

evidence to support his position. The Certification Hearing Officer, consequently, denied the appeal.

Competency XII, “Demonstrates enthusiasm for teaching and learning and the subject being taught”, had three indicators. Petitioner had scores of 66.7%, 55.6%, 77.8%, 44.4%, and 44.4% on Competency XII for the five tests he took.

The record shows that Petitioner participated in coaching basketball, assisted in sports events, chaperoned trips and dances, and directed the painting of murals in the school and the community.

PART III

DISCUSSION

Petitioner claims that the scoring on the TPAI is too subjective and results in inaccurate assessments of teachers. He claims that the raters would not give him any feedback so that he could improve his scores. He also claims that the TPAI is not a valid test because of the inconsistencies that existed in his scores.

Petitioner, however, did not introduce any evidence before the Assessment Appeals Hearing Officer to establish that the TPAI is too subjective and results in inaccurate assessments. Petitioner’s argument, that the inconsistency of the scores, standing alone, shows the TPAI is too subjective, does not have merit. The assessments are made on different days and measure the teacher’s ability demonstrated on that particular day. Additionally, a score of 100% only shows minimum competency. Rather than showing inconsistencies in the TPAI, the different scores could show the difference in the demonstrated ability on the different days.

PART IV

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing, the record submitted, and the briefs and arguments submitted, the Special Master is of the opinion Petitioner has not shown any error in the administration of the TPAI. The Special Master, therefore, recommends that the petition to have another assessment be

DENIED.

This 31st day of October, 1988.

L. O. Buckland
Special Master