responsibility of the teaching profession, as of other professions, to evaluate the quality of its services. To enable educators to meet this responsibility more effectively, the Association calls for continued research and experimentation to develop means of objective evaluation of the performance of all professional personnel . . . (22, p. 2).

The description of this process may provide guidelines for other school districts who are interested in developing their own merit-evaluation program.

**Statement of the Problem**

The major purpose of this study is to (1) identify, if possible, major patterns and trends that determine the process used by a single committee of certificated personnel and board members, in their attempt to develop a merit-evaluation program; (2) describe the major
criteria for the merit program finally agreed upon by the committee.

The Setting

This study was conducted in School District #9, Coos Bay, Oregon which is located in Coos County in southwestern Oregon.

The attendance area covers approximately 350 square miles with an Average Daily Membership (ADM) of 6,426 students. Oregon Education Association (OEA) research statistics, based on pupil enrollment, rank District #9 the eleventh largest district in Oregon. The 321 certificated personnel work in sixteen schools; 12 elementary schools, 3 junior high schools, and 1 senior high school. School District #9 has a 1969-70 operating budget of $6,104,426, or slightly under $1,000 per pupil.

The school board consists of seven members, elected at large by the 12,000 registered voters of the district. The school board has a written philosophy which expresses a desire to have an excellent school system. The basic philosophy developed in 1968 states:

Our schools are obligated to provide educational opportunities for the maximum growth of all its residential pupils. The educational program must be based on the principle that children differ in abilities, capacity, and the pattern of growth. The single most important implication of these statements is that we recognize the teacher as the most important factor in the learning process. The policy of this district is to employ only those who are best qualified by training experience to do the job. The teacher must be paid on a basis which attracts the most desirable type individual, encourages stability, stimulates professional
in-service growth, and enables them to maintain adequate living and cultural standards (28, p. 2).

A total 98.7% of the certificated staff in the school district are represented by the Coos Bay Education Association (CBEA). The remaining 1.3% of the staff are not represented by a professional organization.

**Historical Data**

State legislation passed in 1965, provided the basis for the establishment of the Conference Committee. Oregon laws 342.450 through 342.470 state the right of an elected committee of certificated personnel (Conference Committee) to negotiate matters of salaries and related economic policies affecting professional services. A detailed description is found in the State Department publication, *Laws Relating to the Oregon Public School System* (26, p. 177).

The subject of merit pay in the Coos Bay school district was frequently discussed by the Conference Committee, Professional Economics Committee (PEC), Teacher Education and Professional Standards Committee (TEPS), and the members of the local school board during the 1967-68 school year.

The Conference Committee subsequently did preliminary work and prepared a proposal relating to salaries and other economic policies. Prior to the time of final drafting of the proposal which would be
presented to the school board, a general education association (CBEA) meeting was held on November 7, 1968. All interested members were asked to meet with the Conference Committee and the PEC Committee to discuss the proposal as well as other negotiable items. Fifty-seven certificated personnel attended the meeting to discuss the following proposal.

1. The salary schedule for the '69-70 school year is subject to the following conditions:

   A. Present employees will be placed at a step that corresponds with their present position and on a vertical column warranted by their college preparation.

   B. Advancement in either a vertical or horizontal direction is not automatic but is contingent upon administrative recommendations based upon evaluation of performance.

   C. Advancement horizontally may be based upon having obtained added college credit that has been approved by a credit review committee. However, an individual may be advanced either vertically or horizontally on the basis of administrative recognition of superior performance.

   D. Advancement to higher steps for the 1969-70 school year will be dependent upon evaluation of performance during the current school year. When evaluated, teachers will advance according to their demonstrated merit. Judgment will be made by the heads of department, principals and the superintendent staff. Principals will be advanced by the Superintendent and his staff (7, p. 2).

The proposal was accepted by those in attendance at the November 7, meeting. The Conference Committee was advised to present the proposal to the school board. Negotiations between the CBEA (represented
by the Conference Committee) and the local school board in February, 1969, prompted the Conference Committee to request a study of merit pay based on evaluation. It was agreed that the study would be made and that the procedure was to be developed through a joint effort of the CBEA and the school board.

In May 1969, the Center for Educational Research and Services (CERS), School of Education, Oregon State University, in conjunction with representatives from CBEA, conducted a survey to assess the attitudes, expectations, needs, and ideas regarding merit evaluation plans presently held by the professional staff and administration of the school district.

The results of the survey indicated 61.4% of those interviewed favored the development of a merit system for the school district. Of the 25.7% who indicated teacher competence cannot be measured, 34.6% favored a merit program. The Interview Guide used by the interviewers is shown in Appendix A. Complete results from the responses are shown in Appendix B.

As a result of this survey, the Coos Bay Education Association in cooperation with the school board agreed to make a joint effort to develop a program for the professional staff in School District #9. Agreement was reached that such a program must be functional and within the framework of the school district's philosophy and financial capability. In particular, CBEA and the school board emphasized that
the program was to be developed by teachers and that staff members would participate in the planning process as well as in the final development of the evaluation instruments and procedures. Based on recommendations made by CERS as a result of the staff survey, the Merit Evaluation Committee was established and held their first meeting October 8, 1969.

**General Procedures**

All data was collected from primary sources and was of four general types: (1) the transcription of all verbal interaction by means of the recorded tapes; (2) the Interaction Process Analysis (IPA) system; (3) opinionnaires completed by committee members after each meeting; and (4) written notes on the topics discussed.

The Interaction Process Analysis (IPA) method was used to identify statements made by each member of the committee during the meeting. The method provided a means to classify direct, person-to-person verbal interaction as it took place.

All verbal interaction in each meeting was also recorded on tape. Two tape recorders, placed in different locations, were used to record all possible conversation. The recorded tapes were then transcribed to provide a more convenient method to analyze the data.

The opinionnaire, shown in Appendix C, was filled out by committee members at each meeting. The responses were tallied on a
master copy and compared to the patterns which developed in the meetings. The tallied responses also identified accomplishments of each committee meeting.

Written notes were taken to identify those items discussed during the meetings. Items discussed were pertinent to the committee's purpose and subsequently determined the criteria for the merit-evaluation program.

A content analysis was made of the transcriptions, IPA, opinionnaires and written notes. Data was classified in appropriate categories.

All data were recorded chronologically and subsequently analyzed chronologically. All data will be reported chronologically.

Assumptions Basic to the Study

The following assumptions were made with regard to the Merit-Evaluation Committee which was the subject of this study:

1. The members of the committee were elected by those whom they represented.
2. All members agreed to serve on the committee.
3. All members would participate in the group process.
4. The committee members worked within the professional code of ethics.
Limitations of the Study

The IPA method used to identify patterns is recognized as the best method thus far developed (30). Though the instrument is very workable, it is not yet standardized. Consequently, there were no available norms based on large numbers of observations in terms of which the findings of this particular study could be assessed.

A further limitation was the difficulty of identifying all comments made by committee members. On occasion, several members of the committee spoke simultaneously. As a result, not every response was identified and placed in a category.

The nature of the response to the opinionnaires also was a limitation. The chairman of the committee usually handed out the opinionnaires near the end of the meetings. The members did not respond to all questions each time. After the fourteenth meeting, for example, one member of the committee may have expressed the feeling of others when she stated, "It's getting monotonous filling out these darn questionnaires each time." Throughout the series of meetings, however, no more than one member failed to respond to at least part of the opinionnaire after each meeting.
**Definition of Terms**

**CERS:** Center of Educational Research and Services, Oregon State University.

**Merit Pay:** A merit pay plan or program is defined as one in which the school district provides a salary increase or refusal of salary increase based on factors other than training and experience.

**Middle-Sized School District:** The size of the school district is determined by the number of students enrolled. For the purpose of this study, a middle-sized school district will be assumed to have an average daily membership of 5,000 to 10,000 students.

**Conference Committee:** An elected committee of certificated personnel who negotiated salaries and related economic policies with the school board. They are also referred to as the Teacher Negotiation Committee. The committee represents the Coos Bay Education Association.
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This study is prepared to present two factors. First, it is prepared to present certain methods used by a committee engaged in an interaction process for the purpose of making decisions. Secondly, the study is prepared to present those factors that require consideration in establishing a merit-evaluation program.

A special concern of this study is the interaction process which takes place among the members of a committee. There is evidence that a number of group conditions, termed healthy organizational processes, often characterize an effective group. Miles identifies healthy processes as being clarity of and agreement with educational goals, communication clarity, group cohesiveness, openness, accepting an objective, scientific problem-solving approach, seeking a variety of solutions before making a decision, mutual trust among members, and concern for thoughts and feelings of colleagues (14, p. 17).

Observations of group decision-making and problem-solving have indicated that decisions produced by groups which interact in reaching a decision can be superior to the independent work of individuals. An increase in the quality of decisions seems to occur in those groups where the participants actively and freely discuss the issues. The kind of decision-making process a group uses, as reflected by the patterns of interaction of its members, consequently influences the
quality of the final decision (31, p. 6).

Three decision-making styles which occur most often in groups are: (1) decisions made by a minority of a group; (2) decisions based on the support of a majority with the minority not taking part or responding; (3) and decisions based on support and agreement of the total group after debate and discussion (31, p. 6).

Behavioral science research indicates that the more effective groups have leaders who allow for greater participation, initially wider divergence of expressed judgments, and greater acceptance of diverse decisions. It has also been shown that group participants with little influence not only fail to contribute to a decision but also are less likely to carry out the decision adopted by the rest of the group. Members of a group who do not participate do not feel involved and only half-heartedly, if at all, implement a decision made by the others (8, p. 4).

Robert F. Bales developed a general-purpose instrument which can be used to identify social interaction in small face-to-face groups. Its set of twelve separate categories is a practical compromise between the demands for theoretical adequacy and reasonable simplicity in the processing of data and interpretation of results. Each category is used to define a specific response. These major headings are in line with content and empirical experience used in observation. The present system is the result of several revisions and considerable
exploratory experiences over a three year period of time. A major portion of the instrument was developed in the laboratory of Social Relations at Harvard University. The system is a practical form for the generalized purposes it was meant to serve.

Within the last few years various research centers have been working on instruments which focus on the process analysis of social interaction in small groups. A new field of investigation into group processes appears to be developing (2, p. 8).

The second part of this study is concerned with those factors that require consideration in the establishment of a merit-evaluation program. The present status of merit programs is one of uncertainty with some experimentation by individual school districts. This condition is caused more by the complexities of application than by the lack of acceptance of the concept. While it is true that many individuals and most teacher organizations have opposed merit salary plans, such opposition is in large part based on the questions of feasibility, practicability, and problems inherent in administering a plan. There is virtually no evidence in the literature that indicates the principle of merit, as such, is repudiated or seriously questioned. A study by Kidwell concluded, "Opposition is not to the principle but to rating devices and methods used to implement the programs" (12, p. 109-110).

One of the difficulties in discussing merit programs is the lack of clear definitions. The use of different terminology such as "incentive
pay," "superior service maximum salary," or "quality of service recognition salary" tend to be confusing. In its broadest sense, merit programs include all the various types of plans by which a teacher's salary is to some extent dependent upon a judgment of his competence, whether that judgment stems from the use of a formal rating plan or otherwise (20, p. 3).

**Historical Development**

A review of published data on teacher evaluation indicates that there was a desire for more objective evidence to determine teaching competency before the first world war. A school committee or trustees explicitly stated the quality of services expected and paid the teacher accordingly. If one considers the requirements or expectations of early teachers, salary schedules were of the type now referred to as a merit pay scale (29, p. 220).

Butts and Cremin state, "In general the status and salaries of teachers in the colonial period set the pattern that persists to the present day..." (4, p. 134). Teachers were thought by the general public to need no more than a pittance for their duties. A teacher's knowledge that he had helped another person gain knowledge was thought to be sufficient reward for teaching. The colonial teacher also had to control his life to the point of self-imprisonment. It was advisable for teachers to attend church regularly, stay home, pursue the scholarly
life, read books and stay totally away from women (4, p. 135). Such was the colonial merit pay system.

Teachers' salaries were often determined by an individual's ability to bargain and men teachers always merited more money than women teachers. This was common in the early 1900's and even today some systems frankly admit that men have priority over women for summer jobs or special work of one type or another. This type of masculine priority, however, is rapidly decreasing because of pressures from teacher organizations. Salaries above the regular salary schedule are paid on the basis of special talents or positions difficult to fill rather than on sex or family responsibilities.

The single salary schedule was devised primarily to close the gap between male and female teachers' salaries and to eliminate arbitrary decisions of administrators and boards as well as to provide teachers with a secure income based on training and experience (1, p. 143).

One of the first formal merit plans reportedly used was in Newton, Massachusetts where Frank Spaulding was the chief administrator from 1904-1914 (15, p. 139). The plan was regarded as very successful by school trustees because it was fair, democratic and an excellent way to maintain high teaching efficiency.

William H. Stegman described the status of merit pay plans from 1915 through 1918 in the following manner:
In 1915, there were approximately three hundred merit programs in operation. However, these evaluation programs tended to be vague and indefinite with only general and unsystematized rating. A study conducted shortly after World War I indicated none of these 300 programs were still in operation. It is generally believed that these programs failed because the varied increments for different merit levels of teaching had not been sufficient. The top salaries for superior teachers were approximately the same and the difference in rewarding superior teachers were lost. The average salaries for teachers in the districts with merit programs fell below those of the other districts (33, p. 207).

A study conducted at Ohio State University in 1922 indicated that 120 cities out of 156 with over 25,000 population had some type of a merit rating plan (3, p. 12).

The Department of Classroom Teachers of the NEA appointed its first merit committee in 1924 to study and report on the status of merit pay. Their report to the 1925 NEA Convention revealed that in many cases the interest in rating was simply a concern over justification of dismissal. Only a few cities classified their staffs in categories of merit for monetary purposes (16, p. 202).

The teachers that approved of being rated in the early studies gave reasons similar to those frequently heard from teachers today. Reasons given for favoring a rating system in the 1920's were:

Helps teachers to improve their weak points.
Good Teachers wish their work evaluated.
It is definite and fair.
 Teachers believe in recognition of success and condemnation of failure.
Establishes a basis for promotion.
A committee of teachers make the rating scale.
Teachers regard it as an essential part of administration (16, p. 202).

The views given by those teachers opposed to being rated in the early studies were also similar to the reasons given by teachers today. Generally these views were not criticisms of the idea of rating, but rather their administration and possible abuse. Those opposed gave the following reasons:

- Impossible to measure accurately whole value of a teacher's work.
- Ratings are usually generalities and superficial.
- Rating is a judgment of a suspicion based on limited observation (3, p. 147).

A substantial amount of research on merit pay was conducted during the 1920's; however by the 1950's, most teachers supported the single salary concept. During the 1940-41 school year nearly 31 percent of all salary schedules in the United States were based on experience and training. This grew to 97 percent in the 1950-51 school year (19, p. 7).

There was a renewed interest in merit programs during the 1950's. Chandler and Mathis conducted a study in 1958 that involved 614 teachers. Half the teachers were in merit pay system and half were used as a control group on a matching basis. The study concluded that: (1) merit rating is not detrimental to teacher morale; (2) a significant difference in morale exists between schools as measured by the Chandler-Mathis Attitude Inventory; (3) the difference in morale was not significant when an arithmetic mean was found for merit rating.
schools as opposed to schools with set salary schedules; and (4) morale is a function of many variables and is not predictable (5, p. 4). A report made in 1959 indicated that 451 school districts, or 16.1 percent of all urban school districts, included in their salary schedules an authorization to provide rewards, or penalties, or both, to recognize quality of service (24, p. 8). However, according to NEA research, very few of those school districts had extended success with the merit programs.

In 1964 the proportion of merit programs to the single salary concept reported in the literature was still very small as revealed in this statement from the NEA research report:

Only 4 percent of reporting systems with enrollments of 25,000 or more provide for superior-service, or merit, increments in their salary schedules; 21.5 percent of Stratum 7 systems and 18.9 percent of Stratum 6 systems have such provisions. For Strata 4 and 5, the percents are 7.5 and 12.5 respectively. Among smaller systems, the most common statement about merit payments is the vague one that the 'schedule may be exceeded by board action,' or words to that effect. Among the larger systems which report merit provisions, it is more common for a definite amount to be stated (25, p. 1).

(The various strata are a classification system used to describe the size of the districts. Strata 1 had 100,000 or more students enrolled, down to strata 7 with 1,200-2,999 pupil enrollment.)

A report made of the 1965-66 salary schedule provisions indicated 3.8 percent of all those analyzed had merit provisions (23, p. 3).

At the present time merit pay seems to have its greatest strength
in higher income suburban school districts. The NEA Research Division reported in 1964 as follows:

Almost 30 percent of the salary schedules for the selected group of suburban systems specify added compensation for meritorious service, and over 9 percent state a definite dollar amount by which the schedule may be exceeded for merit (23, p. 6).

A 1967 survey of Chicago's West suburban districts revealed that of the 100 districts studied, 23 percent had merit provisions (35, p. 131).

Merit pay historically has not been popular with teachers. In an opinion poll published in 1963 the NEA Research Division found that:

... the answers received indicate that such plans would meet with widespread teacher opposition in most communities. Almost three teachers in four said they opposed or tend to oppose such a plan. As a group, teachers in secondary schools tended to be more in favor than those in the elementary--33 percent compared with 23 percent (34, p. 3).

Very limited research has been conducted relating to the factors involved in the development and implementation of merit evaluation programs in education. One of the few studies was conducted by Keeney in 1958. Three of the conclusions are closely related to this study.

(1) Programs which succeed in school systems are those which involve all personnel within the system. (2) School systems have not given sufficient concern in merit programs to the development of purposes, qualifications, interest of raters, and conferences with ratees concerning the evaluation made, and (3) findings in this study indicated that school systems utilizing merit rating did not use scientific procedures in developing or implementing the programs (11, p. 109-111).
Numerous articles in educational publications describe the pros and cons of merit programs that are in existence or have been tried in particular school systems. The information is primarily concerned with the effect programs have on teachers rather than the means used in program development and implementation.

A study by Kidwell in 1968 suggested further research for in-depth studies of merit pay programs that involved school personnel. The results would provide valuable data for a district considering a merit program (12, p. 112).

The literature published by NEA's Research Division appears to include all merit programs described in the major educational journals.

A report prepared for the Bureau of Educational Program Research and Statistics of the Board of Education of the City of New York contains a helpful summary of the studies made on merit programs.

Although little in the way of research concerning merit rating was noted in this survey of the literature of the past five years, there is no dearth of material in which the pros and cons of merit rating are debated. The controversy is a heated one - in most instances, the writer of an article takes a strong unilateral stand. In only rare instances is there an attempt to examine both sides of the question, logical fashion (24, p. 1).

The Research Division of NEA described merit provisions in teachers' salary schedules in 1967-68 as generally being of three major types. Those three most common types were described as:
The first, and most frequent type, is the reservation of authority by the board of education to exceed the schedule for 'outstanding' or 'meritorious' service by teachers and sometimes by other members of the instructional staff. This is usually a blanket statement with no detailed information as to the method of implementation.

A less frequent type of reference to merit is in the form of a statement granting the board of education power to accelerate the progress of outstanding teachers on the regular schedule by granting double increments, or the like, but usually not to exceed the regular scheduled maximums contained in the basic schedule.

The third major type provision is the one which provides merit allowances either before or after the scheduled maximums for specific preparation levels have been reached. Most merit provisions providing definite dollar amounts are applicable only after several years of service in the system; many apply only after the regularly scheduled maximum has been reached through normal progression of the schedule (22, p. 1).

The three types of merit provisions described in the NEA report were found in 104 or 9.6 percent of the 1,080 salary schedules which were analyzed by the Research Division. Of this number, 38, or 3.5 percent, indicated that the schedule may be exceeded by definite amounts; 51, or 4.7 percent stated that the schedule may be exceeded by definite amounts; 51, or 4.7 percent stated that schedules could be exceeded by action of the board, 976, or 90.4 percent, of the 1,080 schedules contained no merit provisions. Table 1 illustrates the historical data of provisions in salary schedules from 1964-65 through 1967-68 school years.

The information shown in Table 1 does not indicate a downward
trend, nor does it show a significant increase in the number of districts which are incorporating merit provisions in their schedules (22, p. 2).

Table 1. Provisions for Additional Compensation for Superior Service in Salary Schedules for Classroom Teachers, 1964-65 through 1967-68

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1964-65</th>
<th>1965-66</th>
<th>1966-67</th>
<th>1967-68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schedule may be exceeded for meritorious service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By stated dollar amounts</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By acceleration but not to exceed regularly scheduled maximums</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By board action (details not stated)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO a</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of reporting systems</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>1,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Role of Professional Organizations

When school districts renewed their interest in merit pay programs in the 1950's, both the NEA Department of Classroom Teachers and the NEA Representative Assembly went on record opposing merit programs. The resolution was adopted at the national convention in Portland, Oregon in 1956 and was later restated in a 1967 resolution as follows:
The National Education Association believes that it is a major responsibility of the teaching profession, as of other professions, to evaluate the quality of its services. To enable educators to meet this responsibility more effectively, the Association calls for continued research and experimentation to develop means of objective evaluation of the performance of all professional personnel, including identification of (1) factors that determine professional competence; (2) factors that determine the effectiveness of competent professionals; (3) methods of evaluating effective professional service; (4) methods of recognizing effective professional service through self-realization, personal status and salary.

The Association believes that the use of examinations such as the National Teacher Examination is not a desirable method of evaluating teachers in service for purposes such as salary, tenure, retention, or promotion.

The Association further believes that 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 judgments (commonly known as merit ratings) should be avoided. American education can be better served by continued progress in developing better means of objective evaluation (23, p. 1).

The Association of Classroom Teachers also adopted a resolution vigorously opposing merit ratings of teachers. The current resolution is as follows:

The Department recognized the need for classroom teachers, administrators, and school boards to develop a common understanding of the critical issues of evaluation and merit rating. It directs its officers to work for the adoption by the national organizations representing these three groups of a joint statement, in line with basic department philosophy as hereafter stated, expressing common agreement and acceptance by all parties concerned.

1. Teacher and Administrator Evaluation

The Department maintains that evaluation of teaching and administration for the improvement of instruction is a major responsibility of the teaching profession.
The Department believes that evaluation should be based primarily upon performance of the teaching and administrative tasks in relation to the specific situation in which the tasks are performed. It maintains that evaluation must be continuous and must be based upon all educational factors including type of community, building facilities, and administrative practices as well as classroom procedures.

2. Merit Rating

The Department vigorously opposes merit rating for determining salaries. It maintains that experience shows that the evaluation of individuals for merit rating destroys professional relationships and morale; creates strife and discord; impedes the cooperative improvement of education by classroom teachers, supervisors and administrators; and leads to deterioration in the quality of education of children (20, p. 5).

Teachers feel that any program of evaluation needs to be administered properly, maintaining that, "A good system badly administered could be more destructive than helpful" (21, p. 4).

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (A. S. C. D.) recommended a program which included pupils, school people and lay citizens for curriculum development as the best solution to teacher evaluation. This association maintains that such involvement should begin where teachers are, help them to evaluate, see errors and improve instructional effectiveness (18, p. 64).

The American Federation of Teachers (AFT) supports the NEA's position on merit pay. The AFT maintains that merit ratings create a false salary maximum for a few teachers, undermines morale and pits teacher against teacher. The Federation recommends the single salary
concept with the idea that the best teaching is attainable by keeping teachers' loads at a reasonable minimum, with sympathetic and understanding supervision (9, p. 2).

The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) feels teachers and other school personnel should be paid what they are worth. At the same time the AASA recognized the lack of evaluating instruments which would justify a general adoption of salary schedules based on individual merit rating. The organization felt that it was possible to develop instruments and methods and the idea should not be discarded. The association strongly urged accelerated, systematic experimentation in teacher evaluation in order to attach professional pay with professional rating of merit. The AASA supports experimental programs of merit pay based on teacher evaluations and cautions educators against adamant opposition to such experimentation lest it place the supposed interests of the profession above those of the tax-paying public. The Association also cautioned lay groups against using the concept of merit pay as a subterfuge by which they would oppose paying teachers what they are worth (13, p. 3).

The various professional educational organizations fail to agree on the value and use of merit ratings. School boards and administrators seem more willing to consider merit rating. The organizations which represent school boards and administrators have published supporting statements and expressed interest in merit rating. Teachers'
organizations generally do not approve of connecting ratings of teacher efficiency with salary. Those who favor merit rating have argued that it would increase experimentation and research. A search through the Journal of Educational Research, Encyclopedia of Educational Research and the Review of Educational Research has not provided the evidence necessary to determine which viewpoint is true. A review of research from Educational Resource Information Clearinghouse (ERIC) and the index file for Dissertation Abstract Trace for Resource Information by Xerox (DATRIX) provided very limited research information that contributed to this study.

One must be cognizant of the numerous publications produced by educational associations and the position teachers hold in regard to merit pay programs. The NEA publications are the primary source of educational information received by most teachers. The impact those publications have on teachers' attitudes toward merit pay may be worthy of further study.

Summary

Without question the most recent source of information on merit pay is available from the Research Division of the NEA. Based on this information, there is more evidence to indicate merit programs were unsuccessful than were successful. There seems to be a lack of common ground among those organizations who favor and those who do not
favor the use of teacher evaluations for merit pay. Administrators and school boards believed in the principles of merit ratings. In contrast, teacher organizations disapprove of any evaluations which will serve as the basis for determining salary. Teachers maintain merit ratings are bad for morale; at least one study found, however, that merit ratings have no effect upon morale (5, p. 4). Teachers feel that accurate evaluations can never be made; administrators feel it is possible with careful experimentation.

At present the status of teacher evaluations for merit pay may be described briefly as a controversial issue with strong proponents and opponents.Merit pay programs are recognized by many as being desirable in principle but difficult to apply in practice. The need for research in the development of merit programs does not appear to be emphasized as strongly as the public demands.

The most recent studies on teacher merit evaluations do not indicate any significant changes in program development. The most numerous arguments at present are concerned with the instruments used for measuring teacher competency. Evaluating procedures and instruments have been refined in recent years. However, merit programs have continued to be developed and implemented without awareness of these improved research instruments. Although each program will have certain degrees of variance from the general types, they do have a similar purpose and design.
III. COLLECTING DATA FOR THE STUDY

Initial Phase of the Study

This study used the longitudinal approach to describe the process and procedures of an elected committee over a seven-month period of time.

Permission to conduct the study was granted by the Board of Directors and Superintendent of School District #9, Coos Bay, Oregon in April, 1969. Through the cooperation of the teachers, administrators, and school board members who served on the Merit-Evaluation Committee for the school district, it was possible to collect the data for this study.

The study began in May 1969. The Center of Educational Research and Services (CERS), in conjunction with staff members of School District #9, conducted a survey to assess the attitudes, needs, expectations and ideas regarding merit evaluation held by the professional staff and administration of the school district. A representative stratified random sample of the total staff was selected utilizing statistical sampling procedures. The total sample of 108 represented 33.5% of the 322 certified staff members of the district.

The results of the survey indicated 61.4% of the staff were interested in a merit-evaluation program. The survey also indicated
the program should be developed by members of the professional staff. Representatives of the CBEA and CERS agreed that a thirteen-member committee be elected to develop the merit-evaluation program. The members were elected exclusively by those whom they represented on the professional staff. The thirteen members of the committee included eight classroom teachers, two elementary principals, one representative from the central office and two school board members. All members of the committee were elected by those groups which they represented.

A list of questions was developed to obtain the opinions of committee members regarding each meeting. The original questions were developed and answered by fifteen members of the CBEA at the close of an executive meeting. Each was asked to react to the pertinency of the questions, and to indicate areas of repetition or omission. All fifteen members cooperated and each made specific suggestions for the revision of the opinionnaire. The revised form was reviewed by Drs. Strowbridge and Rees, of Oregon State University, who offered recommendations and made minor changes which were included in the instrument. The original opinionnaire was altered to its present form as shown in Appendix C.

Permission to be a non-participating observer during the Merit-Evaluation Committee meetings was requested of each committee member three weeks prior to the first meeting. Each individual gave his
consent. However, final approval was later obtained from the committee as a whole.

The first Merit-Evaluation Committee meeting was held October 8, 1969, in the Eastside Elementary School. The meeting began at 4:15 p.m. with all members attending. The Committee decided to hold subsequent meetings in the board room of the Administration Building. The new location was more comfortable and conducive to the committee's function.

Permission to be a non-participating observer was requested and granted by the committee. Further permission was granted to record all conversation and to take notes, providing they were kept in confidence or used with discretion. Each committee member volunteered to respond to the opinionnaire at each meeting. The members were told they did not have to respond. Likewise, they were told their signature was not necessary.

Collection of Data

The data which describes the committee was collected from personal conversation with each committee member and the school district's Personnel Director. The age and teaching experience of members were obtained through personal conversation. When the exact years of teaching experience was not certain, it was verified by records kept by the Personnel Director. Permission to collect this
information was granted by each teacher and administrator on the committee, as well as the district superintendent. The board members provided all necessary information through conversation.

An Interaction Process Analysis (IPA) system was used to classify all verbal comments during the committee's meetings. The twelve major categories in terms of which the scoring was done, are shown in Chart 1. A summarization and analysis of the resulting data revealed patterns which developed throughout the series of meetings. Patterns were reported as they developed.

The simplest way to conceive the problem-solving sequence is in terms of the four sections in the chart, labeled A, B, C, and D. Section C consists of a group of activities which can be characterized as Questions. Section B constitutes a group of Attempted Answers. Section A contains a variety of Positive Responses, and Section D contains a similar group of Negative Responses. All the functional problems listed in the twelve categories could occur at any given point in a meeting. As the group interacted during the meeting, each response was categorized. A tally of the total responses falling in each category was made after each meeting. A plotting of these frequencies on a polygon illustrates the pattern that developed. The IPA system thus lends itself well to illustration.

The written notes taken immediately following each meeting revealed; (1) attendance of committee members and, (2) items most

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Shows solidarity</strong>, raises other's status, gives help, reward:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>Shows tension</strong> release, jokes, laughs, shows satisfaction:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>Agrees</strong>, shows passive acceptance, understands, concurs, complies:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>Gives suggestion</strong>, direction, implying autonomy for other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>Gives opinion</strong>, evaluation, analysis, expresses feeling, wish:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>Gives orientation</strong>, information, repeats, clarifies, confirms:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>Asks for orientation</strong>, information, repetition, confirmation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td><strong>Asks for opinion</strong>, evaluation, analysis, expression of feeling:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td><strong>Asks for suggestion</strong>, direction, possible ways of action:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td><strong>Disagrees</strong>, shows passive rejection, formality, withholds help:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td><strong>Shows tension</strong>, asks for help, withdraws out of field:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td><strong>Shows antagonism</strong>, deflates other's status, defends or asserts self:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**
- A. Positive Reaction
- B. Attempted Answers
- C. Questions
- D. Negative Reactions
frequently discussed during the meeting.

Two tape recorders, one cassette and one reel type, were used to record all verbal interaction during each meeting. Recorders were placed in various locations to best record the conversations. The primary data recorded on the tapes revealed those verbal characteristics identified in the Interaction Process Analysis (IPA). The tapes were available for replay when the data was analyzed. Tape recorders were pre-tested before each meeting to assure proper mechanical function. Two extra tapes were available for emergency or additional recording.

All recorded tapes were transcribed. The typed, double spaced pages provided the most convenient means of reviewing the vast amount of data. Verbatim conversation was obtained from the transcriptions. The transcribed material also made it possible to categorize and coordinate the verbal responses made by individual members of Committee.

The opinionnaires were filled out at each meeting. Results were summarized on a master sheet. This information identified; (1) accomplishments of each meeting; (2) criteria used in the merit-evaluation program and, (3) most influential member(s) of each committee meeting. Additional comments were made, in the space provided, and were used when they related to the criteria established by the committee. The Interview Guide, survey results, tape recordings,
transcriptions, Interaction Process Analysis results, opinionnaires, and written notes are on file for later reference.

**Treatment of Data**

Phase I of the data describes the committee. Information was collected from the committee members or the district's personnel director. This data was summarized and reported as received from the sources.

Phase II of the study compares the frequency polygons. The 20 meetings were subdivided into groups of four. The mean of each category for the four meetings was plotted on a separate polygon. Subsequently, these five mean polygons, each representing four meetings, included all of the meetings in the series.

The $t_w$-test, developed by E. Lord and described by Snedecor and Cochran (32, p. 120-122) was used to test the significance of the mean frequencies in each category. The test applies to a set of differences obtained from paired samples. The entries are the values of 

$$\frac{(\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2)}{\sqrt{\frac{W_1 + W_2}{2}}}$$

where $W$ denotes the range of the samples. The formula then becomes $t_w = \frac{D}{W}$. The ratio is called $t_w$, since it plays the role of $t$. Any category in Sets II, III, IV, or V which was significantly different from that in Set I, was reported and explained. The test was personally approved for this study by Dr. Nicholas A. Fattu, Director of Education Research, Indiana University.
Each of the twelve categories in the IPA system was explained for meeting number one. The frequency polygon illustrates the pattern which developed. The polygon was then used as a prototype to compare any deviations which occurred in meetings two, three and four. The frequencies in each category of meetings, one through four, were then summarized and illustrated on a separate polygon or Set I. The polygon was subsequently used as a prototype for the next four Sets of meetings. Set II included meetings five through eight. Set III included meetings nine through twelve. Set IV included meetings thirteen through sixteen and Set V represented meetings seventeen through twenty. Each category in each Set, II through V, is compared to that of Set I.

Phase III of the study reports the criteria developed by the committee for the merit-evaluation program. The transcriptions, opinionnaires and written notes verified the decisions made by the Committee members. The transcriptions provided verbatim statements of the decisions which contributed to the criteria adopted for the program. The opinionnaires identified those items the committee members considered to be the most important accomplishments of each meeting. These accomplishments identified the various categories in the evaluation instrument. The selection and training of evaluators and the procedure used in the evaluating process were also identified as Committee accomplishments. Written notes were made after each meeting
and served as a cross reference to identify the decisions made during each meeting.

The three major criterion adopted by the Committee included; (1) the evaluation instrument; (2) the evaluators; and (3) the evaluating procedures. The criteria for the merit-evaluation program is reported as it was accepted by the Committee.
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This study consisted of three distinct phases, each of which will be reported separately. The selection and analysis of the Merit-Evaluation Committee was Phase I of the study. Phase II was the observation and analysis of the process and procedure used by the Committee in direct, face-to-face, verbal interaction. Phase III of the study consisted of the analysis of the results of the Committee's efforts. The Committee's goal was to develop criteria for a merit-evaluation program for School District #9, Coos Bay, Oregon.

Phase I: Selection of the Merit-Evaluation Committee

In May, 1969, the Center for Educational Research and Services (CERS), in conjunction with representatives from School District #9, conducted a survey to assess the attitudes, expectations, needs, and ideas regarding merit-evaluation plans held by the professional staff and administration of School District #9. The survey was a preliminary step toward the development of a merit-evaluation program. The Interview Guide used in this survey and the summarized responses are shown in Appendices A and B respectively. The data obtained from the survey provided the foundation for the following plans and activities as recommended by CERS and approved by the CBEA and School Board.

(1) A district advisory committee for evaluation, merit,
and tenure was formed.

(2) The selection of teachers for the committee was to be based on nomination and election exclusively by the teaching staff. Administrative representatives were to be selected by the administrative staff. School board members were to be selected by the members of the Board.

(3) The responsibilities of the committee were to include:
   a. A review of the survey results.
   b. Defining objectives and goals.
   c. Developing the mechanics of evaluation.
   d. Specifying the teachers' and evaluators' role in the evaluation process.
   e. Making provisions for revision of the plan.
   f. Identifying and developing appellate procedures.
   g. Keeping the total staff informed of the action taken.

(4) The committee was to utilize CERS as a resource and advisory service.

The thirteen elected members of the Committee included eight classroom teachers, two elementary principals, a representative from the central office and two School Board members.

The classroom teachers were represented by three elementary school teachers, two junior high school teachers and three senior high school teachers. This represented the total staff in a fixed proportion to the number of teachers at each level. The teachers were nominated and elected exclusively by the teaching staff. The executive officers of the Coos Bay Education Association (CBEA) were responsible for the election procedures.

The principals and the central office representative were elected by a ballot vote. Those receiving the most votes were elected and each
agreed to serve on the Committee. Elections for all Committee members were completed in September, 1969.

Eleven members of the Committee were men and two were women. The women represented elementary and junior high classroom teachers. Men represented elementary, junior high, and senior high school classroom teachers. All administrators and Board Members were men.

The age of Committee members ranged from twenty-five to sixty-one. The mean age of the Committee members was 40.8 years.

The educational experience for the certificated staff members ranged from three to thirty-five years. The eleven certificated members had a mean of 13.8 years' experience. The two Board members had served for a total of twenty-one years as directors of the school district, or eighteen and three years respectively.

Representatives from CERS served as consultants and provided research material for the Committee. At least one representative attended each Committee meeting.

Meetings were scheduled at the close of each preceding session. They were held no more than once a week and no less than twice a month. The first meeting was held in the Eastside Elementary School on October 8, 1969. All succeeding meetings were held in the Board Room at the central office. The Committee met on Monday afternoons from approximately 4:15 to 6:00 p.m.
Phase II. The Committee Process and Procedures

The IPA method of categorizing verbal responses, developed by Robert F. Bales, was used throughout the series of meetings. The frequency polygon, shown in Chart 2, illustrates the pattern which developed as a result of the responses recorded in each of the twelve categories during Meeting #1. The categories are reported in numerical order from one through twelve. The IPA system may be considered in four distinct sections. Categories 1, 2 and 3 represent Positive Responses in Section A. Section B represents Attempted Answers and includes Categories 4, 5 and 6. Section C represents Questions which are classified in Categories 7, 8 and 9. Section D contains Negative Responses and includes Categories 10, 11 and 12.

Meeting #1 will be used as a prototype to which the subsequent meetings of Set I, or Meetings 2, 3 and 4, will be compared. The mean frequency for each category for Meetings 1 through 4 is shown in a separate polygon in Chart 6. Each Set represents four meetings. Subsequently, Set I (Meetings 1 through 4) will be used as a prototype with which to compare Sets II, III, IV and V.

The name of each Committee member and the group he or she represents is as follows:

Mr. Monks - - - - - - - - Administration - Central Office
Dr. Flanagan - - - - - - - - Board Member
Mr. Messerle - - - - - - - - Board Member
Mr. Mulkins - - - - - - - - Elementary Principal
Meeting #1 was held October 8, 1969. The CERS consultants conducted the meeting and began by giving the background information which had lead to the first meeting. They explained the reason for their presence and the purpose of the first meeting. That purpose, Dr. Becker explained, "was to get acquainted and to agree on why we (the Committee) are here."

Meeting #1

The frequencies recorded in each Category are shown in Chart 2.

Category 1: Shows solidarity, gives help, reward. (17 responses)

The comments made by the two consultants accounted for eleven of these responses. Remarks such as, "It is a pleasure for me to have an opportunity to work with such a select group," "The staff has shown their confidence in you," and, "You have shown an interest in attacking a difficult task," are examples which contributed to group solidarity.

Principal Mulkins rewarded other members by saying, "This is a challenge, and I can tell from the comments this group is ready for action; I'm just happy to be a part of it."
Chart 2. Interaction Process Analysis Frequency Polygon for Meeting #1.

Frequencies

Categories

1. Shows solidarity
   - gives help, reward.

2. Shows tension
   - release, jokes, laughs, shows satisfaction.

3. Agrees, shows acceptance, concurs, compiles.


5. Gives opinion, evaluation, expresses feeling, wish.

6. Gives orientation, information, repeats, clarifies, confirms.

7. Asks for orientation, information, repetition, confirmation.

8. Asks for opinion, evaluation, expression of feeling.


10. Disagrees, rejects, withholds help.

11. Shows tension, asks for help, withdraws.

12. Shows antagonism, deflates others, defends or asserts self.

Frequencies: 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100, 125, 150, 175, 200, 225, 250, 275, 300, 325, 350.
**Category 2:** Shows tension release, jokes, laughs. (56 responses)

Only in Meeting #6 was there a higher rate of activity in this category. This high frequency of response is consonant with Bales' theory, that this rate is comparatively high in the beginning of a series of meetings when tension symptoms are also high (2, p. 16).

Several humorous responses were given in response to the questions asked by the consultants, "Why are you here?" and "What is your role?" Mrs. Connall said, "I question my colleagues' judgment." Mr. Johnson stated he was there, "because he heard there was coffee and homemade cookies."

When the request was made to be a non-participating member in order to collect data for this study, Mr. Messerle replied, "I would sooner have my remarks put on tape than read what I said in the newspaper." Dr. Flanagan agreed and laughter followed.

**Category 3:** Agrees, shows acceptance . . . . (79 responses)

This rate of activity was a result of Committee members' responses to the consultants' questions, "Why are you here?" and "What is your role?" When members responded, other members agreed with their answers. Lincoln, Martin, Connall and Stocks agreed that they were there "to develop a plan for evaluating teaching." Dwight, Johnson, Mulkins and Nelson agreed that their purpose was "to develop a program that would help to improve instruction as a result of evaluations."
After each member had had an opportunity to answer the above questions, the Committee members briefly reviewed the results from the survey conducted in May, 1969. Questions in the Interview Guide were read, followed by the response received. All members except Johnson and Sebesta accepted the results as reviewed during the first meeting.

Near the close of the meeting Mr. Lincoln said, "I would like to study these results in more detail at the next meeting and go through each item step by step." Stocks, Martin and Connall each concurred with Mr. Lincoln's suggestion.

A motion was made and seconded that the Committee elect a chairman and recording secretaries. All members agreed to the motion that Mrs. Dwight be chairwoman. They also agreed that Mrs. Connall and Mr. Sebesta be recording secretaries.

Category 4: Gives suggestions, direction . . . . (72 responses)

These responses resulted from questions asked by the two consultants, several of which were organizational in nature. Dr. Becker suggested, "The leadership for this Committee should come from within the group and not from us." Dr. Flanagan suggested to the consultants that they "change off being leaders since you are knowledgeable in this area." To this Dr. Aldridge replied, "If you are going to listen to what the results from the survey disclosed; then the program should be developed by the staff." He went on to suggest,
"Leadership should not come from an outside source; if it does, then it is not your program." Dr. Becker then suggested to the group, "This should be given some serious thought and perhaps we should wait before we make that decision."

Dr. Flanagan then suggested a change in meeting places by implying the noise from the street made it difficult to hear what others were saying. He suggested the board room and added, "It would be more conducive to this type of a meeting."

Near the end of the meeting the consultants suggested the members review the survey results and any other material on merit programs.

**Category 5: Gives opinion, evaluation . . . . (137 responses)**

Each Committee member responded to the questions, "Why are you here?" and "What is your role?" Principal Mulkins expressed his opinion by replying, "I feel there is a need to improve standards rather than just determine who should receive merit pay." Mrs. Dwight felt, "The Committee has a great responsibility to do the best possible job."

It was the opinion of Mr. Lincoln that, "Since the teachers showed a vote of confidence in my ability, I am here to help develop a program we will be proud to live with."

Various opinions were expressed concerning the results of the survey taken in the Spring of 1969. The opinion expressed by Mr. Sebesta was shared by Mr. Johnson when he said, "I felt this survey
was conducted to determine if a merit pay study should be made, not as the basis for developing a merit pay program." Mr. Stocks agreed and further stated that he felt, "The questions asked by the interviewers were misinterpreted by the people being interviewed." He then continued by saying, "A majority of those interviewed last spring wouldn't give the same answers now."

Although there appeared to be various opinions expressed, near the close of the meeting Mr. Lincoln said, "I feel the Committee is off to a good start." Mr. Messerle summarized the meeting with his opinion by saying, "We are proceeding in a slow orderly manner," followed by Mrs. Connall's opinion, "A feeling of unity seems to be developing."

Additional opinions were expressed by members regarding the information which should be given out to the staff. It was Mr. Martin's opinion that, "We should keep the discussion on merit pay within this Committee until such time we make a final decision. If we report to the staff after each meeting we will only stir up a hornet's nest." Principal Stocks supported that statement by saying, "No information should go out unless approved by the Committee as a whole." All members agreed except Johnson and Sebesta.

**Category 6:** Gives orientation, information . . . . (233 responses)

The number of frequencies recorded in Category 6 during the first meeting was typical of the pattern which developed throughout the
series of meetings.

The 233 responses came as a result of reading the summarized survey results. In addition to the introduction and summary, Dr. Becker read the 18 questions and the 193 responses.

**Category 7: Asks for orientation, information . . . . (24 responses)**

The questions asked by the Committee members reflected their concern about the May, 1969, survey. Mr. Johnson asked the consultants, "How did you interpret the comments from the raw data and how did you determine the percentages?" Mr. Lincoln then asked, "I would like to hear some of the comments made during the interviews that state how people felt about merit pay." The consultants complied. Mr. Stocks then asked for additional information about the interviewers. "Who were these people and how were they selected?" Since Mrs. Dwight was one of the interviewers Dr. Becker asked her to answer the question and she complied.

After reviewing the survey results, Mrs. Connall asked, "If over 25% of the people interviewed said 'teacher competence cannot be measured' why would almost 35% of that group favor a merit program?" Mr. Mulkins then asked, "How do the results from this survey compare to research findings?" Dr. Aldridge replied, "One can find articles and research to support just about any position you want to take on merit pay."

**Category 8: Asks opinion, evaluation . . . . (33 responses)**
A majority of the 33 questions in Category 8 were those asked by the consultants, "Why are you here?" and "What is your role?"
The questions were repeated nine times to committee members. Four members responded without having the question repeated.

The members of the committee had another opportunity to express themselves near the end of the meeting when they were asked to give their opinion of the first meeting. As the members were reviewing the survey results, the consultants asked, "What do these results mean to you?" or "Do these results tell you anything?"

Category 9: Asks for suggestions, direction . . . . (59 responses)

The two consultants again asked a majority of the questions classified in Category 9. Their questions were primarily concerned with group organization and maintenance. For example, the consultants asked, "What days would you prefer to meet? . . . How long should each meeting last? . . . Should there be a time limit?" Mr. Duncan asked, "Could we meet some place that is centrally located?" Other questions included, "Do you feel we should have a revolving chairman? . . . Is one recording secretary enough or should we have two? . . . Who will see that the room is available? . . . Should we arrange for coffee?"

Category 10: Disagrees, rejects . . . . (7 responses)

Two committee members, Johnson and Sebesta, offered five of the seven responses classified in this category. Mr. Johnson
disagreed with the consultants' interpretation of the raw data from the survey. He said, "The interviews were conducted without the teachers being prepared to think about merit pay before they were interviewed. I really don't think the results are valid." Mr. Sebesta said, "The results should not be the basis for developing a program since the people interviewed did not realize this at the time they were being interviewed." Johnson answered with the statement, "I can't accept your interpretation of the data. I also question the way you calculated the percentages." At this point Mr. Lincoln disagreed with Mr. Johnson.

**Category II: Shows tension, asks for help . . . . (12 responses)**

Five responses were recorded in this category as a result of the disagreement expressed by Johnson and Sebesta. Mr. Martin said, "The raw data is all there if you want to review it and refigure the results." Mr. Nelson added, "I don't think I get your point."

After a brief pause, Mrs. Connall said, "If we have the merit program these people indicated, I would like to know about it." Tension grew as Mr. Stocks said, "I don't know, but I would be uncomfortable developing a program others have to accept." To this, Mr. Messerle replied, "The facts are all there in black and white. I think we should either get on with this or go home. I can't see arguing about something that is right there." Silence followed. Comments made later by Dr. Flanagan changed the subject and they were
classified in other categories.

**Category 12:** Shows antagonism, deflates others . . . . (3 responses)

Three members made the responses in this category. In response to Mr. Sebesta's statement regarding the committee's purpose, Mr. Messerle commented, "You sound like it was the Board's idea to go this route. You'd better get that clear right now; this wasn't our idea." The same Board member made other comments throughout the meeting in which he referred to the committee as "you people." After the phrase was used repeatedly within a short period of time, Mr. Lincoln interrupted Mr. Messerle and said, "You know, I think you are having a problem with your pronouns. I would like to see you working on this committee with the rest of us. You better change this 'you people' bit to 'we.'" Dr. Becker agreed with Lincoln and said, "If we are going to work as a committee we can't do it unless we are all part of the group."

**Meeting #2**

The second Merit-Evaluation Committee meeting was held October 20, 1969, in the Board Room at the central office. A major portion of the meeting was spent discussing; (1) a name for the Committee; (2) the survey results; (3) reports of various merit programs; and (4) feedback from the teaching staff. The members silently reviewed the survey results and read about other merit programs for
approximately 20 minutes. The 428 responses recorded in Meeting #2 are illustrated in the polygon in Chart 3. There were a total of 313 fewer responses in Meeting #2 than in Meeting #1.

**Category 1: Shows solidarity . . . .** (22 responses)

Five additional responses were recorded in this category during Meeting #2 than during Meeting #1. Comments by Dwight, Connall and Lincoln rewarded Dr. Flanagan for his suggestion to meet in the Board Room. Mrs. Dwight said, "The chairs are so much more comfortable," and "It's so much easier to see everyone." Mrs. Connall added, "We can hear what everyone says in here." Mr. Lincoln further rewarded members by saying, "This is really an eager group, to come to a meeting in such horrible weather as this."

**Category 2: Shows tension release . . . .** (22 responses)

Meeting #2 received 34 fewer responses in this category. Fourteen of the 22 responses were recorded during the first 15 minutes of the meeting as compared to nine in meeting #1.

Remarks made early in the meeting had reference to the new meeting place. Mrs. Connall remarked, "No wonder board members serve without pay; these chairs are so comfortable." Mr. Sebesta added, "Maybe that's why their meetings last so long." The comments were followed by laughter from the group.

**Category 3: Agrees . . . .** (51 responses)

There were 33 fewer responses recorded in this category during
Chart 3. Interaction Process Analysis Frequency Polygon for Meeting #2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shows solidarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gives help, reward.</td>
<td>10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 115 125 135 145 155 165 175 185 195 200 215 225 235 245 255 265 275 285 295 305 315 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows tension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>release, jokes, laughs, shows satisfaction.</td>
<td>10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 115 125 135 145 155 165 175 185 195 200 215 225 235 245 255 265 275 285 295 305 315 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrees, shows acceptance, concurs, compiles.</td>
<td>10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 115 125 135 145 155 165 175 185 195 200 215 225 235 245 255 265 275 285 295 305 315 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives suggestion, direction, implies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives opinion, evaluation, expresses feeling, wish.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives orientation, information, repeats, clarifies, confirms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks for orientation, information, repetition, confirmation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks for opinion, evaluation, expression of feeling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks for suggestion, direction, ways of action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagrees, rejects, withholds help.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows tension, asks for help, withdraws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows antagonism, deflates others, defends or asserts self.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the second meeting. Principal Stocks agreed with Mr. Mulkins that, "The word 'merit' should not be in the name of this committee."

Mr. Johnson commented that, "The teachers know what we are trying to do." Sebesta agreed by saying, "That's right, they sure do." With the exception of Mulkins, Stocks and Dwight, the Committee agreed to be called the Merit-Evaluation Committee.

Seven of the responses in this category were recorded shortly after Mr. Mulkins said, "The survey results should be made available to all staff members."

Category 4: Gives suggestions . . . . (69 responses)

There was a difference of 3 responses classified in Category 4. A suggestion was made by Mr. Mulkins, "Let's call it the Evaluation Committee for at least a couple meetings." Mr. Sebesta suggested, "Merit-Evaluation Study Committee or Evaluation-Merit Committee."

Other suggestions included, "We should establish a schedule to know what we are going to do." Mrs. Dwight suggested the members study the brochures handed out by the consultant which described merit programs in various school districts throughout the country. Mr. Lincoln agreed, then suggested, "We should study them, then throw them in the waste basket and go on our own."

Category 5: Gives opinion . . . . (73 responses)

The responses in Meeting #2 may be explained by the comment from Mrs. Dwight who said, "I think we all want to jump into this,
but we don't know how or just what we are going to do just now."

Mrs. Connall gave her opinion by saying, "Merit pay would be great except so many questions come to your mind when you think of measuring teacher competence."

Mr. Monks expressed his concern over Item 1.20 in the survey by saying, "We might have problems regardless of what kind of a program we come up with, if 25% or about 75 teachers in the district don't feel teacher competency can be measured." Dr. Flanagan concluded, "I think this is the job they want us to do."

**Category 6: Gives orientation . . . . (50 responses)**

The greatest difference in the two meetings appeared in this category. The orientation provided in Meeting #1 by the consultants accounted for the change in the rate of activity.

Thirty-eight of the 50 responses recorded in Category 6 were again directly related to the explanation and summarization of the survey results. Orientation in addition to the survey results were primarily responses from the consultant. In response to Mr. Sebesta's questions regarding the election of committee members, Dr. Aldridge said, "The criterion for the selection of teachers was set in proportion to the number of staff members they represented as outlined in the proposal." After further discussion the consultant referred to Items 1.24, 1.25 and 1.26 in the survey results. He then went on to repeat the information which shows that of the 26 respondents who felt teacher
competence cannot be measured, 96.2% said they knew "good teachers" in the district. He continued by pointing out that, "Even though teachers say competency cannot be measured, they still say they know 'good' and 'poor' teachers."

At the close of the meeting, Mrs. Dwight repeated and confirmed the committee's decision "to keep discussions here quite confidential until we have concrete information and approval from the total group."

**Category 7: Asks for orientation . . . . (25 responses)**

A comparison of the Categories 7 in Meetings 1 and 2 reveal a difference of only one response. A majority of the questions classified in this category during Meeting #2 were asked by the Chairwoman rather than the consultants, as was the case in Meeting #1. Chairwoman Dwight asked, "Don't you think we can write down some objectives at this time?" "What do you have as objectives now?" "What do you think about sending a copy of the survey to each building?"

Dr. Aldridge then referred to the Chairwoman's questions when he asked, "How will you know when you have accomplished an objective?"

**Category 8: Asks for opinion . . . . (16 responses)**

A comparison of Charts 2 and 3 reveals a difference of 12 responses. Early in the meeting, the chairwoman asked the committee, "Should we decide what our goals are before we decide on a proper name?" "Do we want to include the word 'merit' in the name?"

"Should we even consider evaluators at this point?" Mr. Lincoln asked,
"Do you board members have an opinion about this?" As the meeting closed, chairwoman Dwight asked, "Is this location and the time of the meetings agreeable to all of you?"

**Category 9: Asks for suggestions . . . . (30 responses)**

The difference in the responses is reflected in the questions asked in Meeting #1 regarding organization of the Committee. With those questions answered, the questions in Meeting #2 referred to concrete ways and means for the group's future actions.

After discussion as to the name of the Committee, chairwoman Dwight asked, "Do I hear a motion for a name?"

Mr. Lincoln again asked, "Should we establish a schedule to know what we plan to do?" Other questions included, "Should we send out more information to the staff?" "Are we to set standards for evaluation for administrators as well as teachers?" "All right, what do you wish to do next?" In closing, Mrs. Dwight asked, "Do you want more material to read?"

**Category 10: Disagrees . . . . (3 responses)**

As illustrated on the polygons in Charts 2 and 3, very little activity developed in this category during Meeting 2.

The three negative responses were made by Mr. Martin and Johnson. Martin rejected Johnson's suggestion that information should be shared with the staff, by saying, "It will just confuse them and rile everybody up." To this Johnson replied, "I don't agree. If we are
supposed to represent them, they have a right to know what we are
doing."

**Category 11: Shows tension . . . . (62 responses)**

The responses in Category 11 may reflect the committee's
anxiety as expressed by the chairwoman when she said, "I don't think
we all want to jump into this but we don't know just what we are going
to do just now. Even a title could make or break this committee and
even the results we end up with."

In response to Item 1.25 in the survey, Mr. Monks replied,
"This is frustrating. How do they (teachers) propose to make it work
if 25% of the staff say it won't?" To this Mrs. Connall replied, "It
may be possible that some of the 25% are incompetent teachers."
With raised voice Sebesta asked, "Is this program being developed
just for teachers or are administrators included?" Principal Mulkins
replied, "We are setting advancement on all staff except the Superin-
tendent."

Mr. Stocks showed tension when Sebesta asked to have the elec-
tion of members reviewed again. He said, "Man, we have heard that
three times now."

**Category 12: Shows antagonism . . . . (12 responses)**

The negative responses classified in Item 12 reflected the atti-
tude committee members had toward teachers. Mrs. Dwight said, "It
really bothers me when teachers are asked, 'What do you do?' and
they say 'I'm just a teacher.'"

In response to the survey results, Mr. Stocks commented, "I don't think the teachers gave the real answers; they gave those they thought the administration wanted to hear."

After further discussion Dr. Aldridge stated, "I think we should maintain a critical attitude and have some negative feelings and continue to express those feelings." After a brief silence Dr. Flanagan replied, "Well, I have some particular things in mind also and will bring them out as the meetings progress."

A discussion on teacher competencies had continued for several minutes when Connall interjected, "I'm not so sure teachers are the only ones who are incompetent." She then rephrased an earlier statement by saying, "I wonder if a principal can do a fair evaluation by dropping into a classroom and then going right back out again?"

Mrs. Connall showed additional antagonism to Sebesta's request for election information by saying, "I think you are trying to nit-pick. Don't you have confidence in the staff's judgment?"

Meeting #3

The third meeting was held October 27, 1969. Approximately one hour and ten minutes of the meeting was spent discussing the feedback received from staff members.

After Meeting #2, the recording secretaries sent the results of
the survey to the staff. In addition to this they attached a separate page which asked two questions: (1) "Do you favor merit pay?" and (2) "Were you interviewed last Spring?" The responses of 44 of the 326 staff members were the topics for a major portion of Meeting #3.

The pattern which developed in Meeting #3 is illustrated in Chart 4. Five of the twelve categories in Meeting #3 varied five or less frequencies from the same categories in Meeting #1. Categories 2, 3, 4, 6 and 9 varied 21 or more frequencies from those recorded in the same categories during Meeting #1.

A list of representative statements for each category are as follows:

**Category 1: Shows solidarity . . . . (14 responses)**

"Hello, Everette, glad you made it."
"It seems to rain every night we have a meeting."
"You did a good job getting the information to the staff."
"You should have some help."
"The Board members are a part of the group."

**Category 2: Shows tension release . . . . (35 responses)**

"By gum, it looks like we're ready to sail."
"I think we should have hamburgers and fries or pizza when we have these meetings."
"I can't help but laugh at some of these comments."

**Category 3: Agrees . . . . (24 responses)**

"I agree, I don't think the teachers even read the information they get in the mail."
"I don't think people really know what merit pay is either."
"That's right, everyone is 'reading in' to this thing."
"Yes, I agree they (staff) need to be aware of the history behind this."
Chart 4. Interaction Process Analysis Frequency Polygon
for Meeting #3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Shows solidarity gives help, reward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Shows tension release, jokes, laughs, shows satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Agrees, shows acceptance, concurs, complies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Gives suggestion, direction, implies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Gives opinion, evaluation, expresses feeling, wish.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Gives orientation, information, repeats, clarifies, confirms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Asks for orientation, information, repetition, confirmation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Asks for opinion, evaluation, expression of feeling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Asks for suggestion, direction, ways of action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Disagrees, rejects, withholds help.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Shows tension, asks for help, withdraws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Shows antagonism, deflates others, defends or asserts self.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Category 4: Gives suggestions . . . (35 responses)

"I think we should get started; it's 4:15."
"I'm going to pass an agenda I made up and hope we can get through all these items tonight."
"I think it is the responsibility of this Committee to come up with some possible definitions."
"Our job now is to work out an evaluation system, to point out good, poor and excellent teachers. It is not only teaching."
"I think we should move to Item #2 and see what we expect to accomplish in the line of objectives."
"Maybe each of us should write down what we think merit is."

Category 5: Gives opinion . . . (116 responses)

"I can't tell if the teachers on our staff are for or against merit pay."
"I feel some teachers are just sort of waiting to see what happens."
"We can keep up this kind of a discussion for weeks."
"I want to hear more about it before I make a judgment. I have no idea which way to go."
"I don't feel we have a merit system - just a philosophy of the system that has been negotiated. I would hope this Committee will come up with something to present to the Board."

Category 6: Gives orientation . . . (127 responses)

"That's the way I feel. If we get this thing going we will have benefits."
"Don't just look at subject matter - look at techniques. Something that will upgrade the entire staff."
"The letter that was sent out to the staff in the Spring of 1969 by the Conference Committee, clearly stated that advancements for the year 1969-70 will be dependent upon evaluation of performance during the school year."
"Going back to the Conference Committee, of which I was a member last year, we had a meeting and invited the entire staff. Only 50 or 60 people came. There was only one mandate that came out of the meeting: 'there was X number of dollars in the budget to go for personnel.' They agreed the X number of dollars should be
used so the better teacher could advance. They all agreed that we should somehow quit advancing the mediocre teacher year after year. This was a mandate from those people attending that meeting in the A-V room. I would say 30-40 of them were the top calibre people in the district."

Category 7: Asks for orientation . . . . (31 responses)

"Don't you think we should come out with some kind of a fact sheet?"
"Do you want to state in your motion that the Committee has received demonstrated concern regarding the lack of information in the past?"
"Did you feel the people in your building were in favor of a program?"
"I don't quite get what you mean when you say teachers didn't read this information."
"I have forgotten who we appointed to send this information out to the staff."

Category 8: Asks for opinion . . . . (38 responses)

"What do you think about sending out information?"
"Does the Board have a comment?"
"Don't we need to be thinking of the new people coming in?"
"Do you think there are better ways to inform people or should we not worry at this point?"

Category 9: Asks for suggestions . . . . (5 responses)

"Do you feel we should meet next week?"
"Did you want to include that in your motion?"
"What do you suggest we prepare for our next meeting?"

Category 10: Disagrees . . . . (9 responses)

"To say they don't know the mechanics is not right - here it is, all spelled out."
"I don't agree with your objectives, Shirley. We need them for this Committee first - then the program."
"No, I feel you need to know what you are setting up objectives for."
"I don't think we should be as concerned about the staff as you think."
Category 11: Shows tension . . . . (10 responses)

"Why don't we try to build something? We could go on forever like this."
"If teachers are really that concerned why don't they talk to their principal about it rather than yak about it in the coffee room?"
"This system where principals evaluate teachers has to change; it won't work."
"I think teachers should have some say as to who they want to evaluate them."

Category 12: Shows antagonism . . . . (7 responses)

"I'm beginning to think teachers are non-readers."
"It doesn't sound to me like anybody here really knows what we are trying to do."
"I'm not going to be forced into doing something I don't agree with."
"Industry has had merit for years. I don't see what you people are so afraid of."

Meeting #4

The fourth meeting was held November 3, 1969. The discussion centered around three distinct areas: (1) The objectives of the Committee; (2) Merit programs in other districts; and (3) The evaluation instrument presently used in School District #9.

The most striking change in the rate of verbal activity appears in Categories 10, 11 and 12 or Section D, Negative Response. Eighty-one responses were classified in Section D in Meeting #4 as compared to the 21 responses classified in the same section during Meeting #1. This pattern again coincides with Bales' Theory that when attention is given to a task, strains are created in the social and emotional
relations of the members of the group (2, p. 8). Chart 5 illustrates the pattern which developed in Meeting #4.

A list of representative statements made during Meeting #4 are as follows:

Category 1: Shows solidarity . . . . (20 responses)

"Thank you, Tom, that coffee tastes great."
"Sue was very thoughtful and brought cookies to us tonight."
"You covered a lot of ground today, Shirley."
"Howard and Bruce certainly did a lot of homework."
"Eight principals agree that Shirley is a merit teacher."

Category 2: Shows tension release . . . . (26 responses)

"I've tried to get rid of those cookies for weeks."
"As the story goes, if you want to get rid of something, just put it in the faculty room - they'll eat it."
"You made some pretty good remarks, Jerry, even with all that brush on your chin."
"They say Tom is a good teacher even though he won't let the principal in his room."

Category 3: Agrees . . . . (45 responses)

"I agree, let's wait two weeks before we meet again."
"I think that's a good idea. Let's write out our own objectives and see if others write the same ones."
"Let's keep the salary schedule and add to it."
"Yes, I think merit is over and above the salary schedule."

Category 4: Gives suggestions . . . . (83 responses)

"We shouldn't make any conclusions to negotiate this year."
"We will continue with the present system until we come up with something better."
"We could get copies of several evaluation forms if you want to build on one we have there."
"I'd like to see us get started on something, even if we have to start from scratch."
"For the next meeting we will study our pamphlets."
Chart 5. Interaction Process Analysis Frequency Polygon for Meeting #4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shows solidarity</td>
<td>10...60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gives help, reward.</td>
<td>60...70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows tension</td>
<td>70...80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>release, jokes, laughs, shows</td>
<td>80...90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction.</td>
<td>90...100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrees, shows</td>
<td>100...110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptance, concurs, compiles.</td>
<td>110...125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives suggestion, direction,</td>
<td>125...150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implies.</td>
<td>150...200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives opinion, evaluation,</td>
<td>200...225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expresses feeling, wish.</td>
<td>225...250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives orientation,</td>
<td>250...300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information, repeats, clarifies, confirms.</td>
<td>300...350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks for orientation, information,</td>
<td>350...400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repetition, confirmation.</td>
<td>400...450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks for opinion, evaluation,</td>
<td>450...500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expression of feeling.</td>
<td>500...550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks for suggestion, direction,</td>
<td>550...600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ways of action.</td>
<td>600...650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagrees, rejects, withholds help.</td>
<td>650...700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows tension, asks for help,</td>
<td>700...750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>withdraws.</td>
<td>750...800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows antagonism,</td>
<td>800...850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deflates others, defends or asserts self.</td>
<td>850...900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Category 5: Gives opinion . . . (116 responses)

"I thought we were just changing from one salary schedule to another."
"I feel that if we come up with something workable the community will buy it."
"I hope every teacher reaches the maximum in five years."
"I would like to see the teaching profession upgraded to where you did not have to include extra work during the summer."
"I feel any teacher who is afraid of parents is not meritorious."

Category 6: Gives orientation . . . (76 responses)

"As I said earlier, the district has always made a practice of allowing teachers to visit other classrooms."
"This instrument we presently use for self-improvement is not used by principals."
"If we have an open-ended schedule then it is clear, there are no limits."
"I repeat, if a teacher stays on the same step for two years or more they should be released."

Category 7: Asks for orientation . . . (22 responses)

"Is it true that some people did not move horizontally or vertically last year?"
"If we go on the merit pay system, will it cost more money?"
"Doesn't a merit system effect only the extremes anyway?"
"Has everyone received a copy of our evaluation form?"
"If I think I'm doing a better job than you, what is my recourse?"

Category 8: Asks for opinion . . . (14 responses)

"If a teacher cries after a conference about lesson plans do you think she has a mental problem?"
"Do you think the loose definitions used by the Conference Committee has created some of the problems or confused the staff?"
"Would it be possible to set up a reserve fund for merit pay?"

Category 9: Asks for suggestions . . . (20 responses)

"Should we use our present form and expand from it?"
"Do you feel we need to send out more information to the staff?"
"Should we recommend additional steps to the present salary schedule?"
"Should we be drawing up guidelines for administrators at the same time?"

Category 10: Disagrees . . . . (13 responses)

"I don't think we have as many insecure teachers as you think."
"I don't feel a teacher necessarily has poor mental health if she cries."
"I don't see how a video tape would help us at this point. I don't think we should even consider watching it."

Category 11: Shows tension . . . . (51 responses)

"If they (Conference Committee) are going to go ahead and negotiate merit pay, what are we doing here anyway."
"I don't understand this. Every teacher grades a student. What are they afraid of?"
"I'm afraid we are just going to muddy up the water more than it is right now."
"I don't see how we can object so much, and say something is being shoved down our throats. Maybe we should look at our own front porch."

Category 12: Shows antagonism . . . . (17 responses)

"If people are that immature they don't belong in the profession."
"I don't mind telling you right now. I'm getting a little impatient with your bickering back and forth every meeting. I think we have wasted four meetings. We don't have a thing yet."
"I would like to see statements based on knowledge and I don't think we have that here yet."

Set I

Set I includes Meetings 1 through 4. The frequencies from each category were summarized and the mean score was plotted on a separate polygon as shown in Chart 6. Subsequently, Set I became a prototype for Sets II, III, IV and V. The Sets were then compared,
Chart 6. Interaction Process Analysis Mean Frequency Polygon for Set I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shows solidarity gives help, reward.</td>
<td>10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 125 150 175 200 225 250 275 300 300 325 350 375 400 425 450 475 500 525 550 575 600 625 650 675 700 725 750 775 800 825 850 875 900 925 950 975 1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
category by category, with those of Set I. The significance of the differences between each category was determined by using the \( t_w \)-test developed by E. Lord. The significant level of \( \frac{(\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2)/\sqrt{W_1 + W_2}}{1/2(W_1 + W_2)} \), with a probability of .10 is .644, where \( \bar{X} \) = mean frequency and \( W \) = the range distribution of responses during the meetings in each Set. All categories which show a significant change in the verbal activity at the .10 level are reported by representative statements.

Set II

The mean frequency polygon for Meetings 5, 6, 7 and 8 is illustrated in Chart 7. A comparison of the categories in Sets I and II show \( t_w \)-test results ranging from .000 to .896. The applied \( t_w \)-test revealed a significance in Categories 4, Gives suggestions, and 7, Asks for orientation. The individual means of Category 4 in Sets I and II are 64.75 and 38.75 respectively. The mean difference is \( \bar{D} = 26.00 \), while \( W = 29 \) and \( n = 4 \).

\[
 t_w = \frac{\bar{D}}{W} = \frac{26.00}{29.00} = .896
\]

The results show the change is reduced significantly at the .05 level of probability.

The activity in Category 4 is explained by the decisions made in the fourth meeting.

"I felt all along that we needed to start with something, such as the instrument, and then expand on it."
Chart 7. Interaction Process Analysis Mean Frequency Polygon for Set II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Shows solidarity</td>
<td>100...125...150...175...200...225...250...300...325...350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gives help, reward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Shows tension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>release, jokes, laughs, shows satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Agrees, shows acceptance, concurs, complies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Gives suggestion, direction, implies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Gives opinion, evaluation, expresses feeling, wish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Gives orientation, information, repeats, clarifies, confirms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Asks for orientation, information, repetition, confirmation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Asks for opinion, evaluation, expression of feeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Asks for suggestion, direction, ways of action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Disagrees, rejects, withholds help</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Shows tension, asks for help, withdraws</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Shows antagonism, deflates others, defends or asserts self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Our job is to put meat on this skeleton."
"Continue reviewing material handed out and see if you can find ideas that might help us."
"Write down suggestions and we will compare them at our next meeting."

With these suggestions, the verbal activity in Category 4 was significantly reduced when compared to the same category in Set I.

The individual means for Category 7 of Sets I and II are 25.50 and 44.75 respectively. The test values are then computed as

\[
\bar{D} = 19.05, \quad W = 26.50 \quad \text{and} \quad n = 4.
\]

\[
t_w = \frac{\bar{D}}{W} = \frac{19.25}{26.50} = .726
\]

The results show a significant increase at the .10 level of probability.

Comments such as those below which were recorded during the meetings in Set II account for the increased rate of activity in Category 7.

"What do you have listed under Item #1, Personal Fitness?"
"What does 'limited' mean in Item 1?"
"Is it possible to get information that is more up to date?"
"Who is going to do the evaluating?"
"Do the department heads feel they should evaluate?"

Set III

Chart 8 is a profile of the interaction during Meetings 9, 10, 11 and 12. A comparison of the mean frequency polygons in Charts 6 and 8, will show that the frequency of responses in Set III is similar to that of Set I. The \(t\)-test was applied to determine which of the
Chart 8. Interaction Process Analysis Mean Frequency Polygon for Set III.

Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>125</th>
<th>150</th>
<th>175</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>225</th>
<th>250</th>
<th>275</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>325</th>
<th>350</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shows solidarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gives help, reward.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows tension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>release, jokes, laughs, shows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrees, shows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shows acceptance, concurs, complies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives suggestion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direction, implies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives opinion, evaluation, expresses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feeling, wish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives orientation, information, repeats,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clarifies, confirms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks for orientation, information,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repetition, confirmation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks for opinion, evaluation,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expression of feeling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks for suggestion, direction, ways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagrees, rejects, withhold help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows tension, asks for help, withholds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows antagonism, deflates others,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defends or asserts self.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
compared means differed significantly. A $t_w$ of .644 was necessary for significance at the .10 level. The results indicated two categories, 4 and 11, had a $t_w$ value of .766 and 1.03 respectively. The significant reduction of activity in Category 4 may have been revealed in the comments made by the chairwoman.

"We should continue to develop the framework around our present evaluation instrument, then go over the total form and add or delete various items."

"Let's begin with Item 2, Attitudes and Service."

"I suggest we keep in mind, that we build an instrument to evaluate teaching, not personalities."

The comments indicate that the Committee had started to work on one of their objectives, that of developing an evaluation instrument. Consequently, suggestions for new proposals were less frequent in the meetings included in Set III.

Category 11, Shows tension, received a total of 10 entries in the four meetings. This reduced activity was significant at the .05 level since the $t_w$ value was 1.03. The following comments made by various Committee members during Meetings 9, 10, 11 and 12 may indicate the reason for reduced tension.

Meeting #9: "Most even-tempered meeting so far."

Meeting #10: "Attitudes of Committee members are really improving."

"I'm relaxed because I feel an instrument is underway."

Meeting #11: "We are all 'one' finally."

"Good discussion."
Meeting #12: "This was our best meeting."
"We are really moving."

The $t$ value of the means in each category of Set III ranged from .071 to 1.03 when compared to those Categories in Set I. Categories 4 and 11 showed a significant difference.

Set IV

Chart 9 shows the mean frequencies of the categories in Meetings 13 through 16. The $t$-test revealed five categories that had a significant mean difference. The verbal activity classified in Categories 1, 3, 4 and 11 of Set IV, was significantly less than that recorded in the same categories in Set I. However, Category 7 showed a significant increase in activity in Set IV when compared to Set I.

Representative statements for the appropriate categories are listed below.

Category 1: Shows solidarity . . . . (29 responses)

"The group has a positive attitude."
"We are really functioning as a team."
"A great group to work with."
"We have some great thinkers."
"That's a good point, Dick."

Category 4: Gives suggestions . . . . (147 responses)

"We need to be concerned with Committee manners."
"Let's continue writing down opinions and bring them to the meetings."
"Let's stay with this instrument."
"We should stick to our task."
Chart 9. Interaction Process Analysis Mean Frequency Polygon for Set IV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Shows solidarity</td>
<td>10...20...30...40...50...60...70...80...90...100...125...150...175...200...225...250...275...300...325...350...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Shows tension</td>
<td>release, jokes, laughs, shows satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Agrees</td>
<td>shows acceptance, concurs, complies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Gives suggestion</td>
<td>direction, implies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Gives opinion</td>
<td>evaluation, expresses feeling, wish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Gives orientation</td>
<td>information, repeats, clarifies, confirms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Asks for orientation</td>
<td>information, repetition, confirmation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Asks for opinion</td>
<td>evaluation, expression of feeling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Asks for suggestion</td>
<td>direction, ways of action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Disagrees</td>
<td>rejects, withholds help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Shows tension</td>
<td>asks for help, withdraws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Shows antagonism</td>
<td>deflates others, defends or asserts self.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Category 5: Gives opinion . . . (273 responses)

"There is too much discussion about high school problems."
"The high school discussion was late but necessary."
"There seems to be more freedom to express opinions."
"The flu is taking its toll."

Category 7: Asks for orientation . . . (155 responses)

"Is discipline a major item?"
"Should we change chairmanship?"
"What is the proper wording to use?"
"Are we concerned with extra-curricular activities?"

Category 11: Shows tension . . . (33 responses)

"I'm stunned. What do you suggest we do?"
"I don't know. That disturbs me."
"This isn't very professional. I'm not sure this is the place for such comments."

Set V

The mean frequency polygon for the meetings in Set V is illustrated in Chart 10. Set V includes the last four meetings of the series. The \( t_w \)-test was again applied to resolve significant change in the category means between Set V and Set I. The \( t_w \) value of Categories 4, 9, 10, 11 and 12 indicated a significant change in the verbal activity in Set V, as compared to Set I. When comparing the differences, one will observe a significant reduction in all of the above categories. It is further noted that all categories in Section D, Negative responses, show a significant decrease. This again is consonant with Bales' theory that as group interact throughout a series of meetings, tension
Chart 10. Interaction Process Analysis Mean Frequency Polygon for Set V.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Shows solidarity, gives help, reward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Shows tension, release, jokes, laughs, shows satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Agrees, shows acceptance, concurs, complies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Gives suggestion, direction, implies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Gives opinion, evaluation, expresses feeling, wish.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Gives orientation, information, repeats, clarifies, confirms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Asks for orientation, information, repetition, confirmation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Asks for opinion, evaluation, expression of feeling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Asks for suggestion, direction, ways of action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Disagrees, rejects, withholds help.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Shows tension, asks for help, withdraws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Shows antagonism, deflates others, defends or asserts self.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
symptoms disappear. As the members modify their behavior they become more stable (2, p. 65).

Representative comments classified in categories showing significant change are listed below.

**Category 4: Gives suggestions . . . (75 responses)**

"This Committee should use this instrument with a video-tape."
"People should present their ideas more freely."
"Let's give some serious thought to who should do the evaluating."
"We need to consider a point system."

A total of 80 responses were recorded in Set V as compared to 259 in Set I. The $t_w$ value of 1.376 is significant at the .01 level.

**Category 9: Asks for suggestions . . . (27 responses)**

There were 27 responses recorded in Category 9 during the meetings in Set V as compared to 114 recorded in Set I.

The $t_w$ value of .679 is significant at the .10 level.

"What should we start on next, evaluators or points?"
"Should we send out information to the staff at this time?"
"Who should we consider as evaluators?"
"Should we think about that for a week?"

**Category 10: Disagrees . . . (10 responses)**

A total of 10 responses were recorded in the four meetings of Set V. This compares to the 31 recorded in Set I. The $t_w$ value of .700 is significant at the .05 level.

Representative comments in Set V include the following:

"I don't think all principals are qualified to evaluate."
"I don't care to comment on that."
"Teachers shouldn't have to be evaluated for merit."

Category 11: Shows tension . . . . (17 responses)

There were 17 responses classified in Category 11 during Set V as compared to 134 in Set I. The $t_w$ value of .928 is significant at the .05 level.

Statements classified in this category include:

"I don't think I should be forced into being evaluated for merit if I don't want to be."
"I don't pretend to have all the answers, but I think we have had more experience, don't you?"
"I'm disturbed."

Category 12: Shows antagonism . . . . (0 responses)

There were no antagonistic remarks made during the meetings in Set V. The 37 remarks classified in this category during the meetings in Set I account for the significant difference between the two Sets.

The $t_w$-test value of 1.321 was significant at the .01 level.

Additional Comments

The following are some comments which illustrate the changes which occurred in the interaction of the Committee members throughout the series of meetings.

Meeting #1:

"There seems to be a desire to do a good job."
"This appears to be an excellent Committee."
"Everyone is feeling each other out."
Meeting #2:

"I'm looking forward to the next meeting."
"More should have been accomplished."
"We are getting to know each other."
"This survey bothers me."

Meeting #3:

"Do people really know what merit pay is - or even what we are attempting to do?"
"I question the value of this Committee."
"I would sooner sit here with my colleague." (Board member)
"We need a more positive outlook."

Meeting #4:

"The Board Member's role on this Committee should be clarified."
"We are too concerned about what people think."
"I'm becoming impatient with our lack of accomplishment.
Let's get something down on paper."
"Let's start with the evaluation form now being used."

Meeting #5:

"I still have faith."
"The Board Members are becoming stronger members of this Committee; they are participating more."
"We are all concerned about the good of the profession."
"This program should be an honor to a teacher rather than a program that makes teachers envious."

Meeting #6:

"Members are doing a lot of outside work."
"Group is finally moving in the same direction."
"I wish we could get into the meat of this thing."
"Negative Committee members are now assuming a role to help build an instrument."

Meeting #7:

"We keep drifting off the subject - too much divergence."
"I liked the open discussion - everybody had a chance to speak freely."
"The Board Members are loosening up."
"There are a lot of road blocks and role playing."

Meeting #8:

"The staff won't cooperate in giving us feedback. Only the vociferous respond."
"Let's send a representative of this Committee to each school to explain what we are doing."
"Teachers don't read what they get in their mail boxes. We should be concerned about our non-reading teachers."
"Progress is slow but effective. More of the group are becoming dedicated to the objective."

Meeting #9:

"It still appears that several staff members are opposed to our purpose."
"We all know the program is going to cost more."
"There is a question as to what is professional about teaching."
"Teaching is a profession and we should work toward upgrading it. If you don't think we are professional I'll challenge you. Now my temper is showing and if you want more there is more where that came from."

Meeting #10:

"This was one of the better meetings."
"The most varied discussions I have heard at any meeting."
"We are finally making progress."
"Let's serve hamburgers or pizza next time."

Meeting #11:

"The Committee is finally 'one."
"These meetings are worth three hours of college credit."
"I hope we don't get bogged down."
"The Committee members are evaluating themselves."

Meeting #12:

"Some members aren't doing their homework."
"The attitudes of the Committee members are really improving."
"I'm relaxed because I feel a program is being developed. I thought it was impossible a couple of meetings ago."
"I still have faith in the Committee."

Meeting #13:

"The flu is taking its toll."
"Today's smaller group seemed more effective. There was less dialogue from one or two people."
"The chairwoman kept us on the right track."
"I was able to express my ideas today."

Meeting #14:

"We are really thinking this out."
"The Committee is functioning as a team."
"This is truly a dedicated group."
"We had a chance to air our grievances about extra curricular activities."
"I can see the light at the end of the tunnel."

Meeting #15:

"This was one of our better meetings. We really covered a lot of material."
"The instrument is weak in some areas."
"These meetings can't go on forever."
"We cleared up some foggy terms."
"The group still wishes to work as a group; not as sub-groups."

Meeting #16:

"I'm stunned at some people's comments."
"There was too much discussion on the problems at the high school."
"The discussion tonight was late but very necessary."
"I feel better about the discussion relating to the problems in our district. Our program should improve them."

Meeting #17:

"We seem to want the total blame or the total credit for the work of the group."
"We didn't make many decisions."
"The staff's interest is still at heart."
"Some members are too argumentative."
Meeting #18:
"We have developed a solid skeleton."
"We are leaving channels open."
"People who don't follow channels end up on the beach."
"The most difficult part is done."
"The politicians of legislation are showing."

Meeting #19:
"The point system is the next big step."
"There seems to be moderate frustration."
"This is a total district; it must be a total plan."
"The Committee has shown that we are able to regroup, redeploy, retrench and start again."
"I'm a bit discouraged."

Meeting #20:
"We are ready to try it out."
"The group is stronger than ever."
"I have a feeling of accomplishment."
"The program will never be completely finished. Changes are a part of the program."

Summary of Phase II

The 20 meetings of the Merit-Evaluation Committee were grouped into five sets of four meetings each in order to facilitate the reporting of the data collected for Phase II of this study. The verbal interaction of Meetings 2, 3 and 4 were compared to that of Meeting 1. Subsequently, the mean frequency polygons of Sets II, III, IV and V were compared to the mean frequency polygon for Set I. The $t_w$-test was applied to determine if the data comparisons reached the .10 probability level. The test application showed a significance in the
means of Categories 4 and 7 in Set II. Categories 4 and 11 showed a significant change in Set III. In Set IV, Categories 1, 4, 5, 7 and 11 showed a significant difference when compared to the same categories in Set I. Five of the twelve categories in Set IV showed a significant change in verbal activity when compared to Set I. They were categories 4, 9, 10, 11 and 12. Overall, a total of thirteen categories show a significant decreased in the number of classified responses. Only Category 7 of Set IV showed a significant increase in verbal activity.

The polygons shown in Charts 2 through 10 illustrate the patterns that developed throughout the series of meetings.

Phase III: The Results of the Committee's Efforts

The Merit-Evaluation program was developed by the Committee in three distinct phases. 1) The evaluation instrument, 2) the evaluators, and 3) the evaluation procedures.

The Evaluation Instrument

The first two meetings were spent reviewing the results of the staff survey taken in May, 1969. The third meeting consisted of hearing reports of several merit programs in operation in various school districts throughout the country. They included the Weber County Schools, Ogden, Utah; Mercer Island, Washington and Bloomington, Illinois. During the fourth meeting, Mr. Lincoln suggested, "Let us
select a program that claims to be successful and build on that to fit our needs." Mrs. Dwight suggested, "Let's start with the evaluation presently used in District #9 and expand from that." A motion was made and seconded to accept Chairwoman Dwight's suggestion. The Committee members all agreed. Meetings 4 through 15 were spent developing criteria for the three major sections of the evaluation instrument. After completing a rough draft of the instrument, Mrs. Connall suggested, "We should go through this with a fine tooth comb now and add or delete parts. Several statements need to be rephrased in order to be more understandable." The chairwoman suggested that each committee member, "take the instrument home and review it carefully, then come back next week with your revised copy." After the instrument was revised in the 16th meeting, it was again revised in certain areas during Meeting #19. The evaluation instrument developed by the Committee is shown in Appendix D.

During the 19th Meeting the Committee viewed a 20-minute videotape of a classroom teacher. Using the point system prescribed for Section III, Teaching Power, the scores recorded by Committee members varied from 251 to 286. A second trial using the same Section, with a different teacher on video-tape, revealed a difference of only 18 points between the minimum and maximum scores recorded. The consultant remarked, "This may indicate the importance of being familiar with the instrument. The more it is used, the more consistent
the results. This is why it is important for the evaluators to be trained in using various instruments."

A major portion of the 19th meeting was spent discussing the points given in each of the three major sections of the evaluation instrument.

Section I, Personal Fitness, contains 15 items. Each item had a weighted value of 1 to 5. The point value ranged from a minimum of 15 to a maximum of 75 for Section I. Section II, Attitudes and Services, consists of 14 items. Each has a weighted point value of 1 to 5, with a minimum of 14 possible points to a maximum of 70 points. The third Section, Teaching Power, included 23 items and was the most weighted Section of the instrument. The total points, based on the 1 to 5 ratio, were multiplied by 3. This gave a value range of 69 to 345 for the 23 items in Section III. The minimum number of points one could receive was 69 with a maximum of 490. The number of steps one could advance on the salary schedule was determined by the number of points received. The scale adopted by the Committee is listed below.

- 446 - 490 - 3 step advance
- 410 - 445 - 2 step advance
- 281 - 409 - 1 step advance
- Below 280 - No advancement

The consensus of the group was expressed by Mr. Mulkins who said, "I feel as this instrument is used for awhile, we may find the points have to be changed or readjusted. We will just have to wait
and see how it works."

**The Evaluators**

The Committee discussed evaluators throughout the series of meetings while they were developing the evaluation instrument. Some of their comments and questions during these meetings are listed below:

**Meeting #4:**

"I think evaluations should also be made by someone else besides the principal."
"Should men do all the evaluating?"
"The evaluator should know the person they are evaluating. By that I mean they should be familiar with them in the total building not just in the classroom."

**Meeting #5:**

"Evaluators should be part of the teaching process themselves."
"The evaluator should be able to establish rapport after a disagreement."
"Should we hire a full time evaluator?"

**Meeting #7:**

"Most teachers do not trust evaluators by-and-large."
"Department heads are very much concerned about doing the evaluating."
"The principal should not be the sole judge."

**Meeting #10:**

"The evaluator seems to be the most important part of the total evaluating process."
"The evaluations should be discussed with the teacher before and after the evaluation."
"I feel the evaluators should use other evaluating instruments besides this one we are developing."
Meeting #11:

"We must make sure that evaluators receive proper training before they do the evaluating."
"Should lay people be considered as evaluators?"
"Lay people wouldn't be familiar with the instrument."

Meeting #13:

"Let's wait until we finish developing an instrument before we decide on who should do the evaluating."
"When you get ideas regarding evaluators, write them down so we can discuss them when the time comes."

Meetings 17, 18 and 19 involved discussion regarding the evaluators and the evaluating procedures. The Committee agreed that two evaluation plans be available to teachers.

Plan I: The evaluation is to be accomplished by the teacher's principal and/or department chairman and the teacher's self-evaluation. The evaluations will be accomplished through observation and a conference, to arrive at a conclusion.

Plan II: This evaluation will be accomplished by a team made up of, (1) the teacher's principal and/or department head, (2) the teacher, (3) one individual selected, by each of the above, from a pool of trained evaluators. This will result in a conference.

The Committee further agreed that; (1) principals, supervisors, and directors are to be evaluated for merit by the Superintendent and his staff, and; (2) the Superintendent's administrative staff is to be evaluated by the Superintendent and the School Board. All principals and department chairmen are to receive training in evaluation techniques provided by School District #9. In addition, all interested persons must take such training to provide a pool of personnel available to
act as evaluators. Principals and department chairmen would be considered members of this pool, so their services would be available to any of the teachers who may request them.

The Committee recommended that Oregon State University be employed to give extensive training to the evaluators. Mr. Stocks recommended that, "The training include the use of the latest evaluating instruments and techniques available." It was also recommended by Chairwoman Dwight that, "No evaluations be made, in relationship to this Merit-Evaluation Program, until such time as the evaluators have completed the training program." Everyone appeared to agree. However Chairwoman Dwight asked, "Does anyone disagree?" There were no negative responses. The Committee agreed that appellate procedures were not necessary at this time, since everyone has a choice of evaluators. It was further agreed that anyone who might have a grievance could relate to the Professional Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

The Evaluation Procedure

The evaluation procedures were discussed in conjunction with evaluators during Meetings 18 and 19. Meeting #20 was spent discussing and finalizing a procedure acceptable to all committee members. The procedures adopted by the Committee are as follows:

(1) Evaluation of teachers is an annual process carried out
to improve instruction and to establish the teacher's position on the salary schedule. Teacher improvement is the desired result of the evaluation process.

(2) A basic assumption of the evaluation system is that a competent teacher is advanced one step on the salary schedule.

(3) Evaluation may also result in the teacher being recommended for dismissal, held at the same salary, or rated as a merit teacher with recommendation for advancement on the salary schedule by two or more steps.

(4) The evaluation process will be carried out by evaluators, using evaluating instruments accepted by the staff, the Superintendent and the School Board.

(5) Two evaluation plans are available to the teachers. (Plan I and Plan II above.)

(6) The principal must review evaluations of all personnel in his building and/or participate in the evaluative process.

(7) Teachers must indicate which plan (I or II) they choose, with their Letter of Intent to accept reemployment.

The "Letter of Intent" is a statement asking personnel to indicate whether or not they intend to return to the district the following year. This procedure is completed by April 1.

Chairwoman Dwight requested the Merit-Evaluation Instrument, procedures and recommendations be typed by the recording secretaries. The Board Members were requested to arrange with the other Board Members, "for a time when they could meet with the Committee," in order to review and discuss the Merit-Evaluation Program as developed by the Committee.

Additional recommendations were made by the Committee which related to the Merit-Evaluation Program. These recommendations were presented to the School Board on May 11, 1970. They included the following:
(1) A Merit-Evaluation Committee should annually revise, study, or adjust the present program.

(2) No teacher will receive a salary lower than that which he is currently receiving.

(3) The training program for evaluators should give consideration to the many variables in the school system, such as ability grouping and unequal class size.

(4) Members of the Committee should be given time to go to each school in the district to explain the program to the professional staff.

(5) Additional steps should be added to the salary schedule each year for the next five years.

(6) The basic philosophy behind the program must be to improve instruction and learning processes.

As the final meeting came to a close, Mr. Sebesta said, "After all this time and effort that we have put in on this program, I hope the time never comes when the Superintendent and the Board sets a limit on the number of people who can receive merit pay." Board member Flanagan responded by saying, "That would certainly be against my wishes. You can't put limits on a merit program, and I think we have one that will work." Mr. Messerle then added, "I feel it's now the Board's responsibility to see that money is available. I really feel the people of this community will support a program if there is proof of a product. I think we all realized, at least the Board did, that a good program is going to cost more money. I really think we have a good program here and I'm convinced it's going to work."
V. SUMMARY

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were to (1) identify major patterns and trends which were determined by the verbal interaction process used by a single committee of certificated personnel and school board members, in their attempt to develop a merit-evaluation program; and (2) describe the major criteria for the merit program finally agreed upon by the committee. Since little educational research has been conducted that describes the procedures used in the development of merit-evaluation programs, this study was made to determine those patterns which develop in the decision making process.

To achieve the purposes of this study, it was necessary to; (1) record on tape and transcribe all verbal interaction during committee meetings; (2) classify all verbal responses according to the Interaction Process Analysis system; (3) have opinionnaires completed by committee members after each meeting; and (4) make written notes of the topics discussed.

History of the Merit-Evaluation Committee

This study was conducted in School District 9, Coos Bay, Oregon. The District has an Average Daily Membership (ADM) of
6,426 students and employed 319 certificated personnel.

A survey conducted in May, 1969 determined the attitudes and wishes of the professional staff regarding a merit-evaluation program. A sample of 33.5% of the certificated staff and administrators was selected and interviewed. The results indicated that 61.4% favored the development of a merit-evaluation program. As a result of the survey, a thirteen-member committee was elected to develop such a program. A representative from Oregon State University attended each meeting of this Committee and provided resource materials for the members. The meetings began October 8, 1969 and continued through April 20, 1970. A total of 20 meetings were held.

Review of the Literature

In Chapter II, literature was reviewed which concerned group interaction processes and the history of merit-evaluation programs. Evidence was presented that decisions produced by groups which interact in reaching a decision can be superior to those produced by individuals. Evidence was also presented that numerous arguments regarding merit-programs are concerned with the methods used in measuring teacher competency. Merit programs have continued to be developed and implemented without the use of recently developed evaluating procedures and instruments. Chapter III describes the procedure used in collecting data for the study.
Findings of the Study

Chapter IV reported the findings of the study. The results of the study were reported in three phases.

Phase I: Make-up of the Committee

Phase I reports the historical development of the Merit-Evaluation Committee. The data obtained from the May, 1969 survey was the basis for the formulation of the advisory committee. The members were nominated and elected exclusively by those whom they represented. The thirteen elected members of the Committee included eight classroom teachers, two elementary principals, a representative from the central office and two school board members. The mean age of the Committee members was 40.8 years. The eleven certificated members had a mean of 13.8 years of teaching and/or administrative experience. The two Board members had served a total of 21 years as directors of the school district.

Phase II: Process and Procedures Used by the Committee

Phase II reported the interaction process and procedures used by the Committee. The Interaction Process Analysis (IPA) system was used to classify all verbal responses made by Committee members. The responses were summarized and plotted on a polygon to
illustrate the pattern which developed in each meeting. The patterns were then compared, category by category, to determine significant change in rate of verbal responses. The $t_w$-test was used to measure the significance of probability. All categories which had a .10 level of probability were reported and representative statements were given. 

The test ratio was $t_w = \frac{\bar{D}}{W}$. This ratio is called $t_w$ since it played the role of $t$.

The twenty meetings were divided into five sets of four meetings each. Set I was used as a prototype with which to compare Sets II, III, IV and V.

The twelve categories in the IPA system were divided into four sections. Section A represented Positive Responses. Section B consisted of Attempted Answers while Section C represented Questions. Section D contained Negative Responses. Each of the twelve categories in the four Sets was compared with the corresponding categories in Set I. Fourteen of these forty-eight Categories showed a significant difference in the rate of classified verbal responses. Thirty-four Categories had no significant change in frequencies.

When Section A of Sets II, III, IV and V were compared to Set I, the results showed scores ranging from 0.000 to 1.222. Category 1, Solidarity, in Set IV showed a significant reduction in verbal activity when compared to the same category in Set I. Category 2, Tension release, in Set II had a $t_w$-test result of 0.000. The mean scores in
Sets I and II were both 34.75 with a range (W) of 34 and 41 respectively. Consequently, the difference between $\bar{X}_1$ and $\bar{X}_2$, or $\bar{D}$, was zero. Category I was the only Category of Set IV which showed a significant reduction in frequencies when compared to Set I.

Section B, Attempted Answers, showed significant changes in Categories 4 and 5. Category 4, Gives Suggestions, had a significant reduction in activity in all of the Sets. The $t_w$-test scores ranged from .682 to 1.376. Category 5, Gives Opinion, of Set IV had a $t_w$ score of .778. The test scores for the remaining Sets ranged from .035 to .352. There were no significant changes in Category 6, Gives Orientation. The test scores ranged from .052 to .422. There was a total of five categories in Section B of Sets II, III, IV and V that were significantly different from those in Set I.

There were three significant changes in Section C, Questions, two of which occurred in Category 7, Asks for Orientation, of Sets II and IV. The $t_w$-test scores for Category 7 ranged from .283 to .726. The rate of verbal activity increased significantly in both cases. There were no significant changes in Category 8, Asks for opinions. The test scores for the four Sets ranged from .027 to .416. Category 9, Asks for suggestions, in Set V had a test result of .679. There was a significant reduction in responses classified in Category 9 when compared with Set I. The scores in the Sets ranged from .381 to .679.

Section D, Negative responses, included Categories 10, 11 and
12. There were five significant changes in the rate of activity classified in this Section. Category 10, Disagrees, showed a significant reduction in Set V. The test result was .700. The scores for the remaining Sets varied from .017 to .368. Category 11, Shows tension, had a significant reduction in classified responses during the meetings included in Sets III, IV and V. The $t_w$ scores for Category 11 ranged from .570 in Set II to .928 in Set V. The only significant change in Category 12, Shows antagonism, appeared in Set V. There were no responses classified in this category in the last four meetings of Set V. The $t_w$-test score was 1.32 which indicated the significant reduction. The scores for Category 12 in Sets II, III and IV ranged from .125 to .613.

Section B, Attempted Answers, and Section D, Negative Responses, each had five significant changes in the rate of verbal activity. All three categories in Section D, (10. Disagrees), (11. Shows tension) and (12. Shows antagonism), of Set V showed a significant decrease in the number of responses. The pattern of activity during the interaction process coincided with Bales' theory that a group of people, working toward a common goal, become more compatible over a period of time and consequently, there is less antagonism among the members.
Phase III: The Merit-Evaluation Program Developed by the Committee

Phase III consisted of the merit-evaluation program for Coos Bay School District 9. The program developed by The Merit-Evaluation Committee consisted of three distinct sets of criteria. They included: (1) the evaluation instrument; (2) the necessary qualifications of the evaluators; and (3) the evaluation procedures.

The Evaluation Instrument. The complete instrument as developed by the Committee is shown in detail in Appendix D. The instrument was divided into three major sections.

Section I, Personal Fitness, was subdivided into 4 parts containing 15 weighted items. The evaluator scores each item of the instrument on a scale from 1 to 5. Number 1 was considered least desirable and number 5 was considered most desirable. The fifteen items listed in Section I are worth a minimum of 15 points or a maximum of 75 points.

Section II, Attitudes and Service, contained three parts with a total of 14 items. Each item was weighted as in Section I, and has a total range of 14 to 75.

Section III, Teaching Power, was divided into 5 parts containing 23 weighted items. The Committee thought that Section III contained the most important observable criteria in the teaching process, so consequently, the total score was to be multiplied by 3, giving a total
point value range of 69 to 345.

The total score of Sections I, II and III ranged from a minimum of 98 to a maximum of 490. The total score a person received determined the number of steps he could advance on the salary schedule.

The recommendations of the Committee were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>446 - 490</td>
<td>3 steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 - 445</td>
<td>2 steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281 - 409</td>
<td>1 step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 280</td>
<td>No advancement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Committee unanimously agreed that no one would get less money than that which they were receiving at the time of the evaluation. Any person who was rated meritorious, year after year, would be advanced vertically or horizontally to the limits of the salary schedule. The Committee recommended, "At least two steps be added to the salary schedule each year for five years."

Qualifications of the Evaluators. The criteria for the qualifications of evaluators as adopted by the Committee is explained in the following paragraph taken from the written recommendations submitted to the school board.

All principals and department chairmen will receive training in evaluation provided by School District 9. In addition, all professional staff members, interested in becoming evaluators, must take such training to provide a pool of personnel available to act as evaluators. Principals and department chairmen also are considered members of this pool, so their services will be available to any of the teachers who request them.

The Committee made two additional recommendations to the school
board which involve the evaluators. They included; (1) employ the
services of qualified instructors to train the evaluators; and (2) the
training should include the use of the instrument developed by The
Committee as well as additional evaluating instruments considered to
be effective in measuring the teaching process.

The Committee emphasized that all evaluators must be trained
by a qualified instructor before doing any evaluating.

The Evaluation Procedure. The following evaluation procedures
were adopted by the Committee and recommended to the School Board.

(1) Principals, supervisors and directors will be evaluated by
the Superintendent and his staff.
(2) The Superintendent's Administrative Staff will be evaluated
by the Superintendent and the School Board.

Two evaluation plans were made available for the teachers.

Plan I: This evaluation will consist of evaluation by the
(1) teacher's principal and/or department chairmen and
the teacher, using observations and a conference to arrive
at a conclusion.

Plan II: This evaluation will consist of evaluation by a team
made up of (1) the teacher's principal and/or department
head; (2) one individual selected by each (the teacher,
the principal and/or department head) from the pool of
trained evaluators. Observations and conferences will
be used to arrive at a final score.

Teachers will choose one of the above plans when they return
their "Letter of Intent" to accept re-employment in School District 9.
The "Letter of Intent" is signed and submitted to the Superintendent
on or before April 1. The plan selected by the teacher would
become effective during the 1971-72 school year.

The Committee members agreed that appellate procedures were unnecessary since the teacher had a choice of evaluation plans. However, it was pointed out that anyone who might have a grievance could relate to the Professional Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

Eleven of the thirteen Committee Members also agreed to serve on the Committee for another year in order to make any necessary changes in the adopted program.

On June 3, 1970, the members of the Merit-Evaluation Committee met with the staff in a special CBEA meeting. The total program as developed by the Committee was then explained. Each section of the evaluation instrument was reviewed and discussed in detail during small group discussion. After making some minor changes, the 137 members who attended the meeting agreed to accept the program as developed by the Merit-Evaluation Committee.

**Suggestions for Further Study**

The following suggestions for further study are presented by the author:

1. This study described the procedures used in a group process using one elected chairwoman throughout a series of meetings. Another study might well describe group processes and procedures
which develop in a small group when each member rotates as chairman.

2. This study involved only those people employed or elected to serve the school district. A study involving lay citizens might well provide valuable data for a district developing its own merit-evaluation program.

3. A third suggestion concerns the research material on merit-evaluations published by the N.E.A. A study is needed to determine the influence these publications have on teachers' attitudes with respect to merit-evaluation programs.

4. Finally, in one or two years a follow-up study could be made of various groups within the district in order to determine opinions toward the merit-evaluation program. The groups could include administrators, teachers, school board members and lay citizens.
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APPENDIX A

Interview Guide
INTERVIEW GUIDE
COOS BAY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

1. 10 What are your (feelings about) (attitudes toward) the evaluation of teacher competence in this school district?

(OPEN RESPONSE)

PROBES:
1. 20 Can teacher competence be measured? Yes No
   (If yes)
   1. 21 What criteria would you use to determine competence?
   1. 22 How about incompetence?
   1. 23 How should this evaluation be accomplished?
      Who would do what? When?

   (If no)
   1. 24 Explain

   1. 25 Do you know any "good teachers" in the district?
      If yes
      On what basis do you make that judgment?

   1. 26 Do you know any "poor teachers" in the district?
      If yes
      On what basis do you make that judgment?

2. 10 What are your (feelings about) (attitudes toward) a system of merit for professional educators?

(OPEN RESPONSE)

PROBES:
2. 20 What does merit mean to you?
2. 30 Describe a merit system as you visualize it.
2. 31 Who is involved in the operation of this merit system?
   (Identify roles? Who is responsible for what?)
   PROBES: Teachers, Principals, Superintendent, Supervisors, Parents, Students, Others.
2. 40 What may be the positive effects of a merit system?
   What may be the negative effects of a merit system?

3. 10 Would you favor the development of a merit system for this district?
   Yes No
   (If yes)
   3. 11 How should this development be accomplished?
      (Who?)

   3. 12 Would you desire to assist in its development?
      Yes No
      If yes In what way?

4. 10 On what basis should the salary of a teacher be determined?

(BE SPECIFIC)
APPENDIX B

Survey Results
SURVEY RESULTS

Questions and Responses:

1.10 What are your (feelings about) (attitudes toward) the evaluation of teachers competence in the school district?

66.7% The present evaluation procedure is in need of improvement.
15.6% More observations by evaluators are needed to get a true evaluation.
14.4% Present procedures are not fully understood.
14.4% What is being done is meaningless and invalid, accomplishes nothing.
11.3% Present procedure is very poor.
7.7% Personality conflicts determine results.
3.3% Other

14.4% The present evaluation procedure is good and satisfactory.

14.4% Suggestions

5.5% Self evaluation is the best.
3.3% Only the principal should be involved.
3.3% Evaluation should include observation from peers.
2.3% Follow up sessions are needed for feedback.

4.5% The present evaluation procedure is an improvement from the past.

1.20 Can teacher competence be measured?

Yes--74.3%  No--25.7%

1.21 What criteria would you use to determine competence?

23.2% Teaching competence
14.4% End results.
6.4% Imagination and use of new techniques
2.4% Performance in the classroom

20.0% Student-teacher relationships
10.4% Rapport
7.2% Understanding children
2.4% Interest in students

16.8% Personal qualities
4.8% Attitude
4.0% Loyalty
3.2% Appearance
2.4% Enthusiasm for teaching
1.6% Dependability
.8% Punctuality

11.2% Classroom control

9.6% Knowledge of subject matter

8.8% Organization and planning of lessons
8.8% Student-parent feedback

1.6% Community activities (participation)

1.22 How about incompetence?

29.1% Lack of ability to get along with students

29.1% Personal qualities

5.8% Indifference

5.8% Attitudes toward students

5.8% Lack of enthusiasm

4.8% Poor dress

2.9% Emotional instability

2.9% Resistance to change

1.1% Poor judgment

1.0% Disloyal

14.6% Lack of preparation

10.7% Lack of discipline

8.7% Subject matter not being taught

5.8% No outside activities

1.9% Sees teaching as an 8 to 5 job

1.23 How should this evaluation be accomplished?

A. How?

53.6% Room visitation

14.3% Criteria developed by the individual principal

14.3% Criteria developed by teachers

14.3% Criteria developed by a committee

3.5% Student judgment

B. Who?

31.4% Principal

18.9% Department Head

16.8% Teachers

10.9% Don't know

9.5% Administration

5.8% Special committee

2.9% Outsider

2.2% Self Evaluation

.8% Students

.8% Parents

C. When?

43.9% Continuous

21.9% Twice a year

17.0% Three times a year

14.7% Four times a year

2.5% By appointment
**Percentages listed in questions 1.24, 1.25, and 1.26 refer only to the 26 respondents who indicated that teacher competency cannot be measured.**

**1.24** The 26 respondents explained why they feel teacher competency cannot be measured.

48.0% Too many variables in the art of teaching making standards general or meaningless

20.0% Differences of opinion and the personality of the evaluator make it impossible for one to judge the other

12.0% Traits of a good teacher do not show up until later years

8.0% Present techniques are not adequate for evaluation

4.0% Principal doesn't have enough time

4.0% Observations make classroom procedures superficial

4.0% Only students could evaluate

**1.25** Do you know any "good teachers" in the district?

Yes---96.2% No---0% No Response--3.8%

On what basis do you make that judgment?

34.5% Student-teacher relationships

20.7% Classroom performance

20.7% Reactions of students

13.8% Personality of the teacher

10.3% Classroom control

**1.26** Do you know any "poor teachers" in the district?

Yes---65.4% No---23.1% No Response--11.5%

On what basis do you make that judgment?

46.7% Lack of commitment to students

26.7% Personality conflict

13.3% Poor discipline

13.3% Set poor example

2.10 What are your (feelings about) (attitudes toward) a system of merit for professional educators?

20.4% There is a need for one. It is necessary and eventually we will have one

19.3% Good teachers should be recognized and poor ones should be helped or weeded out

15.9% Merit pay will cause jealousies and dissension

11.4% It's a good idea but not sure it could operate

5.7% No correct way to judge

4.6% If based upon classroom competency it would be good

4.6% Personality conflicts would enter in
3.4% It's unprofessional
3.4% Evaluators must have a plan for evaluating
3.4% Merit pay for overtime is good
2.4% Hard to improve on the present procedure
1.1% Very few staff would be considered merit teachers
1.1% Would create a competitive situation for position
1.1% Teachers would work for pay rather than for the child's needs
1.1% Should not be concerned with money
1.1% Will cut down on personal freedom

2.20 What does merit mean to you?
31.0% Excellence and ability in teaching
31.0% Award or Bonus
17.2% Money
10.3% No comment
2.3% Worth as a human being
2.3% Political evaluation
2.3% Police operation
1.2% Incentive
1.2% Competition
1.2% Freedom

2.30 Describe a merit system as you visualize it.
37.2% System of awarding teachers' competencies, incentives and drive
15.9% Evaluation by administrators
11.5% Can't be done
10.2% A committee who judges performance
6.4% Rating scale
5.1% Extra duty
5.1% A procedure to improve teaching in the school
2.6% Consistent and regular evaluation
2.6% Doing things without pay
2.6% A mess and a place where things are falling apart

2.31 Who is involved in the operation of this merit system? (Identify roles. Who is responsible for what?)
24.8% Teachers
2. 40 What may be the positive effects of a merit system?

1. Teachers should be paid what they are worth and at the same time known to be worth it.

2. The principle of merit schemes is not only sound but also logical. This principle should become the basis for teacher pay.

3. There should be added incentive for better work through merit salary increments. Such increments or hurdles will produce better teaching.

4. Merit ratings will improve the quality of work done. This in turn will raise the general level of education in our schools.

5. The public is interested in receiving dividends for money spent. Merit programs will make the public more willing to support higher salaries.

6. Merit programs will tend to draw and hold superior teachers in the profession, since they will have an opportunity because of their ability to gain even better salaries.

7. Teachers are already rated daily by pupils, supervisors, parents, and fellow teachers. There is no reason why there cannot be rating for pay.

8. Merit programs develop a demand for high quality of work. This in turn will produce higher quality teaching.

9. A worker approaches his capacity as he is made to feel he is adequately awarded. Pay according to his worth will offer this award.

10. Payment, among other things, should be made for quality, ability, service, efficiency and effort.

11. There is no greater inequality than the equal treatment of unequals. Present basis of pay perpetuates the inequality.

12. Our present system gives security to teachers on the lower side of efficiency. We should give the security to the other end of the scale.

13. The merit principle offers an opportunity for democratic work-team relationships.

14. Competent administration can make ratings with a few inequalities. This should be a regular part of the administrators assignment.

15. If rating is interpreted as evaluation, it should enhance the supervisory relationships.
16. Rating can be done even though it is subjective.

17. Industry has used this merit or bonus incentive with good results. We should be able to adopt this businesslike quality to our schools.

2.41 What may be the negative effects of a merit system?

1. Over a period of time, all programs tried have proven unsuccessful.

2. Thus far it has not been possible to measure teacher competence accurately. Likewise, it is difficult to judge equal or significant merit.

3. Morale, working relationships, and other psychological problems are too complex for simple answers. Merit programs develop negative and competitive attitudes when they should be positive and cooperative.

4. Rating takes a lot more time than the benefits derived warrant, thus takes time of administration and supervision staff from helping teachers and used it in gathering evidence for rating.

5. Working conditions need improving before emphasis is placed upon performance. Will also attract better teacher.

6. Young teachers are often denied competence ratings because of "full quotas" on merit levels, thus discourages candidates from entering the field.

7. Merit regulations too frequently stereotype the teacher to standards and discourages creative teaching.

8. It is more important to recruit and train desirable people than to penalize those not so desirable.

9. Besides interfering with supervisory relationships, merit ratings force teachers to work more and longer when they already work long enough and under enough strain.

10. It is more important that the general level of teaching is raised than a few be rewarded. In-service education programs get far better results than merit or bonus programs.

11. Industry usually makes "merit" or "bonus" awards on the basis of quantity and not quality.

12. Experience has shown that communities soon reject merit plans after they get them.

13. Public interest is influenced more by lack of information on what the school is doing or by population and socio-economic conditions than by genuine concern about improving teacher quality.

14. Teachers, like other groups of people, represent a normal cross section of ability.

15. Merit programs too frequently presuppose that all improvement comes through changing the teacher.

16. The development of professional standards, increasingly better opportunities for professional training, more intensive teacher recruiting and more efficient use of competent research develops better teaching more rapidly and at less cost than any punishment or reward system.

3.10 Would you favor the development of a merit system for this district?

Yes--61.4%  No--38.6%  No Response--0.0%

Of the 25.7% who indicated that teachers competence cannot be measured, 34.6% favored the development of a merit system and 65.6% were in opposition.
3.11 How should this be accomplished (who?)

25.0% By teachers
23.2% Cooperation of total staff
21.4% Administration
10.7% Don't know
8.9% Conf. Comm.
3.6% CBEA
3.6% Outside source

3.12 Would you desire to assist in its development?

Yes--46.5%  No--50.5%  No Response--3.0%

Of the 25.5% who indicated that teacher competence cannot be measured, 26.9% indicated that they desired to assist in the development of a system and 69.2% were not interested.

4.10 On what basis should the salary of a teacher be determined?

56.1% Salary schedule
17.3% Ability to teach (worth in classroom)
10.2% No comment
3.2% Financial structure of the district
3.2% Tenure
2.0% Supply and demand of teachers
2.0% Negotiation
2.0% In relation to other professions
2.0% Responsibility
2.0% Evaluation

Summary

Present feelings and attitudes of the certified staff as represented by the sample drawn for this study indicate that:

1. There is a definite need to improve existing evaluation procedures.
2. Teacher competence can be measured.
3. There are identifiable criteria which can be used to judge teaching competence.
4. Evaluation involves multiple room visitations by individuals other than classroom teachers.
5. Even though some staff members feel that teacher competence cannot be measured, they personally can judge "good" and "poor" teachers and recognize criteria they use in making that judgment.
(6) There is a need for a system of merit as good teaching should be recognized but apprehension exists concerning the effectiveness of such a system.

(7) Merit means recognition for excellence and ability in teaching or an award or bonus.

(8) A merit system involves the evaluation of teaching competence, incentives, and drives by administrators or a committee.

(9) Those responsible for the operation of a merit system include teachers, administrators, principals, and department heads.

(10) There are both positive and negative effects inherent in a merit system, and if a system is developed these must be kept clearly in mind.

(11) A system of merit should be developed for the district and should be accomplished through the work of teachers and administrators.

(12) The salary of a teacher should be determined on the basis of a salary schedule and possibly an assessment of ability to teach.
APPENDIX C

Opinionnaire
1. What was accomplished today that you feel was most important to the purpose of the committee? Why?

2. Do you feel a majority of the certificated staff in the school district would approve of the committee's decisions today? Why?

3. Who do you feel had the most influence in the meeting today? Why?

4. Comments:
APPENDIX D

Evaluation Instrument
**Point Assignment For Evaluation Instrument**

Please rate the person from 1 to 5 on each topic. Consider number one as being least desirable and number five as being most desirable. Number three should be considered normal or average.

### COMMENTS

#### I. PERSONAL FITNESS

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A. Mental Health**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Retains emotional stability through students or colleagues may lose theirs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Displays a sense of humor which does not rely on sarcasm or embarrassment.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Omits personal problems from classroom discussions.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Displays sensitivity to the feelings of others.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Physical Health**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Is physically able to perform assigned duties.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Uses sick leave wisely.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Practices good personal hygiene.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Appearance**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dresses in such manner that clothing does not distract from the learning process.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Is neat, clean and well groomed.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Is free from mannerisms which detract from effective teaching.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMENTS

D. Attitude in (all) group relationships.

1. Uses good judgment in expressing views: (a) to students; (b) to colleagues; (c) to parents; (d) to community groups.

2. Expresses willingness to assume (his) share of responsibility.
   (a) In team teaching situations;
   (b) In extra-curricular activities;
   (c) Within the building and the school area.

3. Tolerant of colleagues and students. (a) Is willing to listen attentively; (b) Tries to resolve problems through constructive efforts; (c) Adjusts to changes in procedures; (d) Is willing to respect ideas of students; (e) Shows respect for other curricular areas.

4. Promotes positive attitudes within the total staff. (a) Promotes friendly staff relations and is generally respected by colleagues; (b) Cooperates with supervisors; (c) Works in developing District programs.

5. Works within the framework of the Professional Code of Ethics.

TOTAL POINTS FOR PART I PERSONAL FITNESS

II. ATTITUDES AND SERVICE

COMMENTS

A. Professional Growth

1. Is personally concerned with improving his methods and classroom procedures. (a) Experiments with new techniques and materials; (b) Is knowledgeable concerning research; (c) Continues to earn college credit and/or participate in workshops.
2. Participates in professional activities related to subject matter, such as (a) Grade level groups; (b) Departmental groups; (c) State and national associations for special disciplines.

3. Works for improvement of the teaching profession in Local, State, and Nationally related activities.

B. Cooperation

1. Understands and supports policies, procedures and regulations, (a) At building level; (b) At district level.

2. Reserves the right to differ on issues, but will support decisions when made. (a) At department level; (b) at building level; (c) At district level.

3. Utilizes stated channels for communications of school problems.

4. Processes routine matters efficiently, such as grade reports, attendance, requisitions and other required paper work.

5. Contributes to the general improvement of the total school program.

6. Shares ideas and techniques of teaching.

C. Public Relations

1. Expresses pride in teaching, in the school program, and the district.

2. Maintains that teachers are expected to main high standards of conduct. (Moderation in all things.)
COMMENTS

3. Is courteous, friendly, and shows respect and warmth to parents, visitors and all school employees.

4. Uses honesty and discretion in discussing students.

5. Assumes a share of responsibility for promoting a positive attitude toward the school.

TOTAL POINTS FOR PART II ATTITUDES AND SERVICE

III. TEACHING POWER

COMMENTS

A. Organization of work.

1. Has clearly defined goals as stated by approved curriculum.

2. Has classroom activities well planned and executed in line with goals.

3. Makes effective use of resources: (a) Material; (b) Human.

4. Adjusts activities on basis of goal attainment.

B. Knowledge of subject matter

1. Knowledgeable of subject matter for specific assignment.

2. Demonstrates depth in subject matter.

3. Selects material applicable to student ability.

C. Techniques of Instruction

1. Motivates and interests students in an approved curriculum.

2. Creates and maintains an attractive classroom.
COMMENTS

3. Creates classroom climate which is conducive to learning.

4. Classroom procedures which encourage student response and participation. (a) Differentiate assignments; (b) Provide breadth of learning activities.

5. Effectively utilizes students in planning and evaluating activities.

D. Influence on Children

1. Has rapport with students.

2. Constructively influences student attitudes and behavior both in and out of classroom.

3. Treats students with courtesy and personal dignity.

4. Is continuously helpful to students.

5. Is concerned with moral values such as honesty, respect, and loyalty.

E. Positive Approach to school control

1. Consistently treats all students fairly according to individual differences.

2. Demonstrates interpersonal effectiveness between teachers and pupils.

3. Encourages individual responsibility.

4. Maintains classroom discipline without loss of freedom.

5. Personally deals effectively with deviate behavior, making proper use of referral personnel such as counselors, principals, department heads, doctors, nurse, parents, psychiatrist, coaches, other teachers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Uses effective group procedures.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL POINTS FOR PART III TEACHING POWER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POINTS PART I</th>
<th>POINTS PART II</th>
<th>POINTS PART III x 3</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>