

## EdAd 636 -- LECTURE NOTES

## TOPIC #4: EMPLOYEE APPRAISAL &amp; DEVELOPMENT

- I. **Background info**
  - A. Reform movement & teacher appraisal (e.g. large-scale state teaching evaluation systems)
  - B. Is teaching a craft? A profession? An art?
  
- II. **Purposes of employee appraisal -- purpose should be linked to type, process, criteria, scoring, etc.**
  - A. Employee development / performance improvement (formative appraisal)
  - B. Personnel decision making (summative appraisal)
    - 1. retain/contract renewal
    - 2. recommend for tenure
    - 3. promotion
    - 4. RIF
    - 5. rewards--merit pay
    - 6. Other?
  
- III. **Policy Guidelines (who develops appraisal policy/procedures?)**
  - A. Match purpose of appraisal to policy objectives, procedures, etc.
  - B. Policies and procedures need to be flexible enough to handle unusual cases, but strong enough to give decision-making guidance to organization
    - 1. too little specificity means policy can be applied in an arbitrary or haphazard way
    - 2. too much specificity may create rigidity and disallow use of reasonable judgment for unusual or atypical circumstances
  - C. Appraisal System must be legally defensible (see below) as well as “effective”
  
- IV. **Matching Purpose with Type of Appraisal**
  - A. Criterion-referenced (absolute standard) -- best for contract renewal, tenure, dismissal, etc.
  - B. Norm-referenced (relative standard) -- best for RIF, promotion, competitive merit pay
  
- V. **Criteria --- MUST BE JOB-RELEVANT -- go to the job description**
  - A. Presage characteristics (traits) -- e.g. personality, disposition, prior education, etc
    - 1. may not necessarily be job relevant
    - 2. inter-rater reliability may be weak
  - B. Process characteristics--performance behavior
    - 1. Selected performance behaviors are best if they have been shown to enhance student learning or other desired performance outcomes
    - 2. Tend to be most reliably assessed if raters appropriately trained, etc.
  - C. Product characteristics--results or specific performance outcomes (e.g. student achievement, attendance, etc)
    - 1. because many factors may influence student outcomes, appraisal should not be based solely on these measures; further, appraisal of “group” or school may be better use of outcome measures than appraisal of individuals---due to weak causality relationship
  
- VI. **Sources of Data & Data Collection Procedures**
  - A. Classroom observations (when, how often? -- more observations increases reliability), portfolios, parent feedback, student paper & pencil evaluations, peer input, student performance data, other?
  - B. By whom? (for classroom observation data, multiple trained raters best)
  - C. Where? (classroom performance only? other broader work contexts (e.g. peer work relations, parent communication, absenteeism, tardiness, record-keeping, auxiliary

- assignments, etc?)
  - D. Other considerations?
- VII. Technical (psychometric) standards for observation instruments?
  - A. Reliability (consistency, accuracy, stability, etc)
    - 1. test-retest
    - 2. inter-rater reliability
  - B. Validity (does instrument measure what it purports to measure?)
    - 1. content validity--is the content of the appraisal system consistent with the job requirements (as determined by panel of experts)?
    - 2. criterion-related validity --- correlation to other measures of performance (e.g. student outcomes, parent feedback, peer input)
  - C. Utility -- appraisal should be:
    - 1. constructive
    - 2. have identified uses
    - 3. utilize credible evaluators
    - 4. yield reports with practical utility
    - 5. be followed up appropriately
- VIII. Measurement issues
  - A. Rater errors
    - 1. Halo/pitchfork effect
    - 2. Leniency effect (to compare across raters, convert to z-scores)
    - 3. Central tendency (no discriminatory power)
  - B. Absolute standard scales
    - 1. Numerical anchors
    - 2. Verbal anchors
    - 3. Behavioral anchors
  - C. Relative standard scales
    - 1. Ranking (for promotion? Competitive merit pay? RIF?)
    - 2. Forced distribution
  - D. Compensatory Scoring versus Multiple Cut-off Scoring
  - E. Weighting of items? Of types or sources of data? (weight on objectivity? Expert judgment? Reliability? Standard deviation (good for RIF)? )
- IX. Appraiser Style -- Dominant-submissive X Warm-hostile (draw model)
- X. Legal Standards
  - A. Substantive due process--"No state shall deprive any person of LIFE, LIBERTY, OR PROPERTY without due process of law"
    - 1. Tenured teachers
    - 2. Non-tenured teachers
  - B. Procedural due process
    - 1. Notice
    - 2. Hearing
    - 3. Fair and impartial proceedings
  - C. Dismissal or nonrenewal must be based on state/district grounds for termination --- e.g. incompetence, insubordination, immorality, neglect of duty, etc.
  - D. Evaluation criteria must be reasonably related to job requirements (content validity)
  - E. If adverse effect on protected class members (prima facie evidence of discrimination), then must show job-relatedness ---- legitimate state purpose served; courts also look at sex/race of supervisors in discrimination cases
  - F. Shouldn't leave decision-making to subjectivity or unilateral decision or single data source;

**if subjective criteria used (in part), must be “validly related to the position requirements, observable, & uniformly applied to all”**

- XI. Implications for Practice (similar to employee selection)**
- A. Use multiple trained raters**
  - B. Multiple observations & data sources or types of data**
  - C. Job-related criteria applied the same to all**
  - D. Notice of performance deficiencies with opportunity to correct (if remediable behavior) in reasonable time-frame**
  - E. Follow-up during/after remediation showing improvement (or not) in reasonable time**