Dissertations                                                    Theses and Dissertations

1980

# An Analytical Survey of Principal Evaluation in Large Secondary Public School Districts in Cook County, Illinois

Ann E. Ludwig
*Loyola University Chicago*

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss

Part of the Education Commons

## Recommended Citation

AN ANALYTICAL SURVEY OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION

IN LARGE SECONDARY PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS

IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

by

Ann E. Ludwig

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School

of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

May

1980

Ann E. Ludwig

Loyola University of Chicago

AN ANALYTICAL SURVEY OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION

IN LARGE SECONDARY PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS

IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

The basic purpose of this analytical survey was to determine
the specific types of principal evaluation systems and practices
which were implemented, the factors which influenced the use of these
evaluation procedures, and the perceived effectiveness of the various
systems and practices.

In an extensive survey of educational literature, three broad
categories of principal evaluation were identified: 1) Performance
Objectives Systems, 2) Performance Standards Systems, and 3) No
Formal Written System. Performance Objectives Systems were most
frequently recommended. Thirteen general evaluation practices which
were frequently recommended in the literature were identified.
Through the use of a questionnaire and follow-up interviews with
superintendents and principals of the twenty subject districts, the
specific type of evaluation system and the number of recommended
practices used in each district were determined. Superintendents
and principals responded to the questions "Are you satisfied with
the principal evaluation system in your district?" and "In your
judgment, does the evaluation system in your district contribute to
principal professional growth?" Further numerical data regarding
categories of the districts' size, wealth, principals' salaries,
and principals' years of experience were obtained from the Educa-

tional Service Region of Cook County.

The analysis of these data provided some insight into principal evaluation procedures. The majority of subject districts used some type of Performance Objectives System and implemented most of the recommended practices. Practices dealing with procedures for principals to appeal unsatisfactory evaluation results and planning in-service according to evaluation results were the only practices not commonly implemented. The type of evaluation system used had very little effect on the perceived influence of evaluation on professional growth or on satisfaction with the system. The implementation of a majority of the recommended practices, however, had a strong positive influence on satisfaction with the system and on perceived professional growth. Larger, wealthier districts were more inclined to use Performance Objectives Systems than were smaller, less wealthy districts. No correlation was found between principals' salaries and the type of evaluation used or the effects of that evaluation. Much emphasis was placed on the value of informal evaluation—frequent, on-the-job interaction between the principal and the evaluator. The value which principals placed on evaluation appeared to correlate closely with the importance the evaluator placed on the system and the degree to which principals understood the system and had been involved in developing it.

Since the type of system seemed to have little influence on the effectiveness of evaluation, it may be that continued emphasis and debate on the relative merits of specific systems is not warranted. Further research on the nature and effect of other factors such as informal evaluation, which do appear to influence evaluation effectiveness would be of real benefit to the field of principal evaluation.

AN ANALYTICAL SURVEY OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION

IN LARGE SECONDARY PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS

IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS


by

Ann E. Ludwig


A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School

of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education


May

1980

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

VITA

Ann E. Ludwig, daughter of Cecile Sollars Ludwig and the
late Holly J. Ludwig, was born in Danville, Illinois on
June 28, 1936. Her elementary education was obtained at
Sandbar School, a one-room school in Pilot Township, Illinois,
and Collison Grade School in Collison, Illinois. She graduated
from Armstrong Township High School in Armstrong, Illinois in
1954.

She attended Mac Murray College in Jacksonville, Illinois
for one year. In June, 1958, she received the degree of
Bachelor of Arts in Teacher Training in English at the
University of Illinois in Urbana, Illinois. She received the
degree of Master of Arts in Education in Curriculum and
Supervision from St. Xavier College in Chicago, Illinois in
June, 1969. In the fall of 1975, she was accepted into the
doctoral program in Educational Administration and Supervision
at Loyola University of Chicago.

Between 1958 and 1972, she taught junior high language arts,
secondary English, and college English Methods and was English
Department Chairman at H.L. Richards High School. Since 1972,
she has been employed as district coordinator of English and
Reading in Community High School District #218. She is a
member of Delta Kappa Gamma and Phi Delta Kappa.

# LIST OF TABLES

# CONTENTS FOR APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Statement of the Problem

The formal evaluation of secondary school principals is
a relatively recent development in education.[1] In a survey of
educational literature and research, many different systems were
reported and many practices were criticized or recommended, but
there was little evidence of widespread implementation of efficient
systems and recommended practices.  The general purpose of this
study is to survey large Cook County, Illinois, suburban secondary
public school districts in an effort to determine what evaluation
systems and practices were employed and to analyze why they were
being used and how their effectiveness was perceived by principals
and superintendents in these districts.

There appears to be a growing interest and unmistakable
trend to evaluate principals.  Indeed, "evaluation is an educational
'must', and if anyone 'must' be carefully evaluated, it is the
all important school principal."[2] Many factors have influenced
this trend.  As school districts have increased in size and
complexity, and personal contact and communication have decreased,

---

[1]Terry Barraclough, Administrator Evaluation, Educational
Management Review Series #15, Eugene, Ore., April, 1973 (Eugene, Ore.:
ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1973), p. 2.

[2]Max Rosenberg, "The Values of School Principal Evaluation,"
Education, 91 (February-March, 1971), p. 213.

1

the need for formal, objective evaluative measures has grown.
Increased federal funding has brought with it the requirement for
evaluation at all levels. The general public is demanding that
schools be accountable for their use of funds, and many state
legislatures are requiring evaluation of all school personnel.
Formal, highly controlled teacher evaluation systems, often a
result of teacher negotiations, have drawn attention to evaluation.
Declining scores on student achievement tests have caused educators
and the general public to examine the educational system and analyze
its effectiveness at all levels.

Historically, principals have always been evaluated, at
least informally, in one way or another. Whether or not anything
was written or conferences held, some type of evaluation was
occurring, usually in a highly subjective manner and without clear
plan or purpose. Often only negative behavior was noted. Such
practices are not considered formal evaluation.[3]

The first reported systems of formal evaluation (systems
which are still widely used) are generally classified as Performance
Standards Systems. While there are many different types of Perfor-
mance Standards Systems, they have in common the practice of rating
principals on their past performance and the degree to which they
possess certain desired, prestated characteristics. The rating is
often done unilaterally by the superintendent and without the

---

[3]Terry Barraclough, Administrator Evaluation, NAESP School
Leadership Digest Series, #5, Washington, D.C., 1974 (Washington,
D.C.: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1974),
p. 1.

involvement, and sometimes without the knowledge, of the

principals. While these systems are highly time and cost

efficient, they are often criticized because they are generally

based on the evaluator's unilateral, subjective judgment; the

instruments are often poorly designed; the evaluatee is usually

not involved in determining criteria, the evaluatee's personal

characteristics are likely to be judged rather than his perfor-

mance, and the systems tend to be inflexible.[4] (The many disad-

vantages of Performance Standards Systems are cited at length

on pages 35-37 of Chapter Two.)

Another basic type of evaluation system, the Performance

Objectives System, has been implemented with increasing frequency

since the 1960's.[5] It is patterned after Management by Objectives

(MBO) as developed in business, and it, too, has taken many diff-

erent forms. Performance Objectives Systems, in general, measure,

the degree to which a principal achieves specific measurable

objectives. In other words, it is forward-looking and measures

outcomes, as opposed to ratings of past behavior as found in

Performance Standards Systems. Performance Objectives Systems

have many advantages and are highly recommended in educational

literature. The main advantages of these systems are that they

are forward-looking, provide a mutually-agreed upon direction

---

[4] William B. Castetter and Richard S. Heisler, Appraising and
Improving the Performance of School Administrative Personnel, Phila-
delphia, Pa., 1971 (University of Pennsylvania Center for Field
Studies, Graduate School of Education, 1971), p. 7.

[5] Educational Research Service, Evaluating Administrative
Performance (Arlington, Va.: Educational Research Service, Inc.,
1974), p. 19.

of effort, provide both the evaluator and evaluatee with mutual criteria for assessment, and judge the evaluatee for what he does instead of for what he is or has been.[6] At the same time these systems have many disadvantages, as pointed out by critics such as Hickcox.[7] Since they are often very complex, they demand a great deal of time and effort from administrators who are already under a great deal of pressure; they require thorough knowledge and understanding by the evaluator and evaluatee, they are dependent on open and honest interaction and the ability of the evaluator and evaluatee to reach mutual agreement; and important areas may be neglected in the goal-setting process. (The many advantages and disadvantages are cited at length on pages 48-50 of Chapter II.)

In correlation with the many types of reported evaluation systems were a wide variety of specific practices which were criticized or recommended, but which were not necessarily inherent to the specific structure of the evaluation system. Practices which were criticized in the various sources surveyed included the failure to involve evaluatees in designing the system and establishing criteria, insufficient time spent by the evaluator actually observing and interacting with the principal, and the absence of procedures for principals to appeal unfavorable evaluation results. The reverse of these practices was recommended,

[6] Robert E. Greene, Administrative Appraisal: A Step to Improved Leadership, (Washington, D.C.: NASSP, 1972), p. 28.

[7] Edward S. Hickcox, "Assessment of Administrative Performance - The Road Not Taken," The Journal (January, 1975), p. 6.

along with such things as having an up-to-date, realistic job description and tying remediation and in-service to evaluation results. These practices may be categorized as to when they occur: during the pre-evaluation stage, during the actual evaluation-observation period, during the final assessment, or during the follow-up stage. (The various general evaluation practices are discussed in detail on pages 51-66 of Chapter II)

A real dilemma appears to exist between the need for effective evaluation of principals and the manner in which that evaluation should be conducted.

In an effort to gain insight into that dilemma, the purpose of this study is to analyze specific aspects of subject districts and their evaluation systems and practices in order to determine:

1. the extent to which recommended evaluation systems and practices are used,

2. if size, wealth, or amount of principals' salaries influence the use of recommended evaluation systems and practices,

3. if the use of recommended systems and practices has a positive effect on principal professional growth, as perceived by principals and by superintendents,

4. if the use of recommended systems and practices has a positive effect on principal and superintendent satisfaction with the system,

5. if more superintendents express satisfaction with the principal evaluation system in their districts than do principals, and

6. the specific characteristics of the evaluation system in each district, why it is used, and its effects on the various people involved.

Hopefully, the conclusions which are reached through this analysis will contribute to educational research and help solve the dilemma which exists in the evaluation of secondary principals.

## Scope and Design of the Study

In this survey and analysis of evaluation systems and practices, all Cook County, Illinois, suburban secondary public school districts with student enrollment of 3,500 or more (twenty districts) were studied. A two-page questionnaire (Appendix A) was sent to the twenty superintendents to determine, initially, the types of systems used in their districts, the recommended practices which were employed, and their perception of the effectiveness of the evaluation systems. All twenty of these questionnaires were returned. A survey of principals (Appendix B) was conducted regarding their perception of the effectiveness of principal evaluation in their district and its contribution to their professional growth. Fifty-two of the fifty-six principals in these districts were surveyed; four were not available for an interview. Superintendents were interviewed in depth regarding the type of evaluation system they used, why it was used, and their perception of its effectiveness (Appendix C). Fourteen of the twenty superintendents were interviewed; six were not available for the interview. Other statistical data, such as wealth of district and principals' salaries, were obtained from the Educational Service Region of Cook County.

These data were tabulated and analyzed quantitatively and narratively. It was determined to what extent systems and practices, as recommended in educational literature, were implemented in subject districts. Frequency analysis was used to determine if relationships existed between the use of recommended systems and practices and 1) the size of the district, 2) the wealth of

a district, 3) the principals' salaries, 4) principals' professional growth as perceived by the principal and by the superintendent, and 5) satisfaction with the system as perceived by the principal and by the superintendent. Frequency analysis was also used to compare principals' and superintendents' satisfaction with the system and their perceptions of its contribution to the principals' professional growth.

In a narrative analysis, individual districts were analyzed further to determine the specific aspects of their principal evaluation systems, why they were used, and their perceived effects.

Conclusions were summarized, apparent trends were noted, and recommendations were made on the basis of the quantitative and narrative analysis of data on principal evaluation in subject districts. Specific methodology and procedure is detailed in Chapter III.

## Limitations and Assumptions

This study was limited to large suburban high school districts in Cook County, Illinois. While it cannot be assumed that what is true here will necessarily be true in smaller suburban or rural school districts, larger urban districts, in elementary or unit districts, or in other states and suburban areas, it was assumed that there are commonalities in the effects of certain evaluation systems and practices upon all principals, and perhaps upon other administrators, in terms of their professional growth and effectiveness.

The assumption was made, on the basis of a survey of educa-
tional literature as reported in Chapter II, that certain evalu-
ation systems and practices are more effective and desirable than
others. In particular, the extensive surveys conducted by the
Educational Research Service in 1968, 1971, and 1974,[8] by Lorraine
Poliakoff in 1973,[9] and by Terry Barraclough in 1974[10] support
this assumption. The thesis of an article written by George
Redfern in 1972 was that "evaluation is more meaningful if based
upon performance objectives than upon predetermined performance
standards with unilateral ratings by the principal's superiors."[11]
In most sources surveyed, Performance Objectives Evaluation systems
are recommended strongly over other systems. Several specific
practices, some inherent to Performance Objectives Systems and
some applicable to any system, are recommended repeatedly. These
recommended practices, such as considering the unique needs of an
individual school in the criteria of assessment and goal setting
and tying pay raises to evaluation results, appeared to be basic
to effective evaluation procedures, and thus were noted repeatedly

[8]Educational Research Service, Evaluating Administrative
Performance, ERS Circular #7; Evaluating Administrative/
Supervisory Personnel, ERS Circular #6; Evaluating Administrative
Performance, ERS, (Arlington, Virginia: Educational Research
Service, Inc., 1968, 1971 and 1974) pp. 1-5, 1-9, 1-23.

[9] Lorraine Poliakoff, "Recent Trends in Evaluating School
Personnel", National Elementary Principal, 52 (February, 1973),
pp. 39-44.

[10]Barraclough, Administrator Evaluation, 1973, pp. 1-23.

[11] George Redfern, "Principals: Who's Evaluating Them, Why
and How?", Bulletin of NASSP, 56 (May, 1972), p. 87.

in the literature.

The study was limited to the evaluation system and practices of a school district and to principals' and superintendents' perceptions of the effectiveness of the system. Except as they were related peripherally, such items as board policy, instrumentation, and who conducted the interview were not included. Aspects which could not be measured quantitatively or in isolation, such as the overall effectiveness of the school, were not included. Secondary results, such as student achievement scores, were not included. While these factors are undoubtedly influenced by principal evaluation indirectly, they are also influenced by many other variables and thus were not included.

Finally, the assumption was made that data obtained from principals and superintendents gave an accurate picture of the evaluation system and practices in their districts. Questionnaire items were field-tested to insure content and construct validity and each item was repeated in the superintendent interview to cross-check validity of answers. All interviews were conducted over a period of five weeks after the close of spring semester. Questions regarding professional growth and satisfaction with the system were, in every instance, restricted to the perception of the individual being questioned. Wherever possible, copies of evaluation instruments, district policy and procedure for evaluation, and relevant written communication were obtained to further check the systems and practices reported.

## Summary

This chapter has presented a general introduction and over-view of the problem the purpose of the study, the general scope and design of the study, and limitations and assumptions. A review of educational literature and research relating to the evaluation of principals is presented in the following chapter.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Definition of Principal Evaluation

Evaluation, in a general sense, is defined in Webster's
Dictionary as "the judgment or determination of the worth or
quality of; an appraisal." A definition of the evaluation of
school administrators by one writer is: "Evaluation of admin-
istrators is the process of delineating, obtaining, and provid-
ing useful information for judging alternatives." He further
defines terms: "Process - activities, methods, or operations;
Delineating - identifying information required; Obtaining -
making information available by collecting, organizing and
analyzing; Providing - putting information into systems (i.e.,
evaluation instruments, questionnaires) and giving it to the
evaluator for making evaluative decisions."[1] William L. Pharis,
Executive Secretary of the National Association of Elementary
School Principals, cited several words used synonymously with
principal evaluation and which vary according to usage and geo-
graphic location: "evaluate, appraise, judge, determine, review,
prove, measure and account." All, he states, "suggest that the
adults involved in the education of children are responsible for

---

[1]Lewis A. Wills, "Evaluation of Administrators: Issues and
Practices," OSSC Bulletin, Vol. 19 (June, 1976), p. 4.

a relationship between the objectives promised, the resources
utilized and the outcomes realized. Evaluation should be a
matching of intent to results, a comparison of what was expected
to happen with what did happen." In essence, evaluation is the
answer to the question, "How are we doing as principals?"[2]

## Historical Development

In the early years of American schools, little attention
was given to the formal evaluation of administrators. When schools
were small and simply structured, administrators did not need a
formal procedure for evaluation because they could assess strengths
and weaknesses of subordinates from first-hand knowledge.[3] Early
articles and texts on administration usually listed various responsi-
bilities and desired characteristics for principals, and, in most
districts, the principal was expected to meet those expectations.
According to these sources, if he did not meet the various expecta-
tions of various evaluators- including his superiors and different
public groups- he was probably dismissed--depending on the subjective
judgment and power of the various evaluators to dismiss him.

As systematic procedures for evaluating administrators began
to emerge, for the most part in large cities in the early part of

[2]William L. Pharis, "Evaluation of School Principals,"
National Elementary Principal, 52 (February, 1973), p. 36.

[3]Barraclaugh, Administrator Evaluation, 1974, p. 1.

this century, some type of checklist rating was the most common.

Great effort was devoted to listing all the desired personal

characteristics of a principal and the duties a principal was

expected to perform. The principal was then rated, in most cases

unilaterally by the superintendent, according to what he was and

what he had done.[4] These types of systems are generally referred

to in the literature as Performance Standards Systems.

In the early 1960's, rapid changes in society and general

social upheaval brought increased pressure on many groups, includ-

ing educators, and on educational evaluation at all levels.

Traditional methods were found inadequate and new ones were adopted.

Among the pressures that created the need for more effective eval-

uation were the increased size and complexity of school systems,

federal aid to schools with accompanying demands for accountability,

increased emphasis on teacher appraisal, teacher militancy, problems

with increased costs of schools, student achievement and discipline,

problems with student achievement accountability at all levels, and

concerns about outdated administrators in leadership roles.[5] It

seemed that the public was "unanimous in demanding educational

accountability. The message was clear that new dollars for education

---

[4]Poliakoff, "Evaluating School Personnel," p. 41.

[5]Maurice Verbeke, "Competency-Based Administrative Evaluation," Administrator's Quarterly (Fall, 1974), p. 19.

would not be forthcoming until the taxpayer's confidence was restored in what was happening in schools and until he could expect a reasonable return from additional investment."[6] Everett Nichols calls this situation the "accountability syndrome" which is placing increasing pressure on principals to justify their performance of administrative duties. This pressure for accountability means a corresponding emphasis on evaluation.[7]

In 1967, the Florida legislature mandated evaluation at all levels in the state schools. Legislation in several other states, including the well known Stull Act in California in 1971, soon followed.[8] The need for more effective administration of schools was evident, and with it a means of assessing that effectiveness.

Since administration in one field has much in common with administration in other fields, educators looked to management developments in business, industry, and government. In his article on evaluation in education, Howsam refers to publications such as The Motivation to Work by Frederick Herzberg in 1959 and New Patterns in Management by Rensis Likert in 1961 which lent much to the understanding of supervisory technique and administrative behavior.[9]

_____

[6]Greene, Administrative Appraisal, p. ix.

[7]Everett W. Nichols, "Performance of Principals in the Accountability Syndrome," Bulletin of NASSP, 56 (May, 1972), p. 102.

[8]George B. Redfern, "Legally Mandated Evaluation," National Elementary Principal, 52 (February, 1973), p. 45.

[9]Robert B. Howsam and John M. Franco, "New Emphasis in Evaluation of Administrators, "National Elementary Principal, 44 (April, 1965) pp. 39-40.

From studies such as these by Herzberg and Likert and subsequent

implementation of new management techniques in business and

industry, educators developed an increasing interest in the system

known as Management by Objectives (MBO). The basis of MBO systems

is that the evaluatee is involved in the decision making process,

in setting goals, and in deciding how and whether those goals are

achieved. The merit of this approach was noted in the National

Association of Secondary School Principals' 1972 publication,

Management Crisis: A Solution.[10]

The MBO system of evaluation, in its many forms in educational

administrative evaluation, has been given such titles as the Job

Targets Approach, Performance Goals Procedure, and Performance

Objectives, as well as MBO. (In this study, the system is referred

to throughout as "Performance Objectives.") Lorraine Poliakoff, in

a 1973 review of literature on educational evaluation, noted a

definite trend toward this particular type of evaluation.[11]

While various forms of MBO evaluation are enjoying current

popularity in educational literature, it is important to note that,

while there may be a trend toward such systems, the majority of

school districts in the United States are still operating without

any formal administrator evaluation system or with some form of

Performance Standards rating system. In 1975, Edward S. Hickcox

wrote, "Evidence from the literature and the observation of practice

---

[10]Greene, Administrative Appraisal, pp. 7-10.

[11]Poliakoff, "Evaluating School Personnel," p. 4.

suggests that, for the most part, administrators are not evaluated systematically and that in those cases where there is an attempt made at evaluation it is done badly."[12]   In his dissertation on the evaluation of high school principals in the United States, Warren MacQueen (University of Southern California, 1969) reported that of 263 large United States high schools in his study, only 44 percent were using some type of formal principal evaluation system.[13]   In another doctoral dissertation on the evaluation of high school principals in Michigan in 1974, Robert Towns reported that, of the responding districts, only 38 percent reported the use of a formal performance evaluation procedure.[14]   In still another dissertation on principal evaluation processes in Cook County, Illinois elementary districts in 1979, Tom Kostes reported that, while the majority of districts had some type of formal evaluation process, the majority of those were not Performance Objectives systems.[15]

---

[12]Hickcox, "Administrative Performance," p. 5.

[13]Warren F. MacQueen, "Evaluating the Job Performance of the Public High School Principal" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1969), p. 33.

[14]Robert M. Towns, "A Survey of the Procedures for Evaluating the Performance of Secondary Public School Principals in Michigan" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1974), pp. 208-58.

[15]Tom P. Kostes, "An Analysis of the Process of Evaluating Elementary School Principals in Selected School Districts, Cook County, Illinois" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Loyola University, 1979), pp. 152-58.

The Educational Research Service has conducted four surveys
of administrator evaluation systems since 1964, primarily in large
urban districts. In the 1964 study, it took two years to <u>find</u>
forty-five districts which had any kind of evaluation system,
including those which were quite informal.[16] In their 1968 survey
of large school districts, 40 percent of the responding districts
reported the use of a formal administrator evaluation system. In
1971, more than 54 percent of the responding districts reported
the use of such systems. The ERS evidence indicates that the
percentage has continued to rise since 1971. Of those districts
reporting formal evaluation systems, 13.7 percent used a Performance
Objectives System in 1968, while 22.6 percent used such a system in
1971. The 1973 study, while not comparable with earlier figures,
indicated a continuing rise in the percentage of Performance
Objectives Systems.[17] Although there appears to be a definite
increase in the number of districts using some type of formal
evaluation and in the number using Performance Objectives Systems,
the percentages are still relatively small and represent only those
districts responding to the surveys. Thus, Hickcox's observation
in 1975 that most administrators are not evaluated systematically
and that those who are evaluated badly may still be true.

---

[16]ERS, <u>Evaluating Administrative Performance</u>, 1968, p. 1.

[17]ERS, <u>Evaluating Administrative Performance</u>, 1974, pp. 18-22.

## Types of Evaluation Systems

Despite evidence that a great many school districts are not formally evaluating principals or are doing the job badly, a basic assumption to all research on the subject would appear to be, as Redfern says, that, "The principal's productivity can be evaluated. Not only can it be, but it should be evaluated."[18] Campbell says, "Every profession needs to assess itself--to determine the roles of its members and to develop procedures whereby the effectiveness of their performance can be ascertained."[19] While there appears to be general agreement that evaluation can and should be done, there is not clear consenses on the type of system that should be used.

In the several states which have mandated evaluation, including California, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Kansas, Maine, Nevada, Oregon, South Dakota, Virginia and Washington, most left the form and substance of the evaluation to the local district. Only California gave a clear mandate for Evaluation by Objectives, including minimal student competencies.[20] While Illinois does not have mandated evaluation, recommendations from the Illinois Office of Education in 1976 stated that "every board of education should adopt policies and procedures that insure the development of an

---

[18]Redfern, "Principals: Who's Evaluating Them," p. 86.

[19]Roald F. Campbell, "The Evaluation of Administrative Performance," Paper Presented at AASA Convention, Atlantic City, New Jersey, February, 1971, p. 1.

[20]Redfern, "Legally Mandated Evaluation," pp. 45-6.

effective administrative staff, including...evaluation of administrators at all levels." This booklet recommends that the board of education should assign the superintendent "the responsibility for evaluating other administrators." It states that "every administrator should be formally evaluated on a regular and continuing basis. This formal evaluation should be based upon the job description, short-term and long-term goals, performance objectives, and other professional attributes."[21] Thus, in the state of Illinois, a fairly specific recommendation has been made for evaluation by objectives, but this system is not required. Several authors, including Redfern, suggest that the specific system of evaluation should not be mandated, that school districts should have great latitude in designing their evaluation system.[22] Most authorities recommend that districts determine the purpose or purposes of their administrator evaluation process and design the system to fit the purposes.

Nearly every reference listed one or more purposes of principal evaluation. The 1974 survey by the ERS emphasized that "the intended purposes of evaluation are of central importance in determining the design of an effective evaluation process and its subsumed procedures." They list representative examples of evaluation purposes culled from their survey:

---

[21]Illinois Office of Education, Guidelines for Fair Treatment of Administrators (Springfield, Illinois: State Board of Education, 1975), p. 3.

[22]Redfern, "Legally Mandated Evaluation," p. 45.

1. To help or prod supervisors to observe their subordinates more closely and to do a better coaching job;
2. To motivate employees by providing feedback on how they are doing;
3. To establish a research and reference base for personnel decisions;
4. To determine the degree of information and skill possessed by the administrator in his role as educational leader;
5. To determine the 'degree to which his decisions are sound, timely, and effectively carried out';
6. To determine th what extent his decisions are shared by those significantly affected by those decisions;
7. To determine the extent to which super-ordinates, co-ordinates, and subordinates are kept informed at all times of all decisions on a need-to-know basis for effective operation at each level;
8. To point up continuing education needs;
9. To facilitate mutual understanding between superior and subordinate;
10. To determine whether organization should transfer, demote, or dismiss personnel
11. To establish compensation that is partially based on performance;
12. To enable managers to see the requirements of their jobs more clearly;
13. To provide an official appraisal record of the principal's performance;
14. To sensitize the director and other central office personnel to the problems and needs of the building principal;
15. To offer suggestions and assistance to the principal for the improvement of the educational program in his school;
16. To contribute to good morale by demonstrating just and equitable personnel practices;
17. To facilitate communication and cooperation among school-based administrators and other members of the profession, students, and the community;
18. To appraise the effectiveness or adequacy of human and material supports for principals and assistant principals;
19. To establish objectives for school-based administrator improvement or for emphasis on indicated areas;
20. To establish a procedure by which long-range goals of the school district can be translated into goals for effective performance for individual employees; and
21. To motivate self-improvement.[23]

---

[23]ERS, _Evaluating Administrative Performance_, 1974, pp. 3-4.

Winston Oberg cited nine different types of appraisal systems, each with its own combination of strengths and weaknesses. He says the type of system used should be determined by appraisal goals and the various aspects of performance which are being appraised.[24]

In general, the various types of evaluation systems reported in the literature fall into three basic categories. It is likely that the specifics within each category reflect the evaluation goals or purposes of a given school district. In summary of the research, the basic categories of systems for evaluating principals are 1) those which are informal, unwritten and subjective, 2) those which formally evaluate a person for what he is and for what he has done according to predetermined standards (Performance Standards Systems), and 3) those which evaluate a person for what he achieves (Performance Objectives Systems).

Informal Evaluation Systems

In a research proposal on educational management, the Battelle Memorial Institute pointed out that schools have not, traditionally, had formal procedures for evaluating administrators. They have, however, had some assessment of administrator strengths and weaknesses in order to make decisions on hiring, training, promotion, and firing. According to this source, in small school systems, the superintendent, school board, and various publics have made

---

[24]Winston Oberg, "Make Performance Appraisal Relevant," Harvard Business Review, 50 (January-February, 1972) p. 66.

these subjective judgments on the basis of first-hand knowledge.[25]

Various surveys and research studies are based on those formal

evaluation systems which were reported. It may be assumed that

many of the districts which did not respond to surveys had no

formal evaluation system to report.

There is, in fact, a growing body of literature which is

critical of all formal evaluation systems. Oberg cited various

articles from the Harvard Business Review and Management of

Personnel Quarterly to support his statement that, in actual

practice, formal appraisal programs have often yielded unsatis-

factory and disappointing results. Some of the articles he cites

suggest that performance appraisal be abandoned as a lost hope,

pointing to scores of problems and pitfalls as evidence.[26]

Howsam and Franco advised playing down formal evaluation in favor

of developing an organizational climate conducive to performance

rather than relying on evaluation to motivate administrators.

They state, "Most school systems will gain more from strengthen-

ing in-service efforts at developing mutual understanding of

administrative and supervisory processes and behavior than from

devoting a great deal of time and effort to formal evaluation

which doesn't really do much good because we don't know much about

it.[27]

---

[25] Battelle Memorial Institute, Increasing the Effectiveness of Educational Management: A Research Proposal (Columbus, Ohio: Columbus Labs, 1968), p. 1.

[26] Oberg, "Performance Appraisal," p. 61.

[27] Howsam and Franco, "Evaluation of Administrators," pp. 7 and 40.

In a paper presented at the AASA Convention in 1971, Jack Culbertson stated that, because of the incomplete development of the sciences of education and management, an infallible evaluation system cannot be guaranteed.[28]

Whether the absence of formal principal evaluation is due to negligence or design, there are strong arguments which support the need for some type of formal evaluation, albeit fallible. De Vaughn noted that many administrators and teachers have taken the position that teacher and administrator performance is too involved and complicated to measure and rank, while teachers have ranked students by specific grades through the years with equally complicated and unreliable evidence.[29] Harold Armstrong concluded that, while there is as yet no perfect evaluation plan, and that any plan which looks good on paper is likely to have aspects that do not work, it is important that evaluation plans be systematically reviewed and continually developed. He states that what is probably most important at this stage of evaluation development is "practice-- lots of it!"[30] Arikado and Musella wrote that, while the evaluation of principals has in the past been considerably subjective and without clear criteria for effectiveness, evaluation is essential

[28] Jack A. Culbertson, "Evaluation of Middle-Administrative Personnel: A Component of the Accountability Process," Paper presented at AASA Convention, Atlantic City, New Jersey, February, 1971, p. 8.

[29] J. Everette DeVaughn, Policies, Procedures and Instruments in the Evaluation of Teacher and Administrator Performance (Atlanta, Georgia: Davis Association, Inc., 1971), p. 3.

[30] Harold R. Armstrong, "Performance Evaluation," National Elementary Principal, 52 (February, 1973), p. 55.

and can be more objective if conducted properly.[31] On the

importance of having a formal principal evaluation system,

Rosenberg states that the right kind of evaluations will help

principals gain insights into their strengths (how they can be

capitalized on) and weaknesses (and how they can be shored up).[32]

Carvell summarizes, "the ability of administrators to generate

pedagogical camouflage will not suffice to meet present condi-

tions, especially regarding administrator evaluation."[33] Oberg

concludes that formal systems for appraising performance are

neither worthless nor evil. Nor are they panaceas. He writes,

"A formal appraisal system is, at the very least, a commendable

attempt to make visible, and hence improvable, a set of essential

organization activities. Personal judgments are inescapable,

and subjective values and fallible human perception are always

involved. ~~Formal appraisal systems at least bring these percep-

tion are always involved.~~ Formal appraisal systems at least

bring these perceptions and values into the open, and make it

possible for at least some of the inherent bias and error to be

recognized and remedied."[34]

_____

[31]Marjorie Arikado and Donald Musella, "Toward an Objective
Evaluation of the School Principal," The Headmaster (Winter
Issue, 1974), p. 13.

[32]Max Rosenberg, "How to Evaluate Your Principals Without
Scaring (or Turning) Them Off," American School Board Journal,
160 (June, 1973), p. 35.

[33]James Carvell, "Case Study #6: Evaluating Administrative
Performance," Thrust for Educational Leadership, 2 (November,
1972), p. 32.

[34]Oberg, "Performance Appraisal," p. 67.

Elements of Formal Evaluation Systems

There are many common elements which may be found in any type of formal evaluation system, be it Performance Standards or Performance Objectives. In Barraclough's analysis of the research on principal evaluation, four common steps of the evaluation process are noted: Pre-Evaluation Conference, Evaluation, Post-Evaluation Conference and Follow-up action. Within each step, he notes, various actions may occur, various people may be involved, and various instruments may be used. The evaluation step may include a wide variety of data gathering and rating techniques. Barraclough states that self-evaluation may play an important part in the total process or not be included at all.[35]

In their 1971 survey of administrative evaluation systems, the ERS identified twelve basic types of systems based on 1) the source of input used in compiling the final evaluation, 2) the degree to which the evaluation procedures facilitate improved performance, and 3) the degree to which the evaluatee is a participant in the evaluation process. Of these twelve systems identified in the ERS study, the first eight are Performance Standards Systems, and the last four are Performance Objectives Systems:

> Systems One to Eight include a list of predetermined Performance Standards to be rated numerically, be selecting a descriptive phrase, or by written comments ₍may also include

---

[35] Barraclough, Administrator Evaluation, 1974, pp. 11-13.

lists of needed improvements).

1. Unilateral evaluation by evaluator; no evaluation conference(s); no notification of evaluation outcome to evaluatee unless unsatisfactory rating is given
2. Unilateral evaluation by evaluator; no evaluation conference(s), but evaluatee is either shown or given a copy of completed form
3. Unilateral evaluation by evaluator based on conference(s) between evaluator and evaluatee during evaluation period; no post-evaluation conference is held, but evaluatee is either shown or given a copy of completed form or letter report
4. Unilateral evaluation by evaluator; post-evaluation conference between evaluator and evaluatee to discuss rating received; evaluatee may also either be shown or given a copy of completed form
5. Evaluations are conducted by team of educators; chairman compiles summary evaluation and holds post-evaluation conference with evaluatee to discuss the rating
6. The evaluator and evaluatee agree on major areas of responsibility for evaluatee; evaluator rates evaluatee on his performance in each major area; post-evaluation conference is held to discuss the evaluation
7. The evaluatee rates himself and evaluator rates evaluatee; these evaluations are discussed in a conference, but only the evaluator's rating, which may or may not be modified as a result of the conference, appears on the completed form
8. The evaluatee rates himself and evaluator rates evaluatee; both evaluations are discussed in conference; both evaluations appear on completed form.

Job Performance Goals tailored to individual evaluatee and major areas of responsibility which may be standardized or individually formulated; rated numerically, by a descriptive phrase, or by written comments (may also include checklists and/or written comments on prescribed characteristics).

9. The evaluatee completes a self-evaluation form, including establishing goals for next evaluation period; completed form is submitted to evaluator, who adds his comments as to accuracy of evaluatee's evaluation. Post-evaluation conference is held to discuss completed form
10. The evaluator and evaluatee, in conference, establish mutually agreed upon performance goals for evaluatee, within his major areas of responsibility; evaluator rates evaluatee on his accomplishment of performance goals and performance in areas of responsibility; post-evaluation conference is held to discuss the evaluation

11. Same as #10 above, except that evaluatee completes a
    self-evaluation prior to conference with his evaluator;
    evaluator places his evaluation on same form with
    evaluatee's; both evaluations are discussed in post-
    evaluation conference

12. Same as #11 above, except that evaluator consults with
    other individuals, including evaluatee's peers and/or
    staff, students, and parents, before completing his
    part of the evaluation form; only evaluator's evaluation
    appears on completed form.[36]

The degree to which the evaluatee, the principal, participates

in the various stages of the evaluation process varies according to

the individual system. Many researchers view this self-evaluation

as an essential part of the formal evaluation system whether it be

Performance Standards or Performance Objectives. In his Guidelines

for Evaluation of Principals, Richard Gorton wrote that self-

evaluation should be emphasized as much as external evaluation.

Formal self-evaluation, he says, should begin at and proceed

through the same time period as the formal external evaluation.

At the end of the process, the principal's perceptions should be

shared with the evaluator. According to Gorton, self-evaluation

can contribute greatly to professional growth and promotes more

accurate and fairer final evaluation by the evaluator.[37] Robert

Denny recommends a "report card" that the principal fills out for

himself covering various areas of principal responsibility accord-

ing to standards pre-determined by the district.[38]

---

[36]ERS, Evaluating Performance, 1971, pp. 4-6.

[37]Richard A. Gorton, "Guidelines for the Evaluation of
Principals," Wisconsin School News (February, 1976), p. 10.

[38]Robert Denny, "A Rating Scale for Elementary Principals,"
American School Board Journal, 149 (December, 1964), pp. 11-12.

Robert Greene wrote that "self-appraisal is a painstaking examination of one's own performance in order to form a basis for future action." In this process, he says, the principal should seek feed-back from his staff to consider in his self-appraisal. Greene maintains that the appraisal program and the instrument must provide for formal self-appraisal. Only when an individual personally sees the need for change does he generate commitment in himself."[39] De Vaughn stated that self-evaluation can add a new dimension to the process, as the evaluatee perhaps best knows his strengths and weaknesses.[40] George Redfern sees self-evaluation as the starting point of a comprehensive assessment of performance effectiveness. He warns, however, that self-assessment is a subtle process which requires the capacity to objectively weigh strengths and weaknesses and to estimate accomplishment.[41] Howsam and Franco say that the real accountability is to one's self. "How well am I doing in terms of my own expectations and my own perceptions of the situation? In the last analysis, one answers to himself." They too warn against the subjectivity of self-perception: "The ability of the individual to protect self-image through a whole host of perceptual

---

[39] Greene, Administrative Appraisal, p. 3.

[40] De Vaughn, Administrator Performance, pp. 17-18.

[41] Redfern, "Principals: Who's Evaluating Them?", p. 90-91.

and other psychological mechanisms is well known. The least

secure among us may need the most feedback and help but be least

able to receive it or even recognize the need."[42] While the many

researchers do not necessarily agree on the degree of importance

of self-evaluation, most would concur that it should at least be

a part of the system, whether it be Performance Standards or

Performance Objectives.

Performance Standards Evaluation Systems

The unique characteristic of Performance Standards Systems,

according to the various sources surveyed, is that they assess what

has happened in the past according to certain pre-determined stand-

ards. These standards often include personal characteristics as

well as administrative job descriptors. Barraclough defined this

approach as a "process which involves rating the administrator

against standards determined in advance by the district. Procedures

utilizing objective rating instruments (such as checklists) are

included in this category. The major assumption underlying this

method of evaluation is that administrator performance can be

accurately and fairly measured by predetermined 'objective' criteria

that measures general, overall performance."[43] The 1971 ERA survey

found that over 75 percent of reported evaluation systems were of

this type. They enumerate the many actions which may be found in

each stage of Performance Standards Evaluation.[44]

---

[42] Howsam and Franco, "Evaluation of Administrators," p. 37-38.

[43] Barraclough, Administrator Evaluation, 1974, p. 15.

[44] ERS, Evaluating Performance, 1971, p. 8.

Most writers concur that, before evaluation occurs, standards must be determined and stated. These may be stated as descriptors of performance (competencies) or as categories of principal responsibilities and characteristics. Most texts on the principalship include a listing, in a variety of categories, of principal responsibilities, duties, qualifications, or characteristics. In a recent monograph prepared for the Illinois Principals Association, Buser and Stuck appended a comprehensive listing of items employed in the evaluation of principals. The various categories were:
A. Personal Characteristics (78 items), B. Professionalism
(19 Items), C. Curriculum-Instructional Leadership (34 Items),
D. Physical Plant (20 Items), E. Fiscal Responsibility (21 Items),
F. Community Relations (31 Items), and G. Managerial Skills
(405 Items). The items range from statements of general characteristics such as "Disposition," to specific indicators such as "Prepares all forms and reports as requested by the central office," to evaluative questions such as, "Does the principal welcome suggestions?"[45] An example of a typical listing of performance standards is the Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory which lists sixty-four items of administrative responsibilities such as "Gains the esteem of his staff by demonstrating a genuine respect for them." This system defines administrative effectiveness as

---

[45]Robert L. Buser and Dean L. Stuck, Evaluation and the Principal (Springfield, Illinois: Illinois Principals Association, 1976), pp. 29-55.

behavior that meets the stated expectations for his performance.[46]

Max Rosenberg recommends the development and use of widely recognized performance categories and with specific behavior standards stated within each category. He suggests nine performance categories: 1) School Organization, 2) Instructional Program, 3) Relationships with Students, 4) Relationships with Staff Members, 5) Relationships with Community, 6) Relationships with Superiors, 7) Plant and Facilities, 8) Schedules, Accounts and Other Management Matters, and 9) School Climate. Typical behavior standards are: 4.1) Stimulates a spirit of high morale among staff members, and 4.2) Has a representative staff council that plays an active role in the development of school programs.[47] (Rosenberg's behavior standards have been used in a 100-Item "Checklist for Rating Principals' in Croft Educational Services Leadership Action Folio and for teacher rating of principals in Teacher magazine[48]). Lloyd McCleary wrote that a statement of principal competencies was a necessity in the evaluation process, and that "what constitutes competency must be determined before evaluation takes place.[49]

---

[46] Richard L. Andrews, The Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory: Preliminary Manual (Seattle, Washington: Bureau of School Services and Research, University of Washington, 1970), pp. 1-16.

[47] Rosenberg, "How to Evaluate Your Principals," p. 35.

[48] Max Rosenberg, "How Does Your Principal Rate," Teacher, 91 (May, 1974), pp. 25-27.

[49] Lloyd E. McCleary, Competency Based Educational Administration and Applications to Research," Paper presented at Conference on Competency Based Administration, Tempe, Arizona, January, 1973, p. 2.

There appears to be general agreement by authorities that standards should be stated in performance terms, with behavior indicators to determine whether or not a particular behavior occurs. According to the literature, the performance standards may be developed by the school board, superintendent, and/or principals; or by a team including representatives of the board, superintendent, principals, teachers, students, community, and/or university consultants. Standards may include items based on findings from a district needs assessment. Standards may be periodically revised and updated or they may survive, unchallenged, over a long period of time.

In the literature surveyed, varying emphasis was given to the Pre-Conference:

The Pre-Conference may or may not occur in the Performance Standards approach. If it does occur, it is generally concerned with the evaluator(s) apprising the principal of the instruments and procedures which will be used, clarifying the performance standards which are expected, identifying particular strengths and weaknesses according to these standards, and discussing means of shoring up weaknesses. It may include an initial rating on the checklist by the evaluator and/or the principal. Most writers agree that a good Performance Standards System will include this step, and, depending on the emphasis on these aspects prior to evaluation, the system may approach a Performance Objectives or goal-setting procedure.

The period of evaluation prior to final evaluation rating will

include various types of data collecting, as noted in the various sources. At the least it will involve informal hearsay evidence which the evaluator obtains. It may include periodic conferences with the evaluatee; on-site observation; interviews or question-naires with students, teachers, peers or parents; surveys of secondary results such as teacher morale or student attendance; and collection of letters, records of phone conversations or news-paper clippings in the principal's personnel file. The principal may or may not be involved in this data-collecting stage. In some instances, the principal himself is responsible for compiling this data.

According to the literature surveyed, the final evaluation rating may be done unilaterally by the evaluator, by the staff or by a team of evaluators. The principal may or may not participate in the rating. While it appears that the rating of the principal is most often done by his superiors, some authors recommend that the teaching staff at least be included in the process. William Goslin, in describing such a model used in Minneapolis, recommends the use of teacher rating as a data-gathering, or needs assessment, technique, rather than as a final rating.[50] The rating will be done according to the data collected: from subjective opinions of the evaluator to a comprehensive, objective assessment based on factual data. Some writers note that secondary results, such as

---

[50] William L. Gaslin, "Evaluation of Administrative Performance by a School's Teaching Staff," NASSP Bulletin (December, 1974), pp. 72-81.

student progress on standardized tests, retention rates, attendance, teacher turnover, and the like, may be included. (Lewis Beall, in an account of the principal evaluation system in the Azusa, California school district, supports the use of student achievement in evaluation as a "constructive lever to influence improvement.[51] Many other writers do not agree since there are so many factors other than principal performance which influence these secondary results.) According to the literature, individual personality traits may also be rated. This rating is generally based on an instrument listing the pre-determined performance standards. The rating may be done on a numerical scale or by checking categories such as "Always, Often, Occasionally, Seldom, Never." The instrument may include several descriptive phrases or behaviors for each item, one of which must be selected. Each item rating may require a narrative supportive statement. The evaluation may or may not include a narrative summary statement by the evaluator and/or principal.

The literature noted various possible aspects of the post-conference stage. In Performance Standards Systems, a post-conference may or may not be held. The rating may be done unilaterally by the evaluator and filed without the principal seeing it or receiving a copy. All sources recommend, however, that such a conference be held for the evaluator and principal to discuss the evaluation. In some cases the principal does a self-evaluation

---

[51]Lewis L. Beall, "Evaluating the Principal, Case Study #7," Thrust for Education Leadership, 2 (November, 1972), p. 36.

which may be attached or superimposed on the evaluator's rating.
The principal may be encouraged to write a summary narrative
evaluation which the evaluator considers in his rating or which
is attached.  The principal may or may not be encouraged to respond,
in writing, to an unfavorable evaluation.  Generally, the evaluation
is placed in the principal's personnel file or kept in a private
file by the evaluator.  Usually, the principal signs the evaluation
and receives a copy.  The principal may be encouraged, as a follow-
up, to seek specific means of remedying weaknesses which were
identified in the rating.  He may receive assistance in this
remediation from his superiors and through in-service training.
However, it appears that all too often in Performance Standards
Systems, evaluation is a once-a-year event when the principal is
rated and the process is forgotten for another year.

There are many critics of Performance Standards Systems.
Barraclough summarized the many objections to these systems:
The rating system is highly subjective, many instruments are
poorly designed, the evaluatee is rarely consulted in establishing
the standards against which he will be measured, the systems are
inflexible and do not allow for changes in circumstances or
variations in specific tasks.  Many rating instruments rely on
personality factors which are rated by some point on a continuum--
they measure the person and not his performance.  This type of
rating, Barraclough states, assumes that the evaluator is qualified
to judge personality factors in another--an assumption which is
generally false.  Often the rating is made on the basis of feelings
or hearsay rather than on objective data which documents actual

performance. He says that the principal is often not involved in the process and may be evaluating himself by completely different standards than the evaluator uses. Variations of the Performance Standards System also come under attack. Using teams of evaluators or multiple instrument simply compounds the problems. Barraclough maintains that the use of secondary results, such as student achievement, credits the principal with too much control of his environment, and is unfair. Using files and personnel records, he says, relies on too much irrelevant matter and data which may not be comprehensive.[52]

The tendency for subjective ratings in Performance Standards Systems is detailed by Pharis in a description of the "Halo and Horn Effect". The Halo Effect involves the tendency to rate an employee very high because of 1) Past Record—Good past work tends to carry over into the present, 2) Compatibility—Those we like are rated higher, 3) Recency—Yesterday is valued higher than a good job last week, 4) Blind Spot—We tend not to see defects similar to our own, and 5) The One-Asset Man—Glib talk or impressive appearance influence high ranking in many areas. The reverse of this is The Horn Effect, or a tendency to rate people lower because of 1) Perfectionism—If expectations are too high we may be disappointed, 2) Contrary Subordinate—The guy who disagrees too often, 3) Oddball—The maverick or non-conformist, 4) Guilt by Association—A man is judged by the company he keeps, 5) Dramatic Incident—A recent goof can wipe out a year's work.[53]

---

[52] Barraclough, _Administrator Evaluation_, 1974, pp. 10-17.

[53] Pharis, "Evaluation of School Principals," p. 38.

The only real advantage of Performance Standards Systems appears to be that they are economical of time, energy, and money. This is undoubtedly the reason they are used so much more often than Performance Objectives Systems.

Performance Objectives Evaluation Systems

According to Brick and Sanchis, the unique characteristic of Performance Objectives Systems which distinguishes them from Performance Standards Systems is that they are concerned with outcomes rather than process and personality. Such systems measure what a person accomplishes rather than what he is as a person or how he accomplishes a task. Performance Objectives Systems, according to these writers, view such things as leadership style, personality, and administrative functions as means to an end and not as ends in themselves. These systems recognize that there is more than one way to get a job done and that each school and person is unique. They conclude that these systems add accountability to the evaluation process; once the tasks and expected competencies are established, they are translated into measurable objectives, thus providing an objective system of evaluation.[54] Barraclough defines the Performance Objectives approach as one which "measures administrative performance by determining district goals, setting specific objectives, and assessing the administrator's success or failure in the achievement of these objectives. This approach usually allows for the

---

[54] Michael Brick and Robert Sanchis, "Evaluating the Principal, Case Study 4," Thrust for Education Leadership, 2 (October, 1972), p. 32.

administrator's direct participation in the objective-setting

process and the administrator himself often helps to determine

the standards against which he will be measured.  This approach,

according to Barraclough, draws on Management by Objectives

theory adopted from business and industry."[55]

William Pharis maintains that the Performance Objectives

System includes those procedures that principals themselves see

as necessities:  They want a system which 1) measures reality,

2) considers only the variables that cna be controlled, 3) spells

out clearly and ahead of time what the principals are to be measured

against, 4) is not subject to different conclusions by different

evaluators, and 5) permits principals to have some voice in deter-

mining goals.[56]  Unlike Performance Standards Systems where Self-

Evaluation is rarely included in appraisal, authorities note that

Performance Objectives Systems almost always involve the principal

in goal-setting and in self-evaluation.

Based on the survey of literature, Performance Objectives

Systems, like other formal evaluation systems, have four common

elements: the pre-evaluation phase, the evaluation phase, the post-

evaluation conference, and follow-up activity.  Many writers have

made recommendations for what should occur in each phase:

Gorton writes that before a Performance Objectives Evaluation

System is put into effect, the principals and their evaluators

should work together to design the specifics of the system.  This

---

[55]Barraclough, Administrator Evaluation, 1974, p. 15.

[56]Pharis, "Evaluation of School Principals," p. 38.

team might also include university consultants and representatives from the board of education. The purposes of evaluation should be specified and the system designed accordingly. At this point, Gorton notes, a list of desirable principal characteristics, in behavioral terms, and a job description should be written. General target dates should be established and any instrumentation should be designed or selected. If the system is to be tied to salary raises, promotion, demotion, or dismissal, this procedure should be clearly spelled out. Built into the system should be procedures for periodic feedback, assessment, and appropriate revision of the system itself.[57]

Based on needs assessment, general district goals should be established with specific goals developed yearly. This process should involve representatives from all areas of the district: students, non-certified staff, teachers, administrators, board of education, parents, and taxpayers. The objectives for all employees will be drawn from these goal statements, depending on their specific job responsibilities within the school system. Jack Culbertson reported extensively on this process which preceded the implementation of a Performance Objectives Evaluation System in the Atlanta Project.[58]

---

[57] Gorton, "Evaluation of Principals," p. 9.

[58] Jack Culbertson, _Performance Objectives for School Principals_ (Berkeley, California: McCutcheon Publishing Corporation, 1974), pp. 10-36.

and optimum acceptable performance; and set a fixed period, or
series of fixed periods, as target dates. According to these
writers, this process gives both parties a clear picture of what
the principal is expected to accomplish and how this performance
will be measured. The evaluator will know, specifically, what to
look for in evaluation. The principal and evaluator should reach
consensus on these objectives and processes. Objectives, time
lines, and criteria should be open to revision as necessary by
mutual agreement during the evaluation stage. These writers state
that the principal should have ample time to develop and present
his case, with the evaluator having final approval.[60] Obviously,
this stage is time-consuming. Culbertson says that, if the process
is to be successful and the purpose of professional growth achieved,
it must be carried out thoughtfully, and its importance must be
valued by both the principal and the evaluator. It is likely, he
says, that in-service will be necessary for evaluatees to become
proficient at writing objectives. This system cannot be implemented
effectively without spending time, money, and effort in preparing
for it.[61]

Arikado and Musella note specific aspects of the next stage:
During the evaluation period, from the time of the pre-conference
to the target date, evidence must be collected for each objective.
This process may follow the same procedure as data collecting in

---

[60] Arikado and Musella, "Evaluation of the School Principal,"
pp. 14-15.

[61] Culbertson, "School Principals," pp. 8-12.

Performance Standards Systems, except that the type of behavior
or data is specified a priori. The principal may be responsible
for compiling the data, but the evaluator should spend time observ-
ing him in his building for the specific purpose of evaluation.
Frequent conferences should be held to determine progress.
Continuous open communication, high trust, and a healthy inter-
personal relationship between the principal and evaluator are
necessary for the success of this system.[62]

George Redfern states, "At the time of the target date, the
evaluator must make a forthright assessment of the extent to which
the principal has achieved success in attaining the pre-determined
performance goals. His judgment must reflect a thorough knowledge
of behavioral changes that have taken place, recognition of super-
visory assistance provided, and the results that have been achieved.
Candor requires that praise be given when due, criticism when
warranted. Above all, evaluative estimates should be supported by
evidence gained by observation and visitations, data collected,
conferences held, and assistance provided. All of this should be
done in a framework of fairness and objectivity." The principal
may conduct a self-evaluation based on the data and agreed upon
criteria.

Redfern goes on to say that, in the post-evaluation conference,
the evaluator and principal compare evaluations, discuss evidence,
and recycle results. Discussing job performance may be the most

---

[62]
Arikado and Musella, "Evaluation of the School Principal,"
pp. 14-15.

important part of the process. It is necessary, he says, that the
evaluator be well prepared and that he has met his obligations to
the principal throughout the year. The evaluator must have training
and experience in order to conduct an effective conference.[63]

The literature reported various procedures for the final written
evaluation. It might be written solely by the evaluator; by the
evaluator after the conference and including the principal's per-
ceptions; both the evaluator and the principal might write their
own; or the principal might be given the opportunity to respond to
the evaluation, with the response being attached. Generally, the
final written evaluation is filed in a confidential personnel file,
and the principal receives a signed copy.

Authors agree that Follow-up Action should be a direct result
of the evaluation, actually becoming a part of the next goal-setting
and evaluation cycle. It is through this ongoing, cumulative process
that real professional growth occurs.

A great many school systems have published reports of their
individual Performance Objectives Evaluation Systems. They tend
to follow the basic patterns outlined in previous pages, but vary
somewhat in complexity, specific procedure, and satisfaction with
the system. Seven representative reports have been selected from
the literature. The individual variations and unique aspects of
these systems are summarized here.

Soon after the Stull Bill became a part of the Education Code
of the State of California in 1971, many new evaluation systems

---

[63]Redfern, "Principals: Who's Evaluating Them?", p. 91.

were reported in educational journals and in publications by
California school districts. Since it was required that all
personnel be evaluated, principal evaluation received its share of
publicity. A typical example is the booklet published by the
Los Angeles County Education Planning Center in 1973 and written
by the superintendent of the South Whittier School District, Stuart E.
Gothold. It is made up of a memo to the principals outlining the
process and samples of the various criteria and forms which are used.
The system is a fairly typical Performance Objectives System, with
the superintendent working with the principal to establish and
attain goals. Specific areas of responsibility are designated, and
the principal sets individual goals within those areas. Unlike many
other evaluation systems, this district, like other California
districts, holds the principal directly accountable for the
performance of students and teachers.[64]

The evaluation system reported by the Dallas Independent School
District for 1974-75, was developed cooperatively by a committee of
administrators. Goals for each administrator are mutually developed
by the administrator and a team of evaluators, who then work
together toward achieving those goals. Principals' goals are
developed within seven predetermined areas of responsibility. This
process of working together in a cooperative atmosphere toward
achievement of goals enhances the administrative team concept,

---

[64]Stuart E. Gothold, Principal Evaluation (Los Angeles,
California: Educational Planning Center, Los Angeles County
Superintendent of Schools, 1973), pp. 1-17.

according to the superintendent, Nolan Estes. He says that the complex administrative role can no longer be evaluated effectively by one person. Also unique in this system is that goals are not set until February, with assessment occurring at the end of the school year.[65]

In a variation of the team approach, administrators in the New Providence School District in New Jersey work as a total administrative team in solving problems and setting goals. This cooperative effort has required the superintendent, John Berwich, to "give up some authority and give a lot of trust to his staff." The administrative team examined many evaluation systems and opted for an MBO approach. It includes built-in methods for proceeding toward attainable goals, progress checks, and a complex system of accountability. Four two-hour instructional programs were held to train administrators in these methods. Administrators appear to be highly satisfied with this cooperative approach, noting that it promotes a positive, supportive and non-competitive atmosphere.[66]

The "Leadership by Objectives" evaluation system in Highland, Indiana, was a direct result of an assistant superintendent's attendance at an AASA seminar on "Designing Evaluation Systems for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel", directed by S. J. Knezevich.

---

[65] Dallas Independent School District, Administrators' Professional Evaluation (Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, 1974-75), pp. 3-10.

[66] Robert Anderson, "Administrative Team in Motion: Evaluation and Team Work Result in Effective Administration," School Management, 17 (March, 1973), pp. 19-24.

in 1970. As a result of this seminar, members of the school board and district administrators participated in a three-day retreat to develop the purposes and particulars of a new evaluation system. This system includes a specific predetermined job description and indicators of effectiveness for each administrative position. A system of setting goals and assessing performance in these areas is spelled out in detail, including target dates and specific evaluators for each position. Board policy states that the purpose of this evaluation system is for cooperative and continuing professional development and improvement of instruction.[67]

The evaluation system in the Pennsbury, Pennsylvania School District is an MBO system developed in 1968. While the goals for evaluation are set within established areas of responsibility, they "go beyond everyday responsibilities." According to their definition of MBO, routine, normal duties are taken for granted and do not fall within the scope of their evaluation system. Their goals relate only to "special or new programs whereby the principal extends himself to achieve new and different heights." The goals are categorized as 1) Individual, 2) Organizational, 3) District, and 4) Joint Performance.[68]

---

[67] Highland Public Schools Educational Service Center, Educational Leadership by Objectives (Highland, Indiana: Highland Public Schools Educational Service Center, 1971), pp. 4-30.

[68] William W. Ingraham and John E. Keefe, "Values of Management by Objectives," School Management, 16 (June, 1972), pp. 28-9.

The evaluation system developed in the Eugene, Oregon School District 4J also differentiates between routine tasks and special or individualized performance areas. Unlike the Pennsbury, Pennsylvania system, this Oregon district employs a Performance Standards system to evaluate general administrative performance, using a checklist to rate predetermined standards. On a separate form, individual performance goals are set and evaluated. With the purpose of holding administrators accountable for their performance, the evaluation is used to determine contract renewal and to monitor the progress of probationary administrators. It also— "ideally"— enables the district to improve the process of administration. They subscribe to this combined approach because it "gives a more detailed picture of administrative performance and allows for differences in duties, goals, and personalities."[69] Several variations of this dual approach were reported in the literature, either by categorizing goals according to specific responsibilities or by rating routine tasks separately from new or unusual goal areas.

One Performance Objectives system worth noting, simply because not all administrators favored it, is the system reported in the Kalamazoo, Michigan school system. While all of the particulars were not reported, it appeared that administrators were notified by letter during the summer that a Performance Objectives System would be implemented, that general goals were more imposed than

---

[69] Barraclough, Administrator Evaluation, 1974, p. 21.

mutually established, that goals were measured by the evaluator
and by secondary results more heavily than by the evaluatee, and
that pay raises were tied specifically to evaluation results.
While the mechanics of this system did not vary greatly from
other systems in its structure, the overall effect appeared to
be negative, controlling, and punitive in its implementation.
It did not appear that the majority of administrators favored
the system, and they were definitely not involved in developing
it.[70]

Proponents of Performance Objectives Evaluation Systems
cite many advantages.  The common advantage cited is that such
systems are forward-looking and measure a person for what he
accomplishes rather than for the type of person he is or for
what he has done in the past.  Such systems, according to
Greene[71] and others, are more conducive to improvement of
administrative performance and accomplishment of educational
goals.  When principals become aware of the behavior that is
necessary in their leadership function and become committed to
specific targets, the time and effort spent in the process will
pay handsome educational dividends and make the principalship
more rewarding.

Another major advantage of such systems is their flexibility.
According to Brick and Sanchis, since these systems are not based

---

[70]
"How to Make Your Staff Accountable for What It Does –
Not What It Is," American School Board Journal, 161 (March, 1974),
pp. 32-36.

[71]
Greene, Administrative Appraisal, p. 28.

on a list of behavioral descriptors or standards, different leadership styles are possible. What works for one principal may not work for another, and such diversity of process can be embraced in a Performance Objectives approach. The uniquenesses of individual job targets are set. They conclude that the system is also flexible in that objectives and time lines may be revised or adjusted by mutual agreement of the evaluator and principal during the evaluation period.[72]

Still another advantage is that Performance Objectives Evaluation Systems, when properly implemented, provide objective, specific information to assess principal performance. Thus, decisions regarding salary, contract renewal, promotion, demotion, and in-service can be made in a fair and just manner.[73]

Although there appear to be many advantages to Performance Objectives Evaluation Systems, various disadvantages are cited by Hickcox as well as other critics. The most obvious disadvantage is that, if such systems are properly implemented, they are complex, costly, and time-consuming. Hickcox says that since it is necessary for both the evaluator and the principal to internalize rather technical language and complicated procedures, this type of system, to work effectively, generally requires intensive in-service training and gradual implementation over a period of time. The process itself, once implemented, demands much time and concentration

[72] Brick and Sanchis, "Evaluating the Principal," p. 32

[73] Barraclough, Administrator Evaluation, 1973, p. 1.

from administrators who are already under pressure and stress
in their jobs.[74]

Arikado and Musella note that the success of a Performance
Objectives Evaluation System is highly dependent on open communi-
cation, honesty, trust, a healthy interpersonal relationship, and
consensus in decision-making on the part of the evaluator and the
principal. While these are highly desirable characteristics, it
is rare to find them all present in all relationships. According
to these writers, when anyone of these characteristics is missing,
the evaluation process is likely to suffer.[75]

In assessments of MBO, or Performance Objectives Systems,
Brown[76], Knezevich[77], and Hacker[78] all point out potential dangers:
When the principal is judged solely on the goals he attains, there
may be a tendency on his part to set easily attainable goals or
goals with unrealistic criteria. For instance, if the principal's
relationship with the faculty is to be judged by the number of
faculty meetings held, it is simple to increase the number of meetings
and rate highly whether or not the real objective is attained. Since

---

[74]Hickcox, "Administrative Performance," p. 6.

[75]Arikado and Musella, "Evaluation of the School Principal,"
p. 15.

[76]Richard Brown, "The Truth About MBO," Wisconsin Education
Association Journal, 105 (September, 1972), p. 12.

[77]Stephen J. Knezevich, Management by Objectives and Results -
A Guidebook for Today's School Executive (Arlington, Virginia: AASA,
1973), p. 23.

[78]Thorne Hacker, "A Word of Warning," School Management, 16
(June, 1972), p. 29.

a realistic set of objectives is not likely to be comprehensive to the point of covering all job responsibilities, areas not included in the objectives may very well be ignored, to the detriment of the educational operation. Hacker recommends that a principal's performance be judged on a variety of criteria to offset these pitfalls. This broader perspective would include the quality of goals set as well as other types of measurement systems.

In view of the many different types of evaluation systems and their various strengths and weaknesses, no one specific system would seem to be ideal for every school situation. As various authorities note, the specific type of system should be designed to fit the needs and purposes of the situation. In general, however, some type of Performance Objectives System, perhaps including some other types of measurements, appears to be the approach most often recommended.

## Recommended Evaluation Practices

Inherent to any type of formal evaluation system, regardless of its specific design, certain general principles and practices receive much attention in the literature dealing with principal evaluation. These practices may be viewed as those occurring 1) prior to the evaluation process, 2) during the evaluation process, 3) at the time of final evaluation, and 4) following, or as a result of, the final evaluation.

Writers concur that prior to evaluation, it is essential that all parties involved know the "rules of the game". All too often, there is not common agreement on what is expected of a principal,

the system by which he will be evaluated, or by what criteria he will be judged. Beyond this, there may not be specific procedures in the system for accommodating the unique needs or problems of a given school or principal.

Without exception, researchers agree that a principal should have a written job description prior to the time of evaluation. Arikado and Musella noted that there must be a list of competencies and responsibilities stated, in terms that apply to all principals in that school board's jurisdiction. They must be clearly defined, specific and understood by all involved.[79] Recommendations from the Illinois Office of Education state that every administrator should have a written job description which specifies responsibilities and corresponding authority and support. This description should be periodically reviewed and updated to reflect changes in the responsibilities of the job. The IOE states that evaluation should be based on this job description.[80] Campbell supports the necessity for a job description in that the administrative role may be perceived in different ways by the public, school personnel and by the principal himself. Conflicting values may influence the perception of what should be done. A common perception or definition of role is essential, he says, so that the same yardstick may be used to measure the same things.[81]

---

[79]Arikado and Musella, "Evaluation of the School Principal," pp. 13-14.

[80]IOE, Fair Treatment of Administrators, p. 3.

[81]Campbell, "Administrative Performance," p. 8.

Since the evaluation process should be based on specific job responsibilities, the subordinate must know, in advance what is expected in order for the evaluation to be both fair and objective.[82] Most authorities go on to say that the principal, or principals as a group, should play a key role in the formulation of this job description.

In addition to knowing what is expected, principals, prior to evaluation, should be thoroughly familiar with the procedures and instruments with which they will be evaluated. The Illinois Office of Education recommends that evaluation should be based on procedures and instruments understood by all parties early in the contract period.[83] In a survey of research on the evaluation of administrators in 1974, Terry Barraclough stated that "most writers agree that the district should establish a set of procedures in advance. Evaluation, he says, should begin with orientation of all concerned as to the policy, procedures, and instruments of evaluation."[84]

Many writers recommended that, beyond being familiar with the process in advance, principals should be involved in developing the process. Wills states, "The administrators to be evaluated must be included in the development of the evaluation plan in order for the plan to be accepted with minimal apprehension and confusion."[85]

---

[82] Battelle, A Research Proposal, p. 4.

[83] IOE, Fair Treatment of Administrators, p. 3.

[84] Barraclough, "Administrator Evaluation," 1974, p. 11.

[85] Wills, "Issues and Practices," p. 2.

As a general guideline for designing an appraisal system, Greene
emphasizes that "involving representatives from the group that will
be directly affected by a new system is an absolute necessity. To
design an appraisal system at the top of an organization and impose
it on those who have to implement it is to invite failure. Those
to be affected by it must participate in its design, installation,
administration, and review. Greene maintains that this cannot be
overemphasized."[86] In keeping with the emphasis on this practice,
it is important to note that, in 1972, in California's Stull Act
and in Virginia's legislation on evaluation, it was mandated that
the staff to be evaluated should participate in developing the
evaluation procedure.[87] This developmental step, including parti-
cipation by principals, was given much attention in most reports
of evaluation procedures which were published by individual school
systems. Buser and Stuck, in a position paper of the Illinois
Principals Association, emphasize this participation as a right
of principals. "Principals are entitled to both legal and pro-
fessional due process and must be active, individually and collec-
tively, to insure meaningful involvement in establishing the
requisites of the evaluation system. Professional security may
well depend on such involvement."[88]

---

[86] Greene, Administrative Appraisal, p. 11.

[87] Redfern, "Legally Mandated Evaluation," p. 46.

[88] Buser and Stuck, Evaluation and the Principal, p. 12.

A specific aspect which should be provided for in the develop-
ment of an evaluation system is a process for recognizing the
unique needs and problems of an individual school or principal.
This provision is inherent to Performance Objectives Systems, but
most writers state that it must be included in any meaningful
evaluation. Several writers point out that evaluation should be
custom designed, at least in part, for the evaluation of a
particular school. Max Rosenberg notes that individual schools
and principals have individual needs and strengths, and that
evaluation should be tailored to these special situations.[89]
Campbell argues that forces inside and outside a school limit what
an administrator can accomplish and that these limitations should
be recognized in stating what is expected of a given administrator.[90]
Buser and Stuck include this point as a guideline for evaluation:
"Evaluation policies, criteria, procedures, and means should be
designed for a particular school setting."[91]

Most writers recommend specific activities which should occur
in the next stage. After the pre-evaluation stage, the principal's
performance over a given period of time is evaluated. The basic
function during this period, before final assessment, or rating,
is the collection of data upon which the assessment will be based.
The evaluator plays a key role in the success or failure of this
function. It is critical that the evaluator have training and

[89] Rosenberg, "School Principal Evaluation," p. 213.

[90] Campbell, "Administrative Performance," p. 8.

[91] Buser and Stuck, Evaluation and the Principal, p. 10.

competency in this function, that he has sufficient time in his
work schedule for evaluation, and that he regularly meets with
and observes the principal on the job.

Greene writes that it is sometimes assumed that the person
in charge, the evaluator, is expert in evaluation technique. All
too often, he says, this is not the case. Many top administrators,
who may be good managers, are not very effective when working with
evaluation procedures. They often employ techniques, particularly
in the case of checklist instruments, which are outdated. Accord-
ing to Greene they may employ techniques which curtail the potential
of principals and even accomplish the opposite of what is intended.[92]
According to Wills, evaluators, for various reasons, often play
down the importance of formal evaluation of administrators. They
may treat it as an exercise that is required, but of little value
in the educational process. The evaluator, according to Wills'
survey, is a key to the success of an evaluation system. He must
himself be knowledgable, he must provide in-service training for
principals so that they also are knowledgable, and he must establish
a positive and trusting working atmosphere.[95] In a survey of
evaluation systems, Barraclough notes that "one of the major problems
inherent in evaluation is that the public schools do not have enough
trained evaluation personnel due to a lack of in-service training
in evaluation." Some writers indict graduate schools of adminis-
tration for lack of training in this area. Barraclough summarizes:

---

[92] Greene, Administrative Appraisal, pp. 1-2.

[93] Wills, "Issues and Practices," pp. 13-14.

"It seems reasonable to expect that the evaluator is expert in evaluation technique and trained in the techniques used in his district."

Besides being expert in the field, the evaluator, according to Barraclough, should be one "whose other duties would not interfere with the job of evaluation." While there is no doubt that school administrators have a great many responsibilities and too little time to meet them all, it cannot be concluded that evaluation is so low on the list of priorities that it does not deserve time and attention. In order to be meaningful, and to produce growth in principal performance, Barraclough notes that evaluation demands that the evaluator spend considerable time with the principal.[94]

Much of the time spent by the evaluator is in the data-collecting process and on-the-job contact with the principal. Periodic meetings with principals in the central office, random comments or complaints, or other hearsay evidence do not provide the evaluator with adequate data. Barraclough states that the evaluator should have sufficient contact with the principal in his usual working area so the evaluator is competent to discuss the principal's actual performance. Regardless of the type of evaluation system, information must be gathered to support the final rating.[95] Rosenberg emphasizes this point:

---

[94] Barraclough, Administrator Evaluation, 1974, pp. 7 and 21.

[95] Ibid., pp. 12-20.

"Evaluations should be made during usual, customary, everyday
school activities. Evaluators should search out and assess
typical--not unusual--behavior." Valid assessments of a principal's
work are made from on-the-job, real-life situations--not from
theoretical tests of ability or knowledge. "In general, current
appraisals are woefully inadequate and unfair, for they are based
upon hearsay or rumor or conjecture--in a word, unacceptable
evidence collected with undesirable methods from unreliable
sources."[96]

According to the literature surveyed, the time span of the
evaluation process will vary from one type of system to another.
The general recommendation for the frequency of evaluation is that
it should be done yearly. Often, board policy or state recommenda-
tions state that administrators should be evaluated once a year.
Most evaluation systems reported in the literature are built upon
the time span of the school year. In Performance Standards systems,
where rating occurs at one point in time, the end of a school year
is generally the time when it occurs. Various types of Performance
Objectives Systems are cyclical, in that the point of final evaluation
is also the beginning of the next evaluation cycle. Such systems
also include, generally, short range and long range goals, which do
not lend themselves to once-a-year rating. Overall, however, recom-
mendations and reported systems of evaluation were based on a school-
year time span, with pre-conferences occurring near the beginning
and final evaluation near the end of the school year.

_____

[96] Rosenberg, "School Principal Evaluation," pp. 212-13.

The principal has a great deal at stake at the time of the
final evaluation, when ratings are made or conclusions are reached
regarding the accomplishment of objectives, when a final conference
generally occurs between the principal and the evaluator, and when
some summative form or statement is finalized for permanent record.
Since what happens at this point is so crucial for the principal,
the literature is extensive in its treatment of the rights of
principals.  For the most part, these recommended practices deal
with the rights of a principal when evaluation results are unfavor-
able or when he does not agree with them.

One commonly recommended practice is that the principal's
self-evaluation be included in some way in the final written record.
This might be in the form of a self-rating, a narrative assessment,
or a response to the written evaluation of the evaluator.  In an
article on legally mandated evaluation, Redfern cites the Stull
Act which includes specific language on this point.  It states that
an employee whose performance is judged less than satisfactory has
the right to file a written dissent to the evaluation.[97]  Recom-
mendations from the Illinois Office of Education state, "The formal
evaluation procedures should...provide the administrator with
opportunity to respond to the evaluator."[98]  In the 1971 ERS Survey,
in a summary of evaluation procedures in eighty-four participating
school systems, it was found that, in 60 percent of the systems,

---

[97] Redfern, "Legally Mandated Evaluation," p. 46.

[98] IOE, Fair Treatment of Administrators, pp. 3-4.

"The evaluatee may file a dissenting statement (on the form or separately) if he does not concur."[99] Poliakoff reported, as one solution to evaluation results, that the principal's self-evaluation go on file along with the evaluator's.[100] Ideally, the final written evaluation will represent a consensus of assessment between two professional people, but when this does not occur, good practice dictates that the principal's response should be included in the record, and that procedure for this be a part of the evaluation system.

Gorton writes that, in addition to the right to file a response, principals should be entitled to professional, as well as legal, due process. When results of the evaluation are tied to salary, promotion, demotion or dismissal, the evaluation procedure should include provisions for review and hearings on the evaluation process. If a decision is perceived as unfair or invalid, it is basic to our democratic heritage that the person affected is entitled to a review of that decision. As Gorton notes, while principals have this constitutional right, just as any other citizen, due process rights of principals may not be spelled out clearly in school codes. If personnel decisions are based on professional evaluation practices and if the intent of the district is to act fairly, then due process rights for all employees, including administrators, should be of no concern to school boards. In addition to the constitutional due process rights of a principal

[99] ERS, _Evaluating Performance_, p. 7.

[100] Poliakoff, "Recent Trends in Evaluation," pp. 13-14.

in the courts, Gorton maintains that the district's evaluation system should include such a procedure as a matter of professional due process. Further, these procedures should be explained to administrators and their availability should be emphasized.[101] This view is supported by position papers of the Illinois Principals Association and in the recommendations for Fair Treatment of Administrators published by the Illinois Office of Education.

In most school systems, review of a principal's evaluation by a higher authority would probably mean review by the superintendent or school board. Most principals would view this as no real review, since the evaluator was a designee of the board. In some situations, as reported by Poliakoff, a grievance board has been appointed to review evaluation results, and perhaps bring more objectivity to the process.[102] In spite of the dilemma of who the higher authority should be, there does appear to be general consensus in the literature that principals are entitled to professional due process, or fair and objective review of the evaluation by a higher authority, as a part of the accepted procedure and without concern for reprisal.[103]

The use of final evaluation results to determine, in some way, pay raises, promotion, demotion, and/or dismissal is a practice generally recommended in the literature. The degree to which evaluation should be tied to these factors and the processes for

---

[101] Gorton, "Evaluation of Principals," p. 10.

[102] Poliakoff, "Evaluating School Personnel," pp. 13-14.

[103] De Vaughn, Administrator Performance, p. 2.

doing so varies considerably. Oberg states that at the very
least, it is recommended that evaluation results provide
supportive data for making these decisions; that this is an
important purpose of evaluation.[104]

Tying pay raises to evaluation results has long been debated
in teacher merit pay systems. While most agree that there should
be some system to reward excellent performance, the processes for
doing so are difficult to quantify. Melton maintains that salary
should not be determined by job title, but by the qualifications
and expertise a person possesses, plus the duties he must execute,
the authority and responsibility he is assigned, and the situa-
tional factors or working conditions of the position.[105] Hickcox
asserts that the assessment process should be tied to a reward
system. He suggests that specific monetary rewards can be tied
to the achievement of specific tasks, but not to global assessment.
He does not recommend a reduction of salary for failure to perform,
however,[106] Mrdjenovich and Meitler have devised a systematic
method for allocating an annual merit increase budget to individual
administrators. This process requires quantifying subjective data
in six areas of a administrative responsibility. The formula they
have devised to weigh various factors produces a percentage factor

---

[104] Oberg, "Performance Appraisal," p. 61.

[105] George Melton, et al., The Principalship:  Job Specifi-
cations and Salary Considerations for the 70's (Washington, D.C.:
NASSP, 1970) p. 40.

[106] Hickcox, "Administrative Performance," p. 7.

to determine the individual's share of the merit pay. While they admit their system is not infallible, they maintain that it is superior to subjective systems commonly in use. They suggest that individual school systems can devise their own formula along similar lines.[107]

Several writers, such as Castetter and Heisler,[108] maintain that one purpose of evaluation is to provide a guide for decisions regarding transfer, promotion, demotion and dismissal. Particularly in the case of probationary administrators, the ability or inability to accomplish specific tasks should be a prime factor in determining contract renewal. Historically, such decisions have certainly been made, at least according to informal evaluation, which is highly subjective. More objective evaluation systems, particularly those which use Performance Objectives, can only improve the criteria upon which such decisions are made.

The final stage of evaluation is follow-up action which occurs after the rating and post-conference. Ideally, this is an ongoing process and occurs simultaneously with the initial stage of the next evaluation cycle. In Barraclough's analysis of evaluation research, he states that there is general agreement that follow-up action should be the fourth and final stage of evaluation.[109] Redfern

[107]Donald Mrdjenovich and Neal Meitler, "Evaluation and Performance Compensation for Administrators," Wisconsin School News (February, 1976), pp. 11-12.

[108]Castetter and Heisler, School Administrative Personnel, p. 5.

[109]Barraclough, Administrator Evaluation, 1974, p. 11.

says that the post-conference will yield ideas for follow-up

action. The need for certain kinds of subsequent activities to

reinforce actions taken during the year is likely to become

evident. He emphasizes that these activities should be carefully

planned and notes should be kept to ensure that this action is

taken.[110] Follow-up action may be remedial or developmental in

nature.

It would appear only fair and realistic that, if the

evaluation finds a principal's performance to be less than

satisfactory, he be given remedial assistance. In some states

it is required by law. The Stull Act requires follow-up counseling

and assistance for any employee whose performance is assessed as

less than satisfactory.[111] While Illinois law does not require a

period of remediation or probation before dismissal, recommendations

from the Illinois Office of Education include such action: "Board

of Education policy should include provisions for notifying any

administrator of necessary remediation or possible probation at

least six months before the end of the contract year."[112] In a

position statement, the Illinois Principals Association includes

the clause that it is "requisite that evaluators be required to

propose corrective measures in writing, with sufficient lead time

to remedy deficiencies.[113] Gorton states that the right to due

110
    Redfern, "Principals:  Who's Evaluating Them?" p. 92.
111
    Redfern, "Legally Mandated Evaluation," p. 46.
112
    IOE, Fair Treatment of Administrators, p. 4.
113
    Buser and Stuck, Evaluation and the Principal, p. 16

process includes the right to intensive follow-up assistance from supervisors when weaknesses are noted. He recommends written documentation of such efforts in the event that subsequent dismissal procedures are challenged.[114]

Besides the remedial type of follow-up action, and perhaps more important, is developmental action. Rosenberg states that one effect of the right kind of evaluation is that it can result in better and more individually tailored in-service training and retraining strategies. The evaluation system should be constructive and developmental, grounded in a counseling and guidance approach.[115] Carvell writes that we have been conditioned to perceive evaluation as a negative process, as a series of "gotcha's" rather than a constructive attempt to improve the quality of anything. The system may foster harassment of the principal and lead to a state of mutual distrust between the principal and the evaluator. Evaluation, he says, must be perceived as an instrument for personal success if it is to be of any worth.[116] Most writers surveyed made the point that positive follow-up action, through individualized in-service and coaching and counseling from the evaluator, were keys to a successful evaluation system.

The final evaluation of the effectiveness of an evaluation system might well be the answer to the question, "Does it result in principal professional growth?" Throughout the literature,

114
    Gorton, "Evaluation of Principals," p. 10.
115
    Rosenberg, "School Principal Evaluation," p. 212.
116
    Carvell, "Evaluating Administrative Performance," pp. 32-35.

from writers who have surveyed the research such as Barraclough and Poliakoff, from recognized authorities in the field such as Redfern and Culbertson, from state offices of education and professional organizations, and from the massive studies of the Educational Research Service, the primary emphasis and purpose of effective evaluation systems is that they truly foster improved principal performance. In the end result, improved principal performance means improved educational systems.

## Summary

This chapter, in a review of literature related to principal evaluation, has presented a definition of principal evaluation and its historical development. Various types of evaluation systems, including informal systems, Performance Standards Systems and Performance Objectives Systems have been described, examples have been cited, and analyses have been reviewed. A summary of selected recommended practices which were most often cited has been given.

The following chapter will present the methodology and procedure for the present study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE

Purpose of the Study

After a review of related educational literature, it was
determined that a dilemma apparently existed between the need
for effective evaluation of secondary principals and the manner
in which that evaluation should be conducted. The purpose of
this study was to determine the specific evaluation systems and
practices of selected school districts and to analyze these data
in terms of 1) the extent to which they correlate with systems
and practices recommended in the literature, 2) the factors
which influence the systems and practices employed, and 3) the
perceived effects of the various systems and practices. To
accomplish this purpose, the following specific questions were
posed:

1. Do most of the subject districts use some type of written,
   formal Performance Objectives system to evaluate principals?

2. Of the selected recommended practices for principal evaluation,
   which are implemented by the majority of subject districts?
   Which are not implemented by the majority of subject districts?

3. Do most of the subject districts implement a majority of the
   recommended practices?

4. Does the size of a district influence its use of a Performance

Objectives Evaluation System or its implementation of
recommended evaluation practices?

5. Does the wealth of a district influence its use of a
   Performance Objectives Evaluation System or its implemen-
   tation of recommended evaluation practices?

6. Does the amount of salary a district pays its principals
   influence its use of a Performance Objectives Evaluation
   System or its implementation of recommended evaluation
   practices?

7. According to superintendents' and principals' judgments,
   does a Performance Objectives Evaluation System contribute
   to a principal's professional growth more than does a
   Performance Standards System?

8. Does a Performance Objectives Evaluation System contribute
   to superintendents' and principals' expressed satisfaction
   with the evaluation system more than does a Performance
   Standards System?

9. Does the implementation of recommended evaluation practices
   have a positive effect on the professional growth of
   principals, according to the judgments of superintendents
   and of principals?

10. Does the implementation of recommended evaluation practices
    have a positive effect on superintendents' and principals'
    expressed satisfaction with the system?

11. Overall, do more superintendents judge their principal
    evaluation system to be a major factor in principal pro-
    fessional growth than do principals?

12. Overall, do more superintendents express satisfaction with the principal evaluation system in their districts than do principals?

Each of the above questions was answered quantitatively in frequency analysis and in depth and detail in narrative analysis. Conclusions were drawn and recommendations were made as a result of these findings.

## Selection of School Districts

Twenty suburban secondary public school districts in Cook County, Illinois were selected for the study. Of the twenty-nine secondary school districts listed in the 1978 Directory of Suburban Public Schools in Cook County, nine districts were excluded. Seven of these nine districts were small, with only one school, and generally had the position of superintendent and principal combined. One unit district and Chicago Public Secondary schools were excluded due to variance in size, grade levels, and administrative staffing patterns. Nineteen of the twenty subject districts had more than one school and, thus, more than one principal. All made a definite distinction between the superintendency and the principalship. Enrollment in subject districts ranged from 3.526 to 19.435 students. There was a total of fifty-seven principals employed in the twenty districts. Those administrators designated as directors, coordinators or supervisors of Adult Education Centers, Vocational Centers, Educational Cooperatives or Special Educational units were not

included in the study.[1]  The salaries of the fifty-seven

principals in the study ranged from \$30,000 to \$40,000 and the

mean average salary was \$34,494.  Their years of educational

experience ranged from twenty to thirty-two years.  Their

experience as principals ranged from one to twenty-one years.[2]

The 112 suburban communities in the twenty subject districts

varied greatly.  In a 1977 socio-economic ranking of Chicago

suburban municipalities, 103 municipalities in Cook County

with populations of 2,500 or more were included.  The lowest

ranked municipality had a median family income of \$13,630,

6.4 percent of the families had an income of over \$25,000 and

the median home value was \$18,500.  The municipality at the

midpoint of the ranking had a median family income of \$22,820,

38.1 percent of the families had an income of over \$25,000, and

the median home value was \$33,400.  The highest ranked munici-

pality had a median family income of \$42,950, 87.5 percent of

the families had an income of over \$25,000, and the median home

value was \$111,000.[3]  Most of the school districts in the study

included more than one municipality.  In some cases, the

---

[1] Educational Service Region of Cook County, 1978 Directory of Suburban Public Schools (Chicago, Illinois:  Educational Service Region of Cook County, 1978), pp. 56-63.

[2] Educational Service Region of Cook County, Research Report #1001:  Cook County Suburban Public School Principals Salary Study (Chicago, Illinois: Educational Service Region of Cook County, 1977-78), p. 20.

[3] Chicago Tribune, September 28, 1977, p. 16.

municipalities within a district were similar in socio-economic status, and in others, they were very diverse. Thus, the make-up of the subject districts varied as greatly as did the municipalities they encompassed.

## Collection of Data

In order to answer the questions posed in the study, the following data were collected and categorized:

1. Various types of principal evaluation systems discussed and recommended in the literature,

2. Types of evaluation systems used in subject districts,

3. Selected evaluation practices commonly recommended in the literature,

4. Recommended practices which were implemented in subject districts,

5. Superintendents' and principals' perception of the effect of the evaluation system on principal professional growth,

6. Superintendents' and principals' expressed satisfaction with the principal evaluation system in their districts,

7. Size and wealth of subject districts, and

8. Average principal salary in subject districts.

In an extensive survey of educational literature as presented in Chapter Two, many different systems of principal evaluation were reported, discussed, and recommended. Various forms of the Performance Objectives System, similar to Management by Objectives (MBO) Systems, were most frequently recommended. Surveys by the Educational Research Service (ERS) showed a

growing trend toward these systems. In their 1971 survey, the ERS identified twelve basic types of evaluation systems categories, eight of which were Performance Standards Systems and four of which were Performance Objectives Systems. The variations within each category were based on the source of input used in compiling the final evaluation, the degree to which the evaluation procedures facilitated improved performance, and the degree to which the evaluatee was a participant in the evaluation process (see pages 25 - 27 Chapter Two).

The twelve systems categories identified by the ERS were used as one part of a questionnaire (Part II, Appendix A) which was sent to the twenty superintendents of subject districts. Prior to finalization of the questionnaire, it was field tested with subject area supervisors, directors, deans, assistant principals and assistant superintendents in one large Cook County suburban secondary public school district and with principals and superintendents of elementary and secondary school districts which were not included in the study. A total of twenty-five administrators participated in the field test. In the section of the questionnaire on types of systems, the twelve ERS categories were listed and subjects were asked to check the one which most closely described the system used to evaluate principals in their district. In the field test, some respondents checked more than one system and some indicated that the general format was misleading. The questionnaire was revised to emphasize the selection of only one of the twelve systems; the introduction was rewritten, defining terms which could be misunderstood; and the format was revised. When this

revised form was tested, directions were followed successfully with no misunderstanding. In the first field test, three respondents noted that they had no formal evaluation system and did not check any categories. This possibility was noted in the cover letter which was sent to superintendents with the questionnaire in order to accommodate that situation. The wording of the original twelve categories was not changed.

During the preliminary survey of the literature, a card file was kept of the various evaluation practices which were repeatedly recommended. These practices were specific recommended acts which were not necessarily tied to a particular type of evaluation system. This file of seventy-eight practices was then culled to select a manageable number for this study. Eliminated from the file were those practices dealing with: 1) the format of the evaluation instrument, 2) who the evaluator(s) should be, 3) specific behaviors which should be assessed, 4) school board policy, 5) areas dictated by law, 6) only one particular type of evaluation system, 7) various minor or insignificant points, 8) items which relied heavily on the respondent's opinion as opposed to the reporting of a factual situation, 9) items which could easily be misinterpreted, and 10) items which required an explanatory response. The list of practices, after culling, included fourteen recommended practices which, when converted to questions, could be answered "Yes" or "No". It also included an open-ended question requesting an estimate of the amount of time spent in principal evaluation. These items were included in Part I of the superintendent questionnaire.

When this section of the questionnaire was field tested, respondents were asked to comment on the clarity and appropriateness of the various items. From the many comments and suggestions, particularly those made more than once, the list was revised and reordered and one of the fourteen practices was eliminated. The itme requesting an estimate of time spent in evaluation was eliminated due to its ambiguity. Responses ranged from "One hour" to "I am continuously evaluating". When this revised section was further tested, respondents did not note any confusion or ambiguity with the items. This section on the implementation of recommended practices is represented in the first thirteen items on Part I of the questionnaire (Appendix A).

The final thirteen selected practices which were recommended in the literature are:

1. Principals should have a written job description which specifies their responsibilities and which is periodically reviewed.

2. Principals should participate in the development of the system by which they are evaluated.

3. Principals should be made aware of procedures and instruments for evaluation prior to the time of evaluation.

4. As part of evaluation practice, the unique needs of each building should be used as one criterion for the evaluation of the principal of that building.

5. Principals' formal evaluation results should be a factor in determining pay raises and reassignment.

6. The evaluation system should include a procedure for principals to submit a written response, which is attached to their evaluation, if evaluation results are unfavorable or if principals do not agree.

7. The evaluation system should include a procedure for principals to obtain a review by a higher district authority or review board other than the evaluator(s) if evaluation results are unfavorable or if principals do not agree.

8. Evaluators should have sufficient time in their work schedule to properly conduct the evaluation of principals.

9. Evaluators should have recent training and competency in comprehensive, goal-oriented evaluation of administrative personnel.

10. Evaluators should periodically visit and observe principals in their usual working area for the specific purpose of collecting data for evaluation.

11. Principals should be evaluated at least once a year.

12. If evaluation results are unsatisfactory, specific remediation should be planned, in writing, and implemented before the next evaluation.

13. The type and content of principals' in-service training should be determined specifically according to the results of their evaluation.

These thirteen recommended practices are discussed extensively, with citations from the literature, on pages 51-66 of Chapter II.

Questions fourteen and fifteen on Part I of the superintendents' questionnaire were: "In your judgment, is your principal evaluation system a major factor in principals' professional growth?" and "Are you satisfied with the quality of your principal evaluation system?" The original form included the question, "Do you plan to make major changes in the evaluation within the next year?" This question was eliminated after the field test because it did not necessarily indicate satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the evaluation system and provided no valid or useful information without further explanation.

The final two items on the questionnaire requested the superintendent's permission to ask the principals in his district their response to Questions Fourteen and Fifteen and permission to contact the superintendent for a follow-up interview.

The two-page questionnaires were mailed to the twenty superintendents with a short cover letter requesting their assistance. Seventeen of the twenty questionnaires were returned within a few days. After two weeks, a second questionnaire and follow-up letter was sent to the remaining three superintendents. One of these was returned the following week. Aftef two more weeks, the two remaining superintendents were contacted personally and requested to fill out the questionnaire. Both agreed and were sent a third questionnaire which was promptly returned. Thus, 100 percent of the superintendent questionnaires were completed.

Of the twenty superintendents, two did not grant permission to contact principals in their districts. One of these districts had one principal and the other had two; thus, three of the fifty-seven principals were eliminated from the study. Over a ten week period, fifty-two of the remaining fifty-four principals were contacted (two were eliminated after repeated unsuccessful attempts to contact them). After a brief explanation, each principal was asked to answer "Yes" or "No" to the two questions regarding their professional growth and satisfaction with the system. They were then asked the question, "Do you have any comments regarding the evaluation of principals in your district?" Detailed notes were taken of these responses.

Of the twenty superintendents, four did not grant permission for a personal follow-up interview. The remaining sixteen superintendents were contacted, at the end of the spring term, a few weeks after questionnaires had been returned, to make appointments for interviews. During this period, the employment of one of these superintendents was terminated and one became seriously ill. The remaining fourteen superintendents were interviewed over a five-week period. The length of the interviews ranged from forty-five minutes to two hours and all but one were tape recorded, with the permission of the superintendents. In each of these interviews, a basic interview schedule (Appendix B) was followed. It included three basic questions regarding a description of the evaluation system, why the system was used, and the effects of the process. The schedule included a variety

of follow-up, specific questions for each of the above. Before

each interview, the superintendent's questionnaire responses

and various data regarding the district were reviewed to

provide questions which were relevant to the individual district's

situation. In addition to details and perceptions of the evalu-

ation process, the questions provided a cross-check of responses to

each item on the questionnaire. When interview responses indicated

a direct contradiction to a questionnaire response, the question

was repeated. If the response was the same, the contradiction

was pointed out to the superintendent in order to attain accuracy.

In each case, the superintendent conceded that the interview

response was correct and asked that the questionnaire response be

changed. Of the two districts where no formal, written evaluation

system was used, only one of the superintendents was interviewed.

In this interview, the majority of the interview schedule was not

relevant and was not used. An attempt was made to elicit the

various types of informal and unwritten evaluation techniques

which were used in that particular district. Many of the super-

intendents gave copies of the evaluation instrument, board policy

on evaluation and relevant memoranda. Several volunteered perusal

of actual evaluations from personnel files, masking the name of

the evaluatee. Most went into detail on their philosophy of

evaluation and cited many specific examples of events which

occurred during or as a result of the evaluation process, as well

as various problems they encountered in evaluation of principals.

After the interviews were concluded, the tapes were transcribed

and responses were organized according to the three basic
questions and various categories of responses.[4]

Various statistical data, including enrollment, number of
principals, assessed valuation per pupil, and principals'
average salary[5] were obtained from the following documents
published by the Educational Service Region of Cook County:
1) 1978 Directory of Suburban Public Schools in Cook County,
2) Research Report #2000: Cost and Financial Resources, Cook
County Elementary and High School Districts, Year Ending
June 30, 1977, and 3) Research Report #1001, Cook County
Suburban Public School Principals Salary Study, 1977-1978.

## Treatment of the Data

Collected data were treated in two different types of
analysis. The first section included a quantitative analysis,
and the second section included a narrative analysis of the data.

In the quantitative analysis section, frequency analysis
was employed. Collected data were tabulated and arranged in
categories according to the design of the study, the twelve
specific areas as detailed on pages 67-69 of this chapter.
In each case, categories were exhaustive, mutually exclusive
and independent.[6]

---

[4] Carter Good, Introduction to Educational Research (New
York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963), pp. 270-299.

[5] Salaries of principals in two of the districts were not
included in the documents cited. These data were obtained
from the Business Offices of the respective districts.

[6] Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New
York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973), pp. 137-39.

From the twelve types of evaluation systems listed on Part II of the superintendent questionnaire, (Appendix A) each superintendent selected the one which most closely described the system used in his district, or indicated that no formal evaluation system was used. These responses were organized into two categories for frequency analysis: 1) those districts which used no formal evaluation system or which used a Performance Standards System, and 2) those districts which used a Performance Objectives System. (The use of specific types of systems within each category was analyzed in the Narrative Analysis section.) The percentage of districts in each of the two categories was calculated. If 60 percent of the districts fell into category two, it was concluded that most of the subject districts used some type of written, formal Performance Objectives System to evaluate principals.

On the list of recommended practices, the first thirteen items on Part I of the superintendent questionnaire, (Appendix A) each superintendent circled "Yes" or "No" for each item. The "Yes" and "No" responses were tabulated for each item and the percentages of districts answering "Yes" and "No" were calculated. If 60 percent of the subject districts implemented a given practice, it was concluded that that specific practice was implemented by a majority of subject districts. If 60 percent did not implement a given practice, it was concluded that the practice was not implemented by a majority of the districts.

To determine if districts used a majority of the recommended practices, the "Yes" and "No" responses to the first thirteen

items on each questionnaire were tallied. If a district employed at least eight of thirteen practices, it was placed in the category of districts which implemented a majority of the recommended practices. If at least 60 percent of the subject districts fell in this category, it was concluded that most of the districts implemented a majority of the recommended practices.

To determine if size of the district influenced its use of Performance Objectives System or its implementation of recommended practices, subject districts were ranked by size and arbitrarily divided into three categories. Four districts fell in the large-size category with enrollments of 10,000-20,000; nine fell in the medium-size category with enrollments of 5,000-9,999, and seven fell in the small-size category of 3,500-4,999.

Districts which used a Performance Objectives Evaluation system were sorted into the three categories of size. The following percentages were calculated: the percentage of large districts which used Performance Objectives, the percentage of medium districts which used Performance Objectives and the percentage of small districts which used Performance Objectives.

Similarly, districts which implemented a majority of the recommended practices were sorted into the size categories and the following percentages were calculated: the percentage of large districts which implement a majority of the recommended practices, the percentage of medium districts which implement the practices, and the percentage of small districts which implement the practices. These categories and percentages were

arranged in a two-variable table and the percentages were

compared. If there was a difference of ten or more percentage

points between large and medium, medium and small, or large

and small, it was concluded that the size of the district

appeared to influence the use of Performance Objectives

Evaluation Systems or, in the other category, the implementa-

tion of recommended practices. The differential of ten per-

centage points was selected arbitrarily as the point where a

measurable difference was apparent.

To determine if the wealth of a district influenced its

use of Performance Objectives Systems or its implementation

of recommended practices, districts were ranked by wealth

according to the Assessed Valuation per Pupil.[7] Three cate-

gories of wealth were arbitrarily established. Five districts

fell into the high wealth category of $100,000-165,000, nine

districts fell into the medium wealth category of $65,000-99,000,

and six fell in the lower wealth category of $40,000-64,999.

Districts which used Performance Objectives Evaluation

Systems were sorted into the three wealth categories and the

following percentages were calculated: the percentage of high

wealth districts which used Performance Objectives Systems,

the percentage of medium wealth districts which used Performance

Objectives, and the percentage of lower wealth districts which

[7] Educational Service Region of Cook County, Research Report
#2000: Cost and Financial Resources, Cook County Elementary and
High School Districts, Year Ending June 30, 1977 (Chicago,
Illinois: Educational Service Region of Cook County, 1977), p. 5.

used Performance Objectives.

Similarly, districts which implemented a majority of recommended practices were sorted into the three wealth categories and the following percentages were calculated: the percentage of high wealth districts which implemented the recommended practices, the percentage of medium wealth districts which implemented the practices, and the percentage of lower wealth districts which implemented the practices.

These categories and percentages were arranged in a two-variable table and the percentages were compared. If there was a difference of ten or more percentage points between high wealth and medium wealth, medium wealth and low wealth, or high wealth and low wealth districts, it was concluded that the wealth of the district appeared to influence the use of Performance Objectives Evaluation Systems, or, in the other category, the implementation of recommended practices.

To determine if the amount of salary a district pays its principals influences its use of a Performance Objectives Evaluation System or its implementation of recommended evaluation practices, subject districts were ranked according to average principal salary in the district. Salaries ranged from $30,000–$40,000. The mean average salary was $34,494, and the mid-point was $35,000. Average principal salaries in nine of the subject districts fell into a category above the mean and mid-point and eleven fell below these points.

Districts which used Performance Objectives Evaluation

Systems were sorted into the Above-Average or Below-Average

Salary categories, and the following percentages were calcu-

lated: the percentage of districts with above-average principal

salaries which use Performance Objectives and the percentage

with below average salaries which use Performance Objectives.

In a similar manner, districts which implemented a majority

of recommended evaluation practices were sorted into the two

salary categories and the following percentages were calculated;

the percentage of districts with above average principal salaries

which implement a majority of the recommended practices and the

percentage of districts with below average salaries which imple-

ment a majority of the practices.

These categories and percentages were arranged on a two-

variable table and the percentages were compared.  If there was

a difference of ten or more percentage points between districts

with above average principal salaries and those with below average

salaries, it was concluded that the amount of salary a district

pays its principals appears to influence its use of a Performance

Objectives Evaluation System, or in the other category, its

implementation of recommended practices.

To determine if, according to superintendents' and principals'

judgments, the use of a Performance Objectives Evaluation Systems

contributes to a principal's professional growth more than does a

Performance Standards System or no formal evaluation, those dis-

tricts which used some form of Performance Objectives were labeled

Group X and those which did not were labeled Group Y.  For the

question, "In your judgment, is your principal evaluation system a

major factor in principals' professional growth?" (Item #1 on

the Principal Questionnaire, Appendix C, and Item #14 on Part I

of the Superintendent Questionnaire, Appendix A,), the "Yes"

responses were tallied separately for principals and superin-

tendents in Group X. The same was tallied for Group Y. The

percentage of "Yes" responses in each category was calculated.

Calculated data in these three categories were arranged in

a three-variable table. If the percentages were higher for

both principals and superintendents in Group X than those in

Group Y, it was concluded that the use of a Performance

Objectives System did contribute to principals' professional

growth more than did Performance Objectives or no system. If

either principals or superintendents in Group X had a higher

percentage of "Yes" responses than those in Group Y, the same

conclusion was made for that particular group.

To determine if the use of a Performance Objectives Evalu-

ation System contribues to superintendents' and principals'

expressed satisfaction with the system more than does a Perfor-

mance Standards or No Formal System, Groups X and Y were again

used. For the question, "Are you satisfied with the quality

of your present principal evaluation system?" (Item #2 on the

Principal Questionnaire, Appendix C, and Item #15 on Part I of

the Superintendent Questionnaire, Appendix A,), the "Yes" responses

were tallied separately for principals and superintendents in

Group X and in Group Y and the percentage of "Yes" responses

in each category was calculated.

Calculated data in these three categories were arranged in
a three-variable table.  If the percentages were measurably
higher for both principals and superintendents in Group X than
those in Group Y, it was concluded that the use of Performance
Objectives Evaluation System contributes to superintendents'
and principals' expressed satisfaction with the evaluation
system more than does a Performance Standards or No Formal
Evaluation System.  If either principals or superintendents
in Group X had a higher percentage of "Yes" responses than those
in Group Y, the same conclusion was made for that particular
group.

To determine if, according to the judgments of superinten-
dents and principals, the implementation of recommended evalu-
ation practices has a positive effect on the professional
growth of principals, those districts which implemented a
majority of the practices were labeled Group A, and the remainder,
who did not, were labeled Group B.  For the question, "In your
judgment, is your principal evaluation system a major factor in
principals' professional growth?", the "Yes" responses were
tallied separately for superintendents and principals in Group A
and in Group B.  The percentage of "Yes" responses in each
category was calculated.

Calculated data in these three categories were arranged in
a three-variable table.  If the percentages were higher for both
superintendents and principals in Group A than those in Group B,
it was concluded that the implementation of the majority of the

recommended evaluation practices does have a positive effect on the professional growth of principals, according to the judgments of superintendents and principals. If either superintendents or principals had a higher percentage of "Yes" responses in Group A than in Group B, the same conclusion was reached for that particular group.

To determine if the implementation of recommended evaluation practices has a positive effect on superintendents' and principals' expressed satisfaction with the evaluation system, Groups A and B were again used. For the question, "Are you satisfied with the quality of your present principal evaluation system?" the number of "Yes" responses were tallied separately for principals and superintendents in Group A and in Group B. The percentage of "Yes" responses in each category was calculated.

These data were arranged in a three-variable table. If the percentages were higher for both superintendents and principals in Group A than for those in Group B, it was concluded that the implementation of recommended evaluation practices does have a positive effect on superintendents' and principals' expressed satisfaction with the principal evaluation system. If either superintendents or principals in Group A had a higher percentage of "Yes" responses than did those in Group B, the same conclusion was reached for that particular group.

To determine if, overall, more superintendents judged their principal evaluation system to be a major factor in principal professional growth than did principals, the "Yes" responses to

the question, "In your judgment, is your principal evaluation

system a major factor in principal professional growth?" were

tallied for principals and for superintendents separately.

The percentage of "Yes" responses for both groups was calculated.

If the percentage of superintendents' "Yes" responses was higher

than principals', it was concluded that, overall, more superin-

tendents judged their principal evaluation system to be a major

factor in principals' professional growth than did principals.

To determine if, overall, more superintendents expressed

satisfaction with their principal evaluation system than did

principals, the "Yes" responses to the question, "Are you

satisfied with the quality of your present principal evaluation

system?" were tallied for principals and superintendents separ-

ately. The percentage of "Yes" responses for both groups was

calculated. If the percentage of superintendents' "Yes" responses

was higher than principals', it was concluded that more superin-

tendents expressed satisfaction with their principal evaluation

system than did principals.

In a narrative analysis, subject districts, superintendents,

and principals were sorted into groups and sub-groups according

to the findings of the quantitative analysis, and the three

following areas were examined: 1) the unique and specific aspects

of the evaluation systems used, 2) the factors which influence

the use of various systems and practices, and 3) the perceived

effects of the various systems and practices. The primary sources

of data for this analysis were the superintendent and principal

interviews. The essential purpose of this section was to go beyond the numerical findings in an attempt to determine why individual districts evaluate principals the way they do and how principals and superintendents perceive the effects of that evaluation.

Initially, the subject districts were sorted into three groups, according to Part II of the Superintendent Questionnaire: 1) those districts which used a Performance Standards Evaluation System, 2) those districts which used a Performance Objectives System, and 3) those districts which had no formal, written, principal evaluation system.

Within each of the first two groups, districts were sorted into sub-groups according to the twelve categories of systems on Part II of the Superintendent Questionnaire. Within each of these sub-groups, the individual subject districts were analyzed in terms of several factors. First, the unique and distinct factors of the evaluation system, how it evolved, what plans existed, if any, for revising the system, and the use or non-use of the various recommended practices were reported. Secondly, the influence of time, cost, number of principals, principals' salaries, principals' years of experience and various other factors on the use of the particular system was examined. Finally, the perceived effects of principal evaluation were reported in terms of what they wanted the effect to be; what it actually was; to what extent it influenced the principals' professional growth; how it was tied to salary, dismissal, promotion, demotion or reassignment; in-service training; what

happened if results were negative; and the advantages and disadvantages of the system. The reasons for satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the system were explored.

In the third group, districts which reported no formal, written evaluation, there were only two districts. In one of these districts, the superintendent was not available for an interview. Responses on the questionnaire and from the principals in the district were used in an attempt to determine what types of informal evaluation were occurring, the perceived effects of that evaluation and why no formal evaluation was used. For the other district, responses of the superintendent in an in-depth interview and from the principals' interview were reported and analyzed.

## Summary

This chapter has presented a statement of the purposes of the study, the method and procedure for selecting subject districts, a description of selected districts, the method and procedure for collecting data for the study, and the method and procedure of the quantitative and narrative analysis of the data.

The following chapter presents the quantitative and narrative analysis of the collected data according to the methods and procedures described above.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

In order to examine the systems and practices of principal
evaluation in subject school districts, collected data were
analyzed quantitatively and narratively in three basic areas.
They were analyzed in terms of the extent to which they corre-
late with systems and practices recommended in the literature,
the factors which influence the systems and practices employed,
and the perceived effects of the various systems and practices.
Specific questions were answered within each of the three basic
areas. Conclusions reached in the Quantitative Analysis are
explored in depth in the Narrative Analysis.

Quantitative Analysis

In the first basic area of quantitative analysis, the extent
to which existing principal evaluation systems and practices
correlated with those recommended in the literature, questionnaire
results provided the information to answer three specific questions:
1) Do most of the subject districts use some type of written,
formal Performance Objectives Evaluation System? 2) Of the
selected recommended practices, which are implemented by the
majority of districts? and 3) Do most of the subject districts
implement a majority of the recommended practices?

To answer the first specific question, a tally was made of responses on the section of the questionnaire dealing with types of evaluation systems. The tally showed that two districts used no written, formal evaluation system and six used one of the eight types of Performance Standards Systems. Twelve districts used one of the four types of Performance Objectives Systems. Thus, 60 percent of the districts fell into the category which used Performance Objectives Evaluation. According to the predetermined criterion of 60 percent, it was concluded that most of the subject districts used some type of written, formal Performance Objectives System to evaluate principals.

This finding is consistent with trends reported in the survey of literature that there is an increase in the use of Performance Objectives Evaluation Systems in school districts throughout the country. The popularity of such systems is likely due, in part, to the widespread use of similar MBO systems in business and industry and the attention they have received as effective management systems. They have been strongly recommended by educational authorities, by national principals' organizations, and in some cases, by state governmental agencies or mandates.

From the thirteen selected recommended evaluation practices, a tally of "Yes" and "No" responses was made for each item. A criterion of 60 percent was used to determine if a majority of subject districts implemented a given practice. The following ten specific practices were implemented by 60 percent or more of the subject districts:

1. Principals have a written job description which specifies their responsibilities and which is periodically reviewed. (95% Yes)

2. Principals participate in the development of the system by which they are evaluated. (90% Yes)

3. Principals are made aware of procedures and instruments for evaluation prior to the time of evaluation. (95% Yes)

4. As part of evaluation practice, the unique needs of each building are used as one criterion for the evaluation of that building. (95% Yes)

5. The evluation system includes a procedure for principals to submit a written response, which is attached to their evaluation, if evaluation results are unfavorable, or if principals do not agree. (75% Yes)

6. Evaluators have sufficient time in their work schedule to properly conduct the evaluation of principals. (85% Yes)

7. Evaluators have recent training and competency in comprehensive, objective, goal-oriented evaluation of administrative personnel. (70% Yes)

8. Evaluators periodically visit and observe principals in their usual working area for the specific purpose of collecting data for evaluation. (65% Yes)

9. Principals are evaluated at least once a year. (90% Yes)

10. If evaluation results are unsatisfactory, specific remediation is planned, in writing, and implemented before the next evaluation. (80% Yes)

Thus, it was concluded that ten of the recommended evaluation practices were implemented by a majority of the subject districts.

From the tally of "No" answers on given practices, 60 percent or more of the districts did not implement the following two practices:

1. The evaluation system includes a procedure for principals to obtain a review by a higher district authority or review board other than the evaluator(s) if evaluation results are unfavorable or if principals do not agree. (90% No)

2. The type and content of principals' in-service training
   is determined specifically according to the results of
   their evaluation. (65% No)

Thus, it was concluded that these two evaluation practices

were not implemented by a majority of subject districts.

Only one of the practices, Number Five, "Principals' formal

evaluation results are a factor in determining pay raises and

reassignment," did not fall into either category. Exactly half

of the subject districts implemented this practice and half did

not, thus, no conclusions were reached as to its implementation

by a majority of subject districts.

To determine if mose of the subject districts implemented

a majority (eight or more) of the thirteen recommended practices,

a tally of "Yes" and "No" responses to these thirteen items on

each questionnaire was made. Fifteen, or 75 percent, of the

districts implemented eight or more of the practices. Thus, the

criterion of 60 percent was met and it was concluded that most

of the subject districts implemented a majority of the recom-

mended practices for principal evaluation.

Since these thirteen recommended practices are so commonly

recommended in the literature, it might be expected that most

districts reported the implementation of a majority. The

unusual finding here, however, was the extremely high percentage

of districts which provided no procedure for appealing unsatis-

factory results to a higher authority other than the evaluator.

While the literature did not report that this practice was

implemented in a significant number of districts, it is certainly

a common recommendation. Literature representing the viewpoint

of principals is most vocal in this matter, and it does appear to

be an unresolved issue. The basic problem may be that, organiza-

tionally, there is no higher authority other than the superinten-

dent, since, in most cases, the superintendent evaluates principals,

and school boards generally back the superintendent in exercising

the authority they have given him. The only solution to this

dilemma which was found in the literature was a recommendation for

the establishment of a district review board for such appeals.

Such review boards, however, are not reported in the literature

as being commonly in effect. In any case, such a board could not

have higher authority than the school board, nor would it be

likely to supercede the authority of the superintendent.

The second practice which was not implemented by a majority

of the districts was that of tying in-service training to evalu-

ation results specifically. The omission of this practice may

be because evaluation results are viewed as related to the indi-

vidual, while in-service activities tend to be implemented for

groups. Nevertheless, if improvement of performance is accepted

as a primary purpose of evaluation, then it would seem that

planned in-service would be a necessary corollary.

In the second basic area concerning the factors which

influence the evaluation systems and practices which are employed,

questionnaire results and other pertinent data provided answers

to the following specific questions: 1) Does the size of a

district influence its use of a Performance Objectives Evaluation

System or its implementation of recommended practices?

2) Does the wealth of a district influence its use of a Performance Objectives Evaluation System or its implementation of recommended practices? 3) Does the amount of salary a district pays its principals influence its use of a Performance Objectives Evaluation System or its implementation of recommended practices?

To determine if the size of a district affected its principal evaluation procedures, all subject districts were sorted into Large, Medium and Small categories according to student enrollment. Within each category, the percentage of districts using Performance Objectives Evaluation Systems and the percentage implementing a majority of the recommended practices were calculated. These data are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGES OF LARGE, MEDIUM AND SMALL DISTRICTS WHICH
IMPLEMENT PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES AND RECOMMENDED PRACTICES

|  | Percent Using Performance Objectives | Percent Implementing Recommended Practices |
|---|---|---|
| Large Districts N = 4 | 75% (3) | 50% (2) |
| Medium Districts N = 9 | 67% (6) | 67% (6) |
| Small Districts N = 7 | 43% (3) | 100% (7) |

In comparing the percentages within each column, it was concluded that the size of the district had an influence if there was a difference of ten or more percentage points between large and medium, medium and small, or large and small sized districts.

In comparing the percentages of large, medium, and small districts which use Performance Objectives Systems to evaluate principals, there was less than 10% difference between large and medium, 24 percent difference between medium and small, and 32 percent difference between large and small. Thus, it was concluded that the size of a district appears to influence its use of Performance Objectives Evaluation Systems. While there was little difference between large and medium sized districts, there was a distinct difference between small districts and medium and large districts. The percentage of districts using Performance Objectives Systems decreases as size of the district decreases. Smaller districts, with enrollments under 5,000 and an average of two principals in the district, appeared less likely to use Performance Objectives Systems to evaluate principals than did districts with enrollments of 5,000 to 20,000 and an average of 3.3 principals in the district.

This trend for larger districts to use Performance Objectives Systems more than do smaller systems is undoubtedly due to the structural complexity of larger districts. Where there are more principals in more schools with more central office administrators, there is also more difficulty in close interaction and monitoring performance. Thus, a more structured and complex evaluation system, such as a Performance Objectives System, is likely to be more effective. Some means of coordinating the efforts and direction of a larger group is necessary, and the structure of Performance Objectives Systems provides this coordination.

In comparing large, medium, and small districts which implemented a majority of the recommended evaluation practices, there was a difference of 17 percent between large and medium sized districts, 33 percent between medium and small, and 50 percent between large and small. There was a distinct difference between each category of size. The percentage of districts implementing the recommended practices increased dramatically as the size of the district decreased. All of the small districts, twice as many as the large districts, implemented the recommended practices. Thus, it can be concluded that the size of a district appears to influence its implementation of recommended evaluation practices; and that the smaller the district, the more likely it is to implement such practices.

The trend for smaller districts to implement recommended practices more than do larger districts may also be due to the complex organizational structure, and it may reflect on the nature of the practices themselves. Most of the practices require time and coordinated effort. For example, for principals to participate in the development of their evaluation system or for the evaluator to periodically visit principals for the specific purpose of evaluation requires a great deal more time and coordinated effort where there are six or eight principals than where are two or three. In most districts, the superintendent evaluates the principals, regardless of their number. Thus, it may be that recommended practices are actually more difficult to implement in larger districts, and, because of

this restraint, are often neglected or purposely omitted.

To answer the question of the effect of wealth on principal

evaluation procedures, all districts were sorted in High, Medium

and Low Wealth categories according to assessed valuation per

pupil. Within each category, the percentage of districts

using Performance Objectives Evaluation Systems and the percentage

implementing a majority of the recommended practices were calcu-

lated. These data are presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGES OF HIGH, MEDIUM AND LOW WEALTH DISTRICTS WHICH
IMPLEMENT PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES AND RECOMMENDED PRACTICES

|  | Percent Using Performance Objectives | Percent Implementing Recommended Practices |
|---|---|---|
| High Wealth Districts N = 5 | 80% (4) | 80% (4) |
| Medium Wealth Districts N = 9 | 56% (5) | 56% (5) |
| Low Wealth Districts N = 6 | 50% (3) | 100% (6) |

In comparing percentages within each column, it was concluded

that wealth influenced evaluation procedures if there was a diff-

erence of ten or more percentage points between high and medium

wealth districts, medium and low wealth districts, or high and low

wealth districts.

In a comparison of percentages of these districts which use

a Performance Objectives Evaluation System, there is a difference

of 24 percent between High and Medium, 30 percent between High and

Low, but less than 10 percent between Medium and Low Wealth Districts.

Thus, it can be concluded that the wealth of a district appears to

be a factor influencing the use of Performance Objectives Evaluation Systems, and that high wealth districts are more likely to use such systems than are medium and low wealth districts.

Since Performance Objectives Systems, when implemented as recommended by experts in the field, are more costly than other systems because of the large demand on time, it is logical that districts of higher wealth can afford such systems where less wealthy districts can not, or at least choose not to. Other factors connected with wealth, such as the socio-economic level of the community and increasing or decreasing enrollment, may also influence the type of evaluation system used.

In comparing districts which implement a majority of the recommended evaluation practices by categories of wealth, an unusual pattern emerges. Of the high wealth districts, 24 percent more implement recommended practices than do districts of medium wealth, 44 percent more of the low wealth districts implement these practices than do medium wealth districts, and 20 percent more small wealth districts implement these practices than do high wealth districts. Thus, it can be concluded that the wealth of a district appears to influence its implementation of recommended practices, that very high and very low wealth districts are more likely to implement the practices than are medium wealth districts, and that low wealth districts are more likely to implement the practices than are either high or medium. One hundred percent of the low wealth districts implemented the recommended practices.

The large percentage differential between the implementation
of recommended practices by high and low wealth districts as
compared to medium wealth districts is not readily apparent.
If, as previously concluded, the implementation of recommended
practices demands time and, thus, money, it would be logical
that wealthier districts would be more inclined to implement
the practices.  However, instead of the low wealth districts
implementing the fewest of the practices, as might be expected,
it was found that <u>all</u> of the low wealth districts implement
most of the practices.  It may be that low wealth districts
have discovered that implementing these practices produces
a high return in effectiveness and, thus, give them high priority
in terms of time and budget.  Such districts may necessarily be
more concerned with cost effectiveness in budget planning than
are wealthier districts.  On the other hand, it may be that
other, unknown, factors which are present in low wealth districts
influence this apparent discrepancy.

To determine if the amount of salary a district pays its
principals influences that district's principal evaluation proce-
dures, districts were sorted into two categories; one with above
average principal salaries and one with below average salaries.
Within each category, the percentage of districts using Perfor-
mance Objectives Evaluations Systems and the percentage imple-
menting a majority of the recommended evaluation practices were
calculated.  These data are presented in Table 3.

## TABLE 3

PERCENTAGES OF DISTRICTS WITH ABOVE AVERAGE AND BELOW AVERAGE
PRINCIPAL SALARIES WHICH IMPLEMENT PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES
AND RECOMMENDED PRACTICES

|  | Percent Using Performance Objectives | Percent Implementing Recommended Practices |
|---|---|---|
| Above Average Principal Salaries N = 9 | 44% (4) | 67% (6) |
| Below Average Principal Salaries N = 11 | 73% (8) | 82% (9) |

In comparing percentages within each column, it was concluded
that the amount of salary a district paid its principals appeared
to influence its principal evaluation procedures if there was a
difference of ten or more percentage points between districts with
above average principal salaries and those with below average
salaries.

In comparing the percentages of districts using Performance
Objectives, 29 percent more of the districts with below average
salaries use Performance Objectives than do the districts with
above average salaries. Thus, it can be concluded that the amount
of salary a district pays its principals appears to influence its
use of Performance Objectives Evaluation Systems, and that districts
which pay principals lower than average salaries are more likely to
use Performance Objectives than are districts which pay higher than
average principal salaries.

A similar pattern is found in comparing percentages of districts
implementing a majority of the recommended practices. Of the dis-

tricts with below average principal salaries, 15 percent more

implement the recommended practices than do districts with

above average principal salaries.  Thus, it can be concluded that

the amount of salary a district pays its principals appears to

influence its implementation of recommended practices and that

districts with lower than average salaries are more likely to

implement these practices than are districts with higher than

average principal salaries.

This apparent tendency of districts with below average

principal salaries to use Performance Objectives Evaluation

Systems and to implement recommended practices more than do dis-

tricts with above average salaries may be related to two factors.

One factor may be that superintendents in low salary districts

need the documentation and closer contact, which tend to be

present with Performance Objectives Systems and where practices

are implemented, as tangible evidence to either attain higher

salaries for effective principals or to substantiate release or

demotion of ineffective principals.  This factor would likely

be the case more in districts of low salary which have recently

adopted Performance Objectives Systems and begun implementing

practices and/or where the superintendent is relatively new to

the district than in districts where there has been little recent

change.  This possible factor is examined in more detail in the

narrative analysis of individual districts where such conditions

exist.

Another factor which may be related to this tendency is the

years of experience of principals with above and below average

salaries. Of the nine principals with above average salaries, five had average years of experience, two had low years of experience, and two had above average or high years of experience. Of the eleven principals with below average salaries, one had average years of experience, four had below average or low years of experience and five had above average or high years of experience (see Appendix D). Thus, principals with average years of experience receive higher salaries than do those with relatively more or less experience. It is likely that the less experienced principals need and receive more monitoring and supervision which tends to be present in Performance Objectives Systems and in the implementation of recommended practices. It may be that more experienced principals who have, perhaps, been in the position for many years and are nearing retirement age also require more monitoring and supervision, at least in the perception of evaluators. Motivation for continued professional growth and high level performance may also be a factor. These principals, who would probably be less likely to change jobs than younger principals, may have reached a certain point and then tended to level off in performance and growth. School boards would not, in such cases, need to pay higher salaries to keep such principals nor, since current principals are likely to stay in the position, to attract outstanding new principals. It may be that principals with average years of experience are at the peak of their careers in terms of performance, motivation, and knowledge of recent developments in administrative practice, and, thus, need and receive less monitoring and super-

vision as found in the absence of Performance Objectives Systems
and recommended practices. They may be demanding and receiving
higher salaries as they change positions. Districts may pay top
salaries to get top principals, and then leave them on their own
to do their job. This situation is explored in more detail in
the narrative analysis of individual districts where these condi-
tions exist.

In the third basic area concerning the perceived effects
of principal evaluation systems and practices, principal and super-
intendent questionnaire responses were used to answer the follow-
ing specific questions:

1.  According to superintendents' and principals' judgments,
    does a Performance Objectives Evaluation System contribute
    to a principal's professional growth more than does a
    Performance Standards System or no formal evaluation
    system?

2.  Does a Performance Objectives Evaluation System contribute
    to superintendents' and principals' expressed satisfaction
    with the evaluation system more than does a Performance
    Standards System or no formal evaluation system?

3.  Does the implementation of recommended evaluation prac-
    tices have a positive effect on the professional growth
    of principals according to the judgments of superinten-
    dents and of principals?

4.  Does the implementation of recommended evaluation practices
    have a positive effect on superintendents' and principals'
    expressed satisfaction with the system?

5.  Overall, do more superintendents judge their principal
    evaluation system to be a major factor in principal
    professional growth than do principals?

6.  Overall, do more superintendents express satisfaction with
    the principal evaluation system in their districts than do
    principals?

To determine if, according to the judgment of principals and
of superintendents, Performance Objectives Evaluation Systems

contribute to a principal's professional growth more than do Performance Standards or no formal evaluation system, districts were sorted into two categories: Those which use Performance Objectives Systems (Group X) and those which do not (Group Y). The "Yes" responses to the question, "In your judgment, is your principal evaluation system a major factor in principals' professional growth?" were tallied separately for principals and for superintendents in each category, and the percentage of those responses were calculated. These data are presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGES OF PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS IN GROUP X AND GROUP Y WHO PERCEIVE A POSITIVE EFFECT OF EVALUATION ON PRINCIPAL PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

|  | Group X (Performance Obj.) | Group Y (Other Systems) |
|---|---|---|
| Superintendents N = 20 | 67% (8) N = 12 | 63% (5) N = 8 |
| Principals N = 52 | 50% (17) N = 34 | 50% (9) N = 18 |

If the percentage of both principals and superintendents or either principals or superintendents was higher in Group X than in Group Y, it was concluded that the use of a Performance Objectives Evaluation System appeared to have a positive effect on principals' professional growth more than do other systems, according to the judgments of principals and/or superintendents.

Although the percentage of superintendents in Group X is slightly higher than the percentage of superintendents in Group Y, the ratios of 8:12 and 5:8 are nearly the same. With the limited numbers in each group, it would not be realistic to consider one higher than the other. The percentage of principals in each group is exactly the same, 50 percent. Thus, it must be concluded that, according to the judgment of principals and superintendents, the use of a Performance Objectives Evaluation System does not appear to contribute to principal professional growth more than does a Performance Standards system or no formal system at all.

If, as concluded from the literature surveyed, professional growth is a primary purpose of principal evaluation, it would not appear, according to these data, that Performance Objectives Systems accomplish that purpose any more than do other systems or no system at all. Yet, Performance Objectives Systems are highly recommended in the literature. In fact, it would not appear that any particular type of evaluation system has a positive effect on professional growth in a majority of the subject districts. If this is the case, then serious questions are raised as to the preference of one type of system over another and what elements of evaluation do, in fact, contribute to professional growth. In the narrative analysis of individual districts, the presence or absence of perceived professional growth is further explored in an attempt to answer these questions.

To determine if a Performance Objectives Evaluation System contributes to superintendents' and principals' expressed satisfaction with the evaluation system, the categories of Group X

(districts using Performance Objectives) and Group Y (districts not using Performance Objectives) were again used. The "Yes" responses to the question, "Are you satisfied with the quality of your present principal evaluation system?" were tallied separately for principals and superintendents in each category, and the percentages of those responses were calculated. These data are presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGES OF PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS IN
GROUP X AND GROUP Y WHO EXPRESS SATISFACTION
WITH THEIR PRINCIPAL EVALUATION SYSTEM

|  | Group X (Performance Obj.) | Group Y (Other Systems) |
|---|---|---|
| Superintendents N = 20 | 50% (6) N = 12 | 63% (5) N = 8 |
| Principals N = 51 | 52% (17) N = 33 | 89% (16) N = 18 |

Again, if the percentages of both principals and superintendents or for either principals or superintendents were higher in Group X than in Group Y, it was concluded that Performance Objectives Evaluation Systems contribute to superintendents' and/or principals' expressed satisfaction with their principal evaluation system. According to the collected data, there were thirteen percentage points fewer for superintendents in Group X than in Group Y, and thirty-seven percentage points fewer for principals in Group X than in Group Y. Thus, it must be concluded that Performance Objectives Systems do not appear to

contribute to principals' or superintendents' expressed satis-
faction with their principal evaluation systems more than does
a Performance Standards or no formal evaluation system. In
fact, the reverse would appear to be true for both.

In terms of satisfaction with the evaluation systems, these
findings raise even more questions as to the superiority of
Performance Objectives Systems than do the findings regarding
professional growth. Again, serious questions are raised as to
the recommendation of Performance Objectives Systems, when only
half of the superintendents and principals expressed satisfaction
with them in districts where they were used, and a much higher
percentage of satisfaction was expressed, particularly by
principals, in districts using Performance Standards or no
formal evaluation system at all. These questions are explored
further in the Narrative Analysis, in an effort to determine the
factors in evaluation which produce satisfaction and dissatis-
faction.

To determine if the implementation of recommended evaluation
practices had a positive effect on principal professional growth
according to the judgments of principals and superintendents,
districts were sorted into two categories: Those which implement
a majority of the recommended practices (Group A) and those which
do not (Group B). The "Yes" responses to the question, "In your
judgment, is your principal evaluation system a major factor in
principals' professional growth?" were tallied separately for
principals and superintendents in each category, and the percentages
of those responses were calculated. These data are presented in
Table 6.

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGES OF PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS IN
GROUP A AND GROUP B WHO PERCEIVE A POSITIVE EFFECT
OF EVALUATION ON PRINCIPAL PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

|  | Group A | Group B |
|---|---|---|
| Superintendents<br>N = 20 | 87% (13)<br>N = 15 | 0% (0)<br>N = 5 |
| Principals<br>N = 52 | 56% (19)<br>N = 34 | 39% (7)<br>N = 18 |

If the percentages of both superintendents and principals or either superintendents or principals were higher in Group A than in Group B, it was concluded that the implementation of a majority of the recommended evaluation practices appeared to have a positive effect on principal professional growth according to the judgments of superintendents and/or principals.

According to figures in Table 6, 87 percent of the superintendents in Group A answered "Yes" as compared to none in Group B, and 17% more of the principals in Group A answered "Yes" than did those in Group B. Thus, the question may be answered affirmatively; the implementation of a majority of the recommended evaluation ractices does have a positive effect on principal professional growth, according to the judgment of both superintendents and principals, and a dramatically higher percentage of superintendents perceive this effect.

To determine if the implementation of a majority of the recommended evaluation practices has a positive effect on superintendents' and principals' expressed satisfaction with the principal

evaluation system, the categories of Group A (districts which implement a majority of the practices) and Group B (those which do not) were again used. The "Yes" responses to the question, "Are you satisfied with the quality of your present principal evaluation system?" were tallied separately for superintendents and principals in each category and the percentages of those responses were calculated. These data are presented in Table 7.

TABLE 7

PERCENTAGES OF PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS IN
GROUP A AND GROUP B WHO EXPRESS SATISFACTION
WITH THEIR PRINCIPAL EVALUATION SYSTEM

|  | Group A | Group B |
|---|---|---|
| Superintendents<br>N = 20 | 73% (11)<br>N = 15 | 0% (0)<br>N = 5 |
| Principals<br>N = 51 | 74% (25)<br>N = 34 | 47% (8)<br>N = 17 |

Again, if the percentages for both superintendents and principals or either superintendents and principals were higher in Group A than in Group B, it was concluded that the implementation of a majority of the recommended practices had a positive effect on the expressed satisfaction of the superintendents and/or principals.

A pattern similar to the previous question was apparent here. While 73 percent of the superintendents in Group A answered "Yes", none in Group B answered "Yes", and 20 percent more of the principals in Group A answered "Yes" than did those in Group B. Thus,

it can be concluded that the implementation of a majority of the recommended evaluation practices does have a positive effect on both the superintendents' and the principals' expressed satisfaction with the principal evaluation system.

As compared to the lack of positive effects from the use of Performance Objectives Systems, the implementation of recommended practices does appear to produce positive effects, both in terms of professional growth and satisfaction. It may be concluded from this, then, that while the structure of the evaluation system seems to make little difference, the various practices implemented in evaluating principals make a large difference in the effects of that evaluation. In this case, the difference in percentages of superintendents is much more dramatic than that of the percentages of principals; yet, in most cases, it is the superintendent who decides whether or not certain practices will be implemented. This circumstance raises a serious question as to why superintendents who do not implement the practices, yet are unanimously dissatisfied with their system of evaluation and do not believe it is a major factor in professional growth, still do not implement a majority of recommended evaluation practices. Their failure to do so is explored further in individual districts where this condition exists.

The last two specific questions regarding the effects of principal evaluation systems concerns the overall responses of superintendents compared to principals as to the effect on professional growth and to their satisfaction with the system.

"Yes" responses to the question, "In your judgment, is your principal evaluation system a major factor in principals' professional growth?" were tallied for all superintendents and all principals separately, and percentages for each group were calculated. Of the superintendents, 65 percent responded "Yes" as compared to 51 percent of the principals. Since the percentage of superintendents is considerably higher, it is concluded that superintendents judge their principal evaluation system to be a major factor in principals' professional growth more than do principals. It may be that superintendents have a broader perspective of the factors which effect principal professional growth than do principals. It is important to note that neither group perceived a high degree of influence on professional growth.

Finally, "Yes" responses to the question, "Are you satisfied with the quality of your principal evaluation system?" were tallied for all superintendents and all principals separately, and percentages for each group were calculated. In this case, 55 percent of the superintendents answered "Yes" as compared to 65 percent of the principals. Thus, it may be concluded that more principals express satisfaction with their evaluation system than do superintendents. That principals express satisfaction with their evaluation system more than do superintendents is surprising, in that superintendents generally have the authority to determine the type of evaluation system which is used to evaluate principals. The question is raised as to why, if they are not satisfied with the evaluation system, do nearly half of these superintendents

not implement a different system? This is explored further in the narrative analysis of such districts.

In this section of quantitative analysis, numerical data and frequency analysis have been used to answer the question as to what types of evaluation systems and practices are used in subject districts, and to analyze the factors which appear to influence the use of these systems and practices and what effects are perceived as a result of their use. In the section of narrative analysis, an attempt is made to go beyond the numerical findings to determine the specific aspects of evaluation systems in each district and to further analyze the causes and effects of this evaluation and the implications they have for evaluation of principals.

## Narrative Analysis

In addition to the findings of the quantitative frequency analysis of the evaluation of principals, two major sources of data were used in the narrative analysis of evaluation. These two major sources were in-depth personal interviews with fifteen superintendents and briefer interviews with fifty-two principals. For this analysis, districts were sorted into major categories of those which use Performance Standards Systems of principal evaluation, those which use Performance Objectives Systems and those which have no formal, written evaluation system. Using the eight different sub-categories of Performance Standards and four different sub-categories of Performance Objectives from Part II of the superintendent questionnaires (Appendix A),

districts were sorted according to the specific type of system

within the area and grouped in sequence from one to eight in

the first area and from nine to twelve in the second. The two

districts which had no formal, written evaluation were dealt

with as a third and separate major category. Districts were

numbered from One to Twenty in this sequence for the purpose

of identification in the narrative analysis. Because of the

confidential nature of the interviews, this numbering system

is the only identification or citation used. Also to insure

confidentiality, the masculine referent is used exclusively,

and, in each district, the plural number is used when referr-

ing to principals. The various numerical data for the twenty

districts are summarized in Appendix D.

Beginning with the first of the districts in the sequence

of Performance Standards Systems and proceeding through the

sequence of Performance Objectives Systems, each district was

first examined individually according to the specifics of its

evaluation system and practices, and the reasons why they do

what they do and the perceived effects of evaluation were then

analyzed. For those districts with no formal, written evaluation,

the informal evaluation practices were examined and the cause

and effect of what evaluation were explored. The narrative

analysis of the various districts varies substantially in

length according to the depth and quantity of data available.

Of the six districts which used some type of Performance

Standards System to evaluate principals, none used any of the

first five types of systems (which were highly unilateral and
subjective), three used Type Six, two used Type Seven, and one
used Type Eight. Districts Number One, Two, and Three indicated
the use of Performance Standards System Type Six: "The evaluator
and evaluatee agree on major areas of responsibility for eval-
uatee; evaluator rates evaluatee on his performance in each
major area; post-evaluation conference is held to discuss the
evaluation."

DISTRICT NUMBER ONE

This district, while meeting the criteria of System Six, had
a relatively unstructured system in actual practice. According
to the superintendent, school district policy does not include
a specific statement on principal evaluation, although it is
assumed that the superintendent is responsible for this evaluation.
Although there is no formally adopted, written procedure, a pro-
cedure for administrator evaluation does exist and principals are
aware of it. The superintendent used this procedure to evaluate
principals and urges them to use it to evaluate their administra-
tive subordinates. The system is based on a written principal
job description which is regularly revised and updated. The
items on this description constitute task areas, or organizational
objectives, which the superintendent and principals agree upon.
THe superintendent uses these task areas, plus items concerning
peronsal characteristics, as a guideline for appraisal. The
appraisal period is both short- and long-range, with emphasis
toward the end of each academic year. During the school year,

the superintendent rarely observes the principals in their
schools for the purpose of evaluation. He sees them frequently
at meetings in the Central Office and informally. He is aware
of their management of building affairs indirectly, and does not
feel that actual observation is always necessary to this per-
ception. For example, if he is involved in a teacher dismissal
case, and written evaluation by the department chairperson does
not document deficiencies of the teacher adequately, the super-
intendent infers that the principal has not done an adequate
job of training and supervising subordinates to conduct evalu-
ations. He receives information on the performance of the
principal from various members of the staff. He sees principals
frequently and is aware of their day-to-day performance.
Periodic informal evaluation conferences occur in the form of
discussion of the principal's handling of specific situations.
Toward the end of the academic year, the superintendent jots
down his observations on the principal's performance, using the
major task areas as a guideline. No rating form is used and no
formal written evaluation is prepared. The superintendent meets
with the principal and goes over the comments he has noted. This
post-conference follows a general format of "What are we trying
to accomplish?" and "How are we doing?" The superintendent
purposely arranges the setting of the post-conference according
to the formality and tone he wishes to establish. When he wishes
to establish a formal atmosphere with a serious tone, generally
to deal with a specific area of concern, he will ask the

principal to make an appointment to come to the superintendent's office for the purpose of appraising the principal's performance. During this conference, he limits discussion to the area of concern. He feels that if concerns, or negative aspects, are couched in praise of other aspects, the emphasis on the problem is lost. The degree of the superintendent's formality, directness and use of authority is specifically related to the degree of the concern, or negative aspect. When the principal's performance is outstanding or above average in all task areas, the post-conference is indirect and informal. The superintendent often makes a lunch or dinner appointment with the principal; the principal knows there is some purpose for the meeting, but the superintendent does not state that the purpose is for appraisal. In this informal setting, discussion revolves around the "How are we doing?" format, and is, for the most part, related directly to the individual principal's performance. These meetings, whether formal or informal, are held whenever the superintendent feels they are needed and are not restricted to one meeting at the end of the year.

Thus, there are written task areas of performance; the evaluator accumulates data, generally on an informal and subjective basis or from secondary sources; the evaluator makes a subjective evaluation of the principal's performance and notes these judgments; and some type of post-conference is held. However, no rating scale or written evaluation is prepared for the purpose of formal records.

In this district, only seven of the thirteen recommended practices are implemented; thus, the district was not included in the group which implemented a majority (at least eight of thirteen) of the practices. Whether or not a given practice was implemented was, for the most part, inherent to the structure of the evaluation system. A job description is used, principals are familiar with evaluation procedures, individual building needs are incorporated, and the evaluation is conducted yearly. Since there is no written record of evaluation results, there is no procedure for the principal to respond in writing or to appeal, for those results to be tied to pay raises or reassignment, or for in-service training to be tied to evaluation. The superintendent answered that he did have time to properly evaluation, and that answer was in response to the current evaluations sytem. Lack of time appears to be one of the reasons that the superintendent does not periodically visit and observe principals for purposes of evaluation. The evaluator does not have formal training in evaluation but stated that he believes he is competent in that area. Principals do participate in the development of the system by which they are evaluated. This participation of principals, as well as other administrators, is in fact a major reason behind the use of the evaluation system which is in effect.

In analyzing the reasons for the use of this system, it is important to note that both the superintendent and the school board would prefer a different type of evaluation. Both would

prefer a more structured, goal-oriented system which would result in a formal written appraisal. The superintendent would result in a formal written appraisal. The superintendent would like this system to be directly tied to pay raises, not for punitive purposes, but to insure administrative raises which are comparable to teachers' raises, which adhere to increases in cost of living indeces, and which give the administrator written, not just verbal, assurance of pay raises. He stated that this monetary factor may force him to implement a more formal system. At the same time, the board wants him to implement a more formal system, but not tied to pay raises. He continues to resist imposing a formal system because administrators strongly favor the system as it is. Principals, in their interviews, strongly favored the informal evaluation in effect. The superintendent observed that administrators feared that formal evaluation tied to pay raises would inhibit the positive team atmosphere they now have and create an unhealthy competitive atmosphere. The two principals and most other administrators have much longer tenure in the district than does the superintendent, and the current system was in effect when the superintendent was hired. This difference in length of tenure may also be a factor in his reluctance to impose change upon a system that is apparently functioning well.

Closely related to these factors is the influence of the size of the district on the type of evaluation system. The district is in the medium size category and has two principals.

Both principals and superintendent stated that their informal

system works well because they are small, see each other often,

and have a great deal of positive interaction which could not

occur in a larger district. Both stated that if there were more

principals they would have to have a more formal, written system.

The wealth of the district and principals' salaries may have

an indrect influence upon the principal evaluation system and the

fact that it remains relatively informal and unstructured. While

this community has a very high socio-economic ranking[1] and prin-

cipals' salaries are among the highest in subject districts, the

district is suffering, according to the superintendent, from

declining enrollment and loss of state aid due to the lower

enrollment and the Illinois State Aid Equalization formula.

These situations create several factors which may contribute to

the continued use of the informal Performance Standards System.

The superintendent noted that he, principals, and other adminis-

trators spend a great deal of time, beyond their usual tasks,

engaged in long- and short-range planning for declining enroll-

ment and budget management. The time-cost effectiveness of the

current system undoubtedly makes it more practical than imple-

menting a more time-consuming, structured system. Also, the fact

that the community, the board, the superintendent, and the princi-

pals themselves are apparently satisfied with the principals'

salaries and performance and feel that things are going well,

---

[1] Chicago Tribune, September 28, 1977, p. 16.

may be a reason not to change. Finally, if enrollment continues to decrease, it is possible that one of the two schools might be closed, necessitating the reassignment of one of the two principals as well as other administrators. This possibility might create apprehension in regard to a new and unfamiliar system of evaluation which would include written records of performance appraisal.

Another factor which may influence the continued use of this evaluation system in District Number One is that it is compatible with the management style of the superintendent. This possibility is inferred from statements made by one of the principals and by the superintendent in the interviews. The superintendent is confident in his ability to do his job well. He expressed the same feeling about the competency of the two principals, noting that they have very different styles of management but are both very good. It is his judgment that a principal (or a superintendent) is expected to be good at the job, and if he can't perform, he should "get out" or be released. He felt that self-evaluation is important and effective and should be an individual process but should not take the place of evaluation by a superior; people who are inadequate probably need someone to point out their shortcomings, according to this superintendent. The overall management approach in this district appeared to be one of positive team work, with the superintendent in a coaching role. He did not feel that recording negative aspects or taking punitive action helped a person perform better. He did feel,

and cited several examples, that a counseling approach was more productive. In such a counseling approach, he places direct and strong emphasis on the problem, and tries to get the person to recognize and correct the problem. He noted that recording or reporting the problem or withholding a pay raise would rarely help. Most problems, he finds, are of a personal, and not professional, nature. He maintained that only if this counseling approach did not work and the problem was severe should it be "written up," and in such a case the person should probably be released. Thus, the informal, inter-action system of evaluation is compatible with this superin-tendent's management style.

The perceived effects of evaluation were examined in two respects: 1) the effect of evaluation on principal professional growth, in the judgment of principals and superintendent, and 2) the superintendent's and principals' expressed satisfaction, or dissatisfaction, with the evaluation system.

In District Number One, neither the superintendent nor the principals felt that the principal evaluation system contri-buted to principals' professional growth. The superintendent stated that both principals are excellent in professional skill areas such as finance, building management, and the like. They are active and take leadership roles in principal organizations, attend workshops and conferences, and stay current on develop-ments in administration. In this respect, they are on their own to pursue specific areas of interest. According to the

superintendent, the problems which arise, and which are dealt with in evaluation, are of a personal nature and do not relate to professional skills. Thus, it would appear that the principals and the superintendent not only do not feel that evaluation contributes to professional growth, but do not expect that it will or feel that it should.

Consistent with the general findings in the quantitative analysis, the principals expressed satisfaction with the evaluation system while the superintendent was not satisfied with it. The cause of this perception is apparent in the reasons given for the type of system which is used; the superintendent uses the type of system the principals want instead of a more formal, written system he would prefer, but chooses not to impose. It is reasonable that the principals are satisfied with the system and the superintendent is not.

The implications for evaluation which emerge in this district are that, in relatively small districts where principals and the superintendent have a close, positive working relationship, where the principals have average years of experience and high salaries, and where administrators are pressured with declining enrollment and budget, an unstructured, informal evaluation system appears to be generally effective. These principals appear to have a great deal of autonomy to operate their buildings and to plan their own in-service and professional growth, yet they receive positive reinforcement from the superintendent for good performance and immediate verbal censure when something goes wrong.

This system is strongly favored by principals, although the superintendent and board, who are more concerned with account-ability, would prefer more structure and documentation.

DISTRICT NUMBER TWO

In District Two, which also indicated the use of System Six, a typical rating sheet is used to evaluate principals. Each of the thirty-five Performance Standards are rated on a scale from one to seven, from "Negative" to "Positive". Each of the three assistant superintendents rate each of the four principals and submit the forms to the superintendent. The superintendent compiles these ratings with his own to achieve the final rating. Each of the assistant superintendents works with the principals directly in various administrative areas and, according to the superintendent, have first-hand knowledge of certain areas which he does not have. The superintendent bases his judgments on what he knows is happening in the buildings, frequent phone calls with the principals, bi-weekly principal meetings, visits to the schools which he tries to make once a week, and attending activi-ties at the various schools. This rating is done by March 15 of each school year; a copy is sent to the principals, and a copy is placed in the principal's personnel file. Copies do not go to the school board. If the principal wishes to discuss the rating, he is free to do so, but he must initiate the conference. The superintendent stated that, in the fourteen years he has been there, no principal has ever objected to an evaluation or asked for a conference regarding the evaluation. If they were to dis-

agree with the ratings, their objections would be documented and attached to the superintendent's rating. The evaluation form includes a brief space for comments, but the superintendent stated that only positive comments are generally included. If any negative situation occurs, the superintendent deals with it directly at the time, either orally or by memo. It is not noted specifically on the evaluation form. While the superintendent encourages self-evaluation and assumes that it occurs, he would not expect to be apprised of that in writing. He does expect to see the results of it, however.

All but one of the recommended evaluation practices are implemented in District Number Two. Like most other subject districts, the system does not include a procedure for appeal to a higher authority other than the evaluator. Since no principal has ever objected to an evaluation in this administration, appeal has obviously not been an issue. Each year, at a principals' meeting approximately a month before rating occurs, the evaluation form is reviewed and the principals are free to request changes in the system, although they usually do not do so. Evaluation results are used indirectly and subjectively in determining pay raises. The superintendent uses a formula to determine a base dollar raise commensurate with teachers' raises. He then may add to the amount according to two factors: 1) where principals are young and their salaries are much lower than the highest paid principal, they receive a higher raise to "close the gap," and 2) when a principal has done an exceptionally fine job,

particularly if there has been a difficult situation to deal with, a bonus is added accordingly. Other practices, for example those tying remediation and in-service to evaluation results, do appear, on the basis of the superintendent interview, to be implemented, although this implementation is not formally structured as part of the system.

Analysis pinpoints two major reasons for the use of this evaluation system in this district. One is that evaluation of some type is required by board policy in general and in an administrative agreement specifically. The other major reason is that this is a system they are satisfied with and choose to use.

Unlike most districts, District Two has a formal Administrative Association to which all administrators and supervisors not in the teachers' bargaining unit, and excepting the superintendent, belong. This organization has a written agreement with the board. One section of this agreement states that administrators shall be evaluated by March 15 of each school year and notified of salary and assignment for the following school year by the end of March. Thus, the superintendent is required to evaluate principals by March 15. The specific system for this evaluation is not spelled out, either in the agreement or in the board's formal policy and procedures.

Both the superintendent and the principals find the rating format in this Performance Standards System efficient and, since evaluation must occur, this is the system they choose to use. A narrative evaluation system was used previously, but was replaced

by this checklist rating years ago because the narrative "didn't mean much." The superintendent stated that he felt there was little real value in Management by Objectives Systems. He stated, "MBO's are a lot like what you hear in education courses; it sounds good and looks good on paper, but doesn't accomplish much. Education really isn't very complicated; you must have good people, and good people know the objectives and keep shooting for them anyway." He felt that specific and unique objectives come into play only in special situations, such as establishing a new program of major change or dealing with major and unusual problems. One of the principals uses an MBO system to evaluate his subordinates and this practice is fine with the superintendent; he feels they should be free to use the evaluation system they prefer. The superintendent, however, prefers the checklist rating system because it is not time-consuming. While he gives serious thought to the ratings, they take little time. Both he and the principals felt that the real evaluation occurs informally and on a day-to-day basis.

Size, wealth and principals' salaries appear to be related, in some degree, to the evaluation system. This is a medium-sized district with four principals. While it is a relatively large district, the superintendent manages to have frequent contact with the principals and does not feel the need for a more complex documentary appraisal or goal setting process. It is a low-wealth district, and, consistent with quantitative findings, is more likely to implement recommended practices and less likely

to use Performance Objectives than higher wealth districts.  It
may be inferred that the cause is the time-cost efficiency of
Performance Standards and perhaps the effective results of imple-
menting recommended practices.  Principals' salaries are among
the highest of subject districts, again consistent with the
quantitative findings that districts with high salaries are less
likely to use Performance Objectives than are districts with low
salaries.  It may be inferred that higher salaries attract better
principals and that principals perform better when they are well-
paid; thus, with high level performance, less need is felt for
complex evaluation systems.  This inference was supported in the
interviews with principals and with the superintendent.  The super-
intendent repeatedly emphasized that he had outstanding principals
who were among the highest paid in the State.

Three of the four principals and the superintendent indicated
that they felt the evaluation system contributed to professional
growth.  Most associated the informal, day-to-day interaction with
the formal rating in terms of evaluation, and all felt that the
informal was the more important part.  All stated that the super-
intendent was quick to note and give credit for good performance
but was also very direct when criticism was warranted.  One prin-
cipal noted that "you'd better be able to hear the verbal cues;
they probably won't be detailed in writing."  Another noted that
the superintendent's non-verbal reactions were often the best
communication of his disapproval.  The principal who did not feel
that evaluation contributed to his professional growth differ-

entiated between the written rating and the informal interaction;
he felt strongly that the latter was what really made a difference
in his performance. From the interviews, it may be concluded that
the combination of the day-to-day interaction and coaching, com-
bined with the once a year "score card" does in fact contribute
to the professional growth of these principals as perceived by
the principals themselves and by the superintendent.

All four principals and the superintendent expressed satis-
faction with the evaluation system and practices. The system
works well for them and does not get in their way. All implied
that the written rating, the formal documentation, was a necessity
but not too important. In a memo attached to the yearly rating,
the superintendent stated (quoted with his permission):

> As you may readily see on your evaluation sheet, the
> ratings are predominantly 'high positive'. I'm really not
> convinced that checklist evaluations, or any other written
> ones, are of great value, but we are in an age when it seems
> that everything must be documented in some fashion.

Accordingly, the superintendent felt that the formal system could
be eliminated and it would not make much difference in the way
the district operated. It would make a great deal of difference,
however, if the day-to-day, informal evaluation were to cease.
The importance placed on informal evaluation is apparent in
another quote from the superintendent's memo:

> You may be assured that when I feel there is a serious
> concern I will talk with you immediately and directly, just
> as I hope to compliment you for your achievements at various
> times.

> There should be no doubt that I have the utmost respect
> for the administrators in the district office and for the
> building principals. Your cooperation and support through

the years with this office and for me have been exceptional and deeply appreciated. I do believe our district is unique in this respect, and I want to keep it that way.

The implications for evaluation found in District Two are much like District One, with highly paid principals of average experience who work closely, in a positive team effort, with the superintendent, yet are generally left to run their schools without interference unless something goes wrong. While there are twice as many principals in this district as in District One, the superintendent apparently manages to maintain close contact with them. Although the formal rating is not viewed with great importance, it is documented, and nearly all of the evaluation practices are implemented. Unlike District One, both principals and the superintendent perceive a positive effect on professional growth and are satisfied with the system, and the presence of simple documentation and recommended practices may be the reason for the difference. In districts such as these first two, it would seem that a relatively simple system of formal evaluation and a great deal of emphasis on informal, team-oriented contact and effort provides evaluation which is generally effective.

DISTRICT NUMBER THREE

In this district, third of the districts which indicated the use of Evaluation System Number Six, the two principals were interviewed, but the superintendent was not.

The Performance Standards Evaluation System in this district is tied very closely to the principals' job description. Near the end of the academic year, each principal meets with the assistant superintendent and they go over the twenty-five items on the

principal's job description, discussing the principal's performance
in each area. The superintendent may or may not joint in this
conference, but he indicates to the assistant superintendent his
assessment of the principal's performance in each area. After the
conference, a narrative assessment is written for each item on the
list of standards (no checklist rating is used), incorporating the
self-assessment of the principal from his conference comments, plus
the assessment of the superintendent and assistant superintendent.
Copies of this evaluation are given to the board and to the princi-
pal and one is placed in the principal's personnel file. Principals
may submit a written response to be attached to the evaluation, but
this generally does not occur.

This district indicated implementation of nine of the thirteen
recommended evaluation practices. It was the only one of the twenty
subject districts which did not implement the practice of principals
participating in the development of the system by which they are
evaluated nor the practice of using the unique needs of a building
as one criterion for evaluation. The twenty-five performance
standards are the only criteria. Like most other subject districts,
there is no system for review by a higher authority other than the
evaluator, and in-service training is not tied to evaluation results.
The other nine practices were implemented, though little data were
available for the specifics of their use.

Likewise, little data were available as to why these systems
and practices are used. Since principals do not participate in
developing the system by which they are evaluated, and since,

according to both principals, a very high priority is given to evaluation of all levels of personnel and of the school board itself, it is likely that this system was developed by the superintendent and assistant superintendent with approval of the board and, as such, reflects their choice of the type of system which should be used. As a small, low-wealth district, the use of Performance Standards is consistent with findings that such districts are less likely to use Performance Objectives and more likely to implement recommended practices than are larger, higher wealth districts. Again, it can be inferred that the time-cost factor of Performance Objectives Systems inhibits their use in low-wealth districts, and that small districts require less formal complex systems than do larger districts, although they implement recommended practices more than do larger districts. The salaries of the two principals in this district are among the lowest of all principals in the study, yet they are average with twenty-four years of experience in education. This fact is not consistent with the quantitative findings that districts with below average principals' salaries were more likely to use Performance Objectives than were districts with above-average salaries. Most other districts using Performance Standards tend to treat evaluation as a somewhat informal, low-priority item, while District Three has a highly structured, rigid evaluation system which is given high priority. This difference may account for its appearing to be unlike other low principal salary districts which tend to use Performance Objectives, a more complex, structured, time-consuming system.

The perceived effects of evaluation in this district were generally positive, based on questionnaire data; in-depth analysis was limited due to the lack of interview data. The superintendent and one principal indicated on the questionnaires that they felt evaluation was a major factor in principal professional growth; the other principal indicated that, while it did influence his professional growth, it was not a major factor. All three indicated that they were satisfied with the quality of the evaluation system. One principal stated that, while he was satisfied with the system, he felt it should be more comprehensive and that the written comments tended to be very brief and general.

This was the only district in the study where principals of average years of experience received lower than average salaries. There were insufficient data available to analyze this discrepancy which might be due to the principals' or superintendent's tenure in the district, the working relationship between them, their management style and ability, the influence of the board, or a variety of other factors. It does appear that, like most principals with below average salary, they are evaluated by a fairly rigid and controlling system, even though it is not a Performance Objectives System. Where principals received higher salaries, they tended to be left more on their own.

Two districts indicated the use of Performance Standards Evaluation System Number Seven in which "the evaluatee rates himself and the evaluator rates the evaluatee; these evaluations are discussed in a conference, but only the evaluator's rating,

which may or may not be modified as a result of the conference, appears on the completed forms." This system differs from System Six in that, as part of the formal system, the principal rates himself on the evaluation form prior to the conference. Neither of the superintendents in these two districts was interviewed, and the principals in only one of the two districts were interviewed; thus, very little data were available for in-depth analysis.

DISTRICT NUMBER FOUR

In District Four, where the two principals, but not the superintendent, were interviewed, the specifics of the evaluation system were difficult to identify. While there appeared to be some aspects of Performance Objectives Systems in terms of goal-setting, the yearly rating by the principals themselves and by the evaluator, followed by a conference, appeared to be the only written appraisal. According to the superintendent questionnaire, all recommended practices were implemented except that evaluation results were not used in determining job reassignment nor, like most other districts, were they tied to in-service training. This was one of two districts in the study which indicated that principals could appeal unfavorable results to a higher authority other than the evaluator, but no evidence of such a procedure was available.

It was also difficult to determine why this evaluation system was used. It is a small, medium-wealth district, with above average principal salaries. Consistent with quantitative findings, such districts are less likely to use Performance Objectives than are larger, wealthier districts with low principal salaries.

Because of the limited data, any inferences beyond this numerical data would be highly speculative.

The effects of the evaluation were also difficult to identify. On the questionnaire, the superintendent and one principal indicated that they felt evaluation contributed to principal growth and all three indicated satisfaction with the system. Yet, in interview, both principals had very negative reactions to the evaluation system and practices. Both referred to the system as an MBO system "on paper." They indicated that such a system could be an "effective tool," and that it was a good system. One indicated, however, that it did not accomplish anything the way they did it and that the final appraisal meant very little. In his words, "Why does it matter what your evaluation says? No one sees it anyway." The other principal who was very reluctant to discuss the district's principal evaluation system, said MBO systems could be good but that they had "negative" aspects as implemented in his district.

It is important to note that, at least in this district, questionnaire responses indicate one thing while further discussion of the same questions indicates a different situation. It appears that what in "on paper" and what actually occurs may be quite different. It seems likely that there is not common agreement and understanding of what will actually occur in evaluation in this district. It also appeared that a positive and trusting team approach to management was not present. As is the case in much research, little data are available to analyze situations which

are not successful, whereas in successful situations, the
personnel involved are anxious to discuss and report their
activities.

DISTRICT NUMBER FIVE

In District Five, where neither the superintendent nor prin-
cipals were interviewed, very few data were available. Beyond
the selection of System Seven on the questionnaire, no specifics
of the system are known. All recommended practices were imple-
mented except two: Like most districts, there is no provision
for principals to obtain a review, and, unlike most districts,
the evaluator does not periodically visit and observe principals
for the purpose of collecting data for evaluation. This district
is identical to District Four in that it is small, of medium
wealth, and pays above-average principal salaries. It followed
the same trends as other such districts. The superintendent
indicated that, in his judgment, evaluation was a major factor
in principal professional growth and that he was satisfied with
the quality of the evaluation system.

DISTRICT NUMBER SIX

This district indicated on the questionnaire the use of
System Number Eight: "The evaluatee rates himself and evaluator
rates evaluatee; both evaluations are discussed in conference;
both evaluations appear on completed form." While this definition
apparently describes the system of principal evaluation in previous
years, the superintendent interview revealed that principals were
currently being included in a highly structured Performance Objec-

tives System. This system had been developed by a curriculum director and used with teachers and division supervisors in recent years. At the beginning of the school year in which this study is based, a complete turnover of central office administrators occurred, including the employment of a new superintendent, and the promotion of the curriculum director to assistant superintendent of curriculum and instruction. The superintendent indicated that when he came into the job, he felt that the Performance Objectives System was a good one and chose not to disrupt it, but to use it for all administrators, including himself. Two of the three principals were interviewed, and from these data, it appeared that they were not clearly oriented to the new evaluation system. This lack of understanding was substantiated by the superintendent, who described a summer administrative workshop in which the full scale system was to be initiated. Since this new system came closest of all systems in the study to the highly structured Performance Objectives Systems recommended in the literature, and since it was in the process of being implemented, it is included here rather than past practice. Principals had been involved in some aspects of the new system during the school year just ended, but essentially it appeared that this had been a year of transition for principal evaluation. Principals were involved in one of the goals of the previous year which was to evaluate the evaluation system and adopt a formal system, the one which is described here.

While the principal evaluation system being implemented in

this district is definitely a Performance Objectives System, it goes beyond evaluation in that it is a management system which involves all personnel as well as the school board, the students, and the community. Thus, it is an action plan for the district and each employee's evaluation is a measure of his success in playing his role in that plan. Principals, then, are a part of the overall plan and assessment.

Early in the spring, a needs assessment for the district is conducted, with information gleaned from students, community members, teaching staff, administrators, and the school board. A committee of teachers and administrators compile this information. In a summer workshop, the administrative council extrapolates general district goals from this compilation under the direction of the superintendent. These goals are then approved by the board. Some of these goals involve district level efforts such as computer services, some relate to instructional processes, and some to student performance and behavior. A committee of certified staff members is formed for each goal, with a principal or division supervisor serving as chairman of each committee. Working downward through the chain of command, each staff member develops individual goals unique to their job.

Principals work with the superintendent to revise their job description and to set individual goals for themselves and for their buildings, incorporating the general district goals. In doing this, they take into account the needs indicated by students, parents and teachers from their buildings. At this initial stage,

a specific plan of action is detailed, with periodic assessment dates as well as a time for final assessment, generally toward the end of the academic year. this plan details not only what the principal will do, but also what the superintendent will do to assist him and support services he will need. In the initial conference, the principal establishes, with the superintendent, what measurement will determine whether or not a goal has been accomplished and at what level of performance (from minimal to beyond what was expected) it has been accomplished. Administrative in-service is part of this initial planning, including attending seminars and workshops, observing other people, and conferring with the superintendent or experts in the particular area.

Throughout the academic year, the principal collects data regarding his actions and accomplishments toward each goal. The superintendent visits each building for one to two hours at least twice a week, conferring with the principal and observing various activities and operations in the building. While these visits are not limited to the specific stated goals, they provide interaction, assessment of progress, and possible revision of the goals or the action plan. Any other current concerns which may not be part of the goal plan are dealt with at these times. The superintendent states that it is during these visits that he accomplishes the most in terms of praise, suggestions and, if the situation warrants, specific verbal criticism and/or direction. He also noted that the principals had been in their

positions for many years, were experienced and mature, and needed little direct supervision from him. For the most part, his visits are a matter of staying informed and reinforcing principal performance as opposed to giving direction and supervising their performance. Progress in accomplishing general district goals is discussed at least once a month in Administrative Council. Toward the end of the academic year, the principal compiles the data he has collected and writes a self-evaluation for each goal, providing narrative documentation of what has been accomplished and at what level, according to the initial criteria. This evaluation is strictly in narrative format according to goal statements and criteria, and no printed form is used. This document is submitted to the superintendent, who reviews it and adds comments based on his observations. A post-conference is held to discuss this final compiled assessment. The principal receives a copy and a copy goes into his file. If he disagrees with the final assessment, he may submit a written response which is attached. (While principals have not submitted such responses, other administrators have). This evaluation statement is not offered to the board, although they have the right to see it if they choose. The superintendent feels that maintaining the privacy of this document creates a non-threatening climate in which he can suggest change and receive positive reactions from the principal.

Pay raises, while determined somewhat subjectively, are also tied to the evaluation. Staying on a par with other schools

in the area, maintaining cost-of-living standards, and basic
increases form a standard raise index which a principal can
expect if he has met expectations.  If he has done less than
that, he may receive less than the standard, and if his perfor-
mance is inferior, his salary may be decreased, the board
notified, and he may be placed on probation, with specific
criteria for improving performance during the next evaluation
period.  If a principal has done an excellent job, far exceed-
ing expectations, he will receive a raise proportionately
higher than the standard.

Evaluation results, revised job description, and updated
needs assessments become the basis for the formulation of new
goals and the beginning of a new evaluation cycle.

All but one of the recommended evaluation practices are
implemented in this district, and, in most cases, a formal pro-
cedure exists to insure that those practices are implemented.
Data from principal and superintendent interviews substantiate
that these practices are, in fact, implemented.  (This situation
was not the case in all districts which indicated the implementa-
tion of the practices.)  This was one of the few districts in
which principal in-service training was tied individually and
directly to the evaluation process.  Like most other districts,
however, there is no procedure for principals to appeal unfavor-
able results to a higher authority other than the evaluator.

In the analysis of the evaluation used in this district, it
appears that the primary reasons for adopting this Performance

Objectives System are that the assistant superintendent has

developed it over a period of years, the new superintendent

approves of it, principals (as well as other administrators)

have had the opportunity to assess and adopt it, and the

board approves of it. The system is consistent with current

recommended evaluation systems as recommended in educational

literature and it appeared that both the assistant superinten-

dent and the superintendent had very thorough and recent know-

ledge and understanding of these procedures. On the basis of

a brief interview, at least one of the principals did not appear

to have such understanding, although an effort was apparently

being made to achieve this understnaind through in-service train-

ing and administrative workshops.

This is a small, low-wealth district; such districts, accord-

ing to quantitative data, were less likely to use Performance

Objectives than were larger, wealthier districts. This finding

would substantiate the previous assumption that the primary

reason for the use of Performance Objectives in this district was

due to the influence of the top administrators. In this district,

the principals were paid well below the average principals'

salary, and this finding was consistent with findings that such

districts were more inclined to use Performance Objectives than

were districts with above-average principal salaries. It is

important to note that salary data for principals were based on

principals' salaries as reported for the year prior to the

academic year of this study,[2] and that the new superintendent

had gone to the board for administrative raises at the beginning

and at the end of this academic year and was successful in obtain-

ing substantial raises both times based on comparative salary data,

cost of living indeces, and documented evidence of administrative

performance. While this action is not sufficient evidence to

support a conclusion, it suggests, at least, that superintendents

of districts where principals receive comparatively low salaries

may adopt Performance Objectives Systems because they do provide

factual, measurable evidence of principal performance and, thus,

support the superintendent's efforts to obtain raises for principals.

Since this system is in its formative stages, assessment of its

effects is somewhat perfunctory and premature. Questionnaire

results showed that the two principals who responded and the super-

intendent felt that the evaluation system contributed to principal

professional growth. Only one of the principals and the superin-

tendent indicated satisfaction with the system.

One principal was highly positive about the system. He des-

cribed the system of using objectives and felt that his personal

professional growth was closely correlated with the degree to

which he accomplished his goals. He stated that the entire staff

works closely together, knowing what is expected and "how the

game is to be played." He keeps his goal statements close at

hand and refers to them often. He emphasized his positive feelings

---

[2]
 Educational Service Region of Cook County, Research Report
#1001: Principals Salary Study, p. 20.

about the system and the fact that these feelings were not just because he happened to get a good evaluation.

The other principal, who indicated dissatisfaction with the system, referred to a two-part evaluation based on accomplishment of objectives and a rating scale based on the principal job description. Since there was no other mention of such a rating scale, it is assumed that he was referring to the previous system of evaluation. His primary complaint was the use of a "Merit Pay System" and the fact that he found out about evaluation results after the raise and that that should be reversed. This statement was not consistent with the superintendent's description of the system, and may have been a one-time situation due to the transition in the system and the fact that the superintendent went to the board twice in one academic year for administrative pay raises.

The superintendent was enthusiastic about the evaluation system and, thus, saw many advantages in it. Primarily, he felt that it enabled them all to "head in the same direction," knowing where they were going and accomplishing specific goals according to predetermined priority. He stated that the system promotes positive evaluation: "You can look for the good things and perhaps identify areas where you can do better. You can give strokes. If you look for the negative, then the system will be negative and threatening. This system has done away with appre- hension. It appraises performance, not the person." He stated that, although the system was very time-consuming to conduct

properly, it was worth it because it produced effective results.
He believes that an evaluation system will be effective and
perceived as valuable by evaluatees in direct proportion to the
evaluator's perception and communication of the importance and
value of the system.

The most important implication for evaluation found in this
district, particularly for districts which are adopting Performance
Objectives Systems, is found in the difference in the perception of
the two principals. For one, it is seen as a valuable tool; for
the other, it appears to be a source of frustration. It appears
that the one principal thoroughly understands the process and uses
it effectively, while the other apparently does not understand it,
or at least resists it for some reason, and, thus, is not able to
use it effectively. Performance Objectives Systems are complex
and do require a thorough understanding of the goal-setting
process if they are to be effective. Where this understanding
is not present, the system will probably not work effectively.
The failure of district evaluators to provide adequate in-service
for evaluatees when these systems are implemented is undoubtedly
a major reason for the dissatisfaction with such systems. If,
in addition to in-service, evaluatees are involved in the develop-
ment of the system, they are likely to have commitment to, as well
as understanding of, the system.

If this understanding is brought about for all administrative
staff, most of whom are evaluators as well as evaluatees, through
the planned in-service, the evaluation system in District Six may

well become exemplary of Performance Objectives Systems as recommended in educational literature.

The six districts which indicate the use of Performance Standards Evaluation Systems (including the one which is changing to a Performance Objectives System) tend to be small districts of low or medium wealth with relatively few principals. Most principals receive high salaries and have average years of experience. All but one of the principals and all but one of the superintendents expressed satisfaction with their evaluation systems, which are generally uncomplicated and require little time. The main emphasis in evaluation appears to be on informal, day-to-day contact and team effort. When problems occur, they are dealt with at the time, and are not likely to become part of any written record of evaluation. No large districts, no high wealth districts, and no districts where principals had above average years of experience reported this type of evaluation system. Thus, for districts similar to the first six described here, Performance Standards Systems, with heavy emphasis on informal evaluation, appear to prove satisfactory. The informal evaluation and climate of coordinated effort appear to be more of a contributing factor to this effectiveness than does the checklist rating which occurs once each year. Other factors which appear to be highly significant are that these systems are time and cost efficient, the districts are small enough for the superintendent and principals to be in close proximity and have frequent contact, the principals are evidently effective

enough in administrative skills that they do not require close
monitoring, the high salaries may attract highly skilled princi-
pals or they may motivate high performance, principals and
superintendents in most cases express esteem and positive feeling
for each other, and, perhaps most significant, the superintendents
and principals express satisfaction with their evaluation systems.
These factors which appear to produce satisfactory evaluation are
explored later in this chapter as they appear in other types of
districts and evaluation systems.

Twelve districts indicated the use of one of the four types
of Performance Objectives Principal Evaluation Systems as detailed
on Part II of the Superintendent Questionnaire (Appendix A). The
systems, from nine through twelve, are increasingly complex, compre-
hensive and goal-oriented. An introductory descriptor of all four
systems states that they "include the use of goals or objectives
which are formulated for each individual principal at the beginning
of the evaluation period. They may also include checklists of
prescribed characteristics." One district indicated the use of
System Number Nine, four the use of System Number Ten, five the
use of System Number Eleven, and two the use of System Number Twelve.

DISTRICT NUMBER SEVEN

District Number Seven was the one district which indicated
the use of System Number Nine: "The evaluatee completes a self-
evaluation form, including establishing goals for the next evalu-
ation period; completed form is submitted to evaluator, who adds
his comments as to accuracy of evaluatee's evaluation. Post-eval-

uation conference is held to discuss completed form."

In this district, board policy states that all personnel shall be evaluated, and the board has adopted a specific procedure and instrument for the evaluation of all administrators. It is a combination of checklist rating, self-evaluation and performance objectives.

By July first of each year, the superintendent fills out the fourteen item checklist, rating principals from 1 (Unsatisfactory) to 4 (Excellent). Each item has a general performance descriptor followed by space for comments. If a "Fair" or "Unsatisfactory" is given, a statement documenting that rating must be included. Space for narrative comment on potential for advancement (used primarily for lower level administrators and supervisors) and self-evaluation follows the checklist. Prior to the post-conference, the principal prepares a list of goals he wishes to pursue during the next evaluation period and assesses his overall performance as well as his progress on the previous year's goals. In the post-conference, usually held in July or Auguest, the superintendent and principal review and discuss the evaluation, and the principal's self evaluation is added to the form. They discuss whether or not the previous year's goals were attained and mutually agree upon new goals. The superintendent may suggest goals in addition or in place of those the principal has developed. The superintendent tries to limit the goals to three or four specific areas. Goals are in areas above and beyond the expected performance areas as stated in the job description, areas specific to

individual improvement or problem areas which need to be corrected. The superintendent perceives this process of goal setting as very important, perhaps the most important phase of the process. He noted that checklist ratings are almost always "Good" or "Excellent" for two reasons. One, it is expected that a principal be "good" or "excellent," or he should not be in the position. Second, since the superintendent, at least in this district, has probably selected the principal, he would, in a sense, be criticizing himself if he rated the principal less than "good."

Salary increases are based on a system, but this system is purposely not tied to the formal evaluation. When salary differentials are being determined, subjective, unwritten assessment of the principal's performance is a factor. The superintendent stated that he occasionally gives a principal a relatively small raise as an indication to him that he is not doing as well as expected. This deficiency may or may not be discussed and is generally not included on the formal evaluation. For the most part, principals receive similar salaries, with differences due only to seniority in the position.

The one summer conference serves as both pre- and post-conference, ending one evaluation period and beginning a new one. During the year, the principal is on his own to pursue his goals. Nothing is formally written or planned as to how he will achieve them. According to the superintendent, if principals attend meetings or conferences which happen to pertain to their goals, it is probably coincidental rather than planned.

The superintendent rarely visits the buildings, preferring instead the policy of being readily available to principals in his office. He meets regularly with the Administrative Council (which includes principals) in the district office, and during these meetings, he states, much is accomplished in the way of supervision and evaluation, though not on an individual basis. After the end of the academic year, the evaluation is filled out, a conference is held, and a new evaluation cycle begins.

This district implements only six, less than a majority, of the thirteen recommended evaluation practices. Unlike most other evaluators, this superintendent indicated that he did not have sufficient time in his schedule to properly conduct evaluation, he did not have recent training and competency in comprehensive, objective, goal-oriented evaluation procedures, and he did not visit and observe principals for the purpose of evaluation. Also unlike most other districts, specific remediation is not planned and implemented if evaluation results are unsatisfactory.

There appear to be several reasons why this type of evaluation system is used. The formal instrument and procedure were developed several years ago by a committee of administrators at the direction of the board. While the superintendent did not participate in that committee work, he approved the system, as did the board. The system is fairly general and adaptable for all administrative and supervisory personnel. Consistent with the trend of the influence of size on the evaluation system, this district, among the largest in the study, with several principals, uses a relatively structured, formal system which

includes performance objectives. Its result is a comprehensive, written assessment of the principal's performance, generally a very positive statement. A major reason that this system is used appears to be that the superintendent likes it. He says, "It's as good a formal system as you can have. The written evaluation is something that must be done and this system gets it done. Informal interaction throughout the year is much more significant. For most of us, the formal evaluation is just that: a formality. We could stop doing it and it wouldn't make much difference." However, since evaluation must be done, he perceives this as "as good a system as you can have."

The superintendent's comment that the formal evaluation system could be eliminated and it would not make much difference would seem to be a fair assessment of the effects of formal evaluation in this district.

The superintendent, on the questionnaire, indicated that he did not perceive the evaluation system as a major factor in principal professional growth and that he was not satisfied with the system. On the other hand, in the interview, he said that a formal, written evaluation had to be done and this system was as good as any. He indicated that real evaluation results were achieved through informal, day-to-day interaction. The interaction process of goal setting appeared to be the only phase of formal evaluation in which he perceived value.

On the principal questionnaire, slightly more than half of the principals indicated that evaluation contributed to their professional growth. From the interviews with this superintendent

and with principals in this and several other districts, it
appeared that professional growth was dependent upon the initiative
of the individual principal. Those principals who consciously
set goals for themselves according to their own perception, who
received and accepted suggestions from the superintendent for
improvement, and who purposely sought to meet those goals tended
to feel that evaluation contributed to their professional growth,
although they tended to perceive this process as separate from
the formal evaluation system.

All but one of the principals in this district indicated
that they were not satisfied with the formal evaluation system.
They did not echo the superintendent's feeling that, since it had
to be done, this system was as good as any. There was a very
strong feeling among principals that more value should be placed
on evaluation, that it should be more precise and rigorous, that
the superintendent should give more realistic and constructive
suggestions for improvement, and that the evaluation conference
should not be rushed through as something unimportant but which
had to be done. They were critical of the general nature of their
job description and evaluation categories. They felt that the
superintendent did not really know what was going on in their
buildings and relied on hearsay for data. There was a strong
reaction of wanting to hear, and see in writing, their specific
accomplishments as well as areas in which they could improve.
It is important to note that most of the principals in this
district have been in that position for many years, apparently
do not feel any threat to their job security, and are among the

highest paid of all principals in the study. While negative personal feelings toward the superintendent were not apparent, considerable frustration with the evaluation system was expressed. One principal commented, "In the evaluation conference, we have a nice chat, but that's about all it amounts to. It's all positive and you don't really know where you stand. We need more frequent contact and more open and honest communication." Most indicated that the system should be revised and felt the need for more, not less, interaction and evaluation from the superintednent. The perception of the formal evaluation system in this district reinforces the belief of the superintendent in District Number Six that evaluation is valued in proportion to the importance placed on it by the superintendent. Neither the superintendent nor the principals in this district place much value on their evaluation system, and the principals, at least, expressed a need for a meaningful system. The size of this district is undoubtedly the key to the problem here. The superintendent believes that the best evaluation occurs through frequent, day-to-day informal interaction and supervision. However, this interaction does not occur because the district is large, his time is restricted, and he rarely sees the principals in their buildings. Relying on them coming to him because "his door is always open" is not effective. The informal coaching approach which appears to be effective in smaller districts does not appear to work in this district and the reason is undoubtedly due to size and infrequent contact.

While District Seven was similar to most of the first six
districts in that it was of medium wealth, high principals'
salaries, and average years of principals' experience, it is
unlike those districts in several important areas other than the
different structure of the evaluation system. These differences
have important implications for evaluation practice. This is a
very large district, and, as might be expected, the structure
of evaluation was fairly complex, which would seem necessary to
coordinate the efforts of so many people in so many different
schools. Yet the system did not seem to be effective. In actual
practice, it did not require a great deal of time, so that would
not seem to be the problem. The principals receive high salaries
and are of average years of experience, so, according to the
trends found in the study, they could be expected to function
effectively without a great deal of monitored, documented assess-
ment; so that would not seem to be the problem. The problem
would appear to be due to lack of meaningful, honest interaction
with the superintendent (or some other evaluator) and the fact
that many of the recommended practices are not implemented. These
factors would seem to be attributable to the size of the district
and the fact that the superintendent has not delegated part of
his responsibilities to make time for principal supervision or
delegated the bulk of the responsibility for the supervision of
principals to an assistant. The superintendent stated that infor-
mal day-to-day interaction with principals produced the "real
results." Yet, he also stated that he did not get into the
buildings or work closely with principals except for meetings

in the central office. Most practices were not implemented because they were too time-consuming in this district. The superintendent was satisfied with the system because it was "as good as any," and he felt formal evaluation was just "a formality," anyway. Principals rarely received anything but positive comment from the superintendent. While they did not express negative personal feelings for him, they did express the desire for him to know what was going on in their buildings and to give helpful suggestions for dealing with problems. They apparently do not work closely with an assistant superintendent, have little opportunity to interact with each other, and have too little contact with the superintendent to meet this need.

This factor is highly significant for evaluation in large districts. Some provision must be found to provide this on-the-job, day-to-day involvement and interaction with principals. They do want and need feedback on their performance from another administrator whose administrative skill they respect.

Four districts indicated the use of Performance Objectives Evaluation System Number Ten: "The evaluator and evaluatee, in conference, establish mutually agreed upon performance goals for evaluatee, within his major areas of responsibility; evaluator rates evaluatee on his accomplishment of performance goals and performance in areas of responsibility, post-evaluation conference is held to discuss the evaluation."

DISTRICT NUMBER EIGHT

The specific evaluation system in District Number Eight was

very much like that in District Seven, except that principal
self-evaluation was not included. It was a combination of
checklist rating and performance objectives, and the objectives
were above and beyond the "givens" of the job description. The
checklist instrument, according to the superintendent, is used to
rate the principals on their overall administrative performance
as stated in their job description. An assistant superintendent
works with principals early in the year to develop mutually accept-
able objectives which are then submitted to the superintendent.
These objectives are generally limited to two to four and are
both measurable and observable. Some of the objectives are likely
to be in areas of general concern to the district. It is the
principal's responsibility to develop and write the action plan
for achieving the objectives; this plan is not submitted to the
evaluator. At the end of the academic year, a post-conference
is held with the superintendent to review the checklist rating
he has done and the attainment of objectives. Principal self-
evaluation is not included.

While the superintendent's questionnaire responses indicated
the implementation of nine, a majority, of the thirteen recom-
mended practices, some of these "Yes" responses were changed to
"No" or "To some degree" during the interview. Like District
Number Seven, this district purposely does not use evaluation
results to determine pay raises; pay raises are determined separ-
ately and subjectively by design. Also like District Seven, the
superintendent indicated that the evaluator did not have recent

training and competency in goal-oriented evaluation (although

he appeared in the interview to be very well verses on this

subject), and the type of in-service training is not determined

by evaluation results. Principals are not involved in the develop-

ment of the system by which they are evaluated. The system has

"evolved" over the years, and the present superintendent has

modified the system which was in effect before he came. He

plans to further modify the system and to provide more training

for principals in the use and effectiveness of the system.

In analyzing the reason for the use of the system, it appears

to be that it is what the superintendent wants to do. He is

gradually moving toward a more formal, Performance Objectives

System. While he intends to work with principals on the imple-

mentation of the system, principals will not be involved in its

development or modification. Some of this in-service work will

be delegated to the assistant superintendent. This district is

among the larger of the medium size districts and the use of

and movement toward the more formal Performance Objectives System

is consistent with other similar sized districts. The salaries

of principals in this district are among the lowest of those in

the study, and their average years of experience are among the

highest. Districts with lower than average principal salaries

are more likely to use Performance Objectives Evaluation Systems

than are districts with higher salaries. (Three fourths of the

districts with below-average principals' salaries use Performance

Objectives while less than half of those with above average

salaries do so." The cause is difficult to determine. There is
no significant correlation between the size nor wealth of a
district and the average principals' salary. Years of experience
do appear to affect the average principal salary: Six principals
with an average of 20.6 years of experience receive an average of
$34,583, eleven principals with an average of 25 years of exper-
ience receive an average salary of $35,075, and three principals
with an average of 31 years experience receive an average salary
of $33,983. Thus, those with relatively less experience and those
with relatively more experience receive lower salaries than do
those in the middle, and most principals of above- and below-
average experience are in districts which use Performance Objec-
tives Systems. It is logical that principals with less experience
would receive a lower salary and would be evaluated by a more formal,
complex and controlling system such as Performance Objectives. The
same logic would not seem to apply to principals with the most
experience unless such principals are declining in effectiveness,
perhaps due to a leveling-off of performance. It can be concluded,
however, that lower paid principals are subject to more formal,
comprehensive Performance Objectives Systems than are higher paid
principals who tend to be evaluated once a year with a checklist
or informally, and this is exemplified in District Number Eight.

As in District Seven, principals' perceptions of the effects of
evaluation in District Number Eight differ from the perceptions of
the superintendent. The superintendent believes that evaluation
contributes to principals' professional growth to some degree,

while only one of the principals felt that it did. This principal
indicated that his professional growth was due more to his own
efforts to achieve his goals than it was to the influence of
formal evaluation, however. The superintendent indicated that he
was satisfied with the evaluation system, although he was continu-
ally striving to improve it. One area he was working on was to
motivate principals to take the system more seriously, to "do it
right," and to accept the concept that working with the system
can make a real difference in their performance. He sees no value
in seeking input from principals themselves, their peers, students,
teachers or parents in assessing principal performance. Like most
other superintendents, he observed that much of real evaluation
was not written down but occurred informally on a personal basis.

The principals in this district, similar to those in District
Number Seven, were unanimous and emphatic in their dissatisfaction
with the system. All felt that the data upon which the evaluation
was based were inadequate. They felt that the superintendent was
not sufficiently involved in the goal-setting process, based assess-
ment on hearsay as opposed to finding out what was really going on
in the building (good as well as bad), and that principals should
have more input into the final assessment, either through self-
evaluation or in a conference prior to the final rating. One
indicated that there was no avenue of response if you disagreed
with your evaluation or pay raise. Another stated that he felt
frustrated and cheated after the evaluation conference, that it
was very general and complimentary and indicated no real knowledge

of what the principal was actually doing and gave no suggestions

of where performance could be improved. He made the point that

principals are expected to point out teachers' strengths and weak-

nesses in evaluation, but that the superintendent would not be so

candid with principals; "He expects us to take the heat, but he

won't take it himself." Two of the principals complained that they

had nothing in writing, although the superintendent referred to a

file of written evaluations.

As in District Number Seven, the principals in District Eight

are not satisfied with their evaluation system, while the superin-

tendent is. In contrast to District Seven, they receive low

salaries and have high years of experience. The district is not

nearly as large as District Seven, no larger than some of the first

six districts. However, the reaction of principals is nearly the

same: they appear frustrated because they do not feel that the

superintendent really knows what is going on in their buildings,

and they are not getting honest feedback on their performance.

Their lack of involvement in developing the system, their possible

lack of understanding of how it is to work, a possible lack of

mutual esteem, and the lack of self-evaluation seem to further

add to their dissatisfaction. It appears that, although some

responsibility has been delegated to an assistant superintendent,

he is not involved in all stages and is not providing the inter-

action or feedback principals want. The low salaries of these

principals, who have much experience and are not likely to move

to another district, undoubtedly add to their dissatisfaction.

These factors, then, are not necessarily due to the size of the district, but can create dissatisfaction with evaluation in any situation.

DISTRICT NUMBER NINE

This district, second of the four districts which indicated the use of System Ten, uses a carefully planned, comprehensive Performance Objectives System based on MBO Systems as used in industry. While System Ten was checked on the questionnaire, components of Systems Nine, Eleven and Twelve were also included as determined in the interview. The in-depth interview was conducted with the superintendent's designee, an assistant superintendent who has much of the day-to-day responsibility for evaluation and supervision of principals.

Prior to the beginning of a new evaluation cycle, before the end of the academic year, principals conduct a needs assessment for their individual schools. Various means are used for this assessment, including questionnaires to parents; meetings with faculty, students and building administrators; informal input from many sources; and the principal's own assessment. The results of the evaluation post-conference for that school year, held early in July, provide further direction for the principal in establishing goals. Near the time of this post-conference, the superintendent distributes an extensive packet to principals, detailing the evaluation system and presenting the calendar of important steps and dates in the process for the ensuing year. He reviews the process with principals in the post-conference as needed, and

distributes district goals which he has developed with the board
of education.

During the next few weeks, the principal prepares his draft of
goals for the following year. This draft includes personal and
organizational goals in areas of routine duties, problem-solving,
innovation and personal development. Specifics may vary from year
to year according to the needs of the district, for instance a
principal may be required to prepare two personal and two organiza-
tional goals and include specific target areas such as community
involvement and appearance and grooming. The principal writes
various steps he plans to take to achieve the goals, and to esta-
blish criteria for determining accomplishment. This action plan
is to include sub-steps which may be assessed periodically through-
out the assessment period, and the date when he feels the goal will
be met. The superintendent also notes specific goals which he sees
as important for each principal, incorporating suggestions from
other central office administrators.

Before the first of October, the superintendent meets with
principals individually to review the written goals. The superin-
tendent and principal arrive at mutually acceptable goals, the action
plan for achieving the goals, periodic assessment dates, and criteria
for determining achievement. The superintendent notes specific
support services which he and other central staff will provide
(these items become part of the superintendent's goals). The
entire plan is reviewed according to criteria listed in the evalu-
ation packet, which includes details of the process as well as its
rationale.

Direct principal supervision is delegated to an assistant superintendent who works closely with principals throughout the year, not only on goal attainment, but on routine management problems and details.  He keeps a file for each principal, with documentation of all contact, from phone calls from parents to letters of commendation.  He conducts weekly meetings with the administrative council which consits of principals and central office administrators, including the superintendent.  At each meeting he asks different principals to share with the others various things they have done which have been particularly effective, and the most outstanding are included in a packet for the school board.  These meetings may take the form of in-service which is directed at district goals, and which principals are expected to disseminate in their buildings.

At least twice during the year, the superintendent meets with the principal and/or the building administrative team and the assistant superintendent to review progress toward the principal's personal and/or building (organizational) goals.  At these confer- ences, goals, action plans and target dates are assessed and revised as necessary.

At the end of the academic year, the principal is asked to prepare a self-evaluation assessing his performance and accomplish- ment for each specific goal.  The assistant superintendent submits data to the superintendent based on the principal's file, obser- vation and any other pertinent information.  In the post-conference, the superintendent reviews this report with the principal in detail,

noting failures and accomplishments and analyzing reasons for any failures. No final assessment or rating document is written or placed on file.

According to the superintendent's questionnaire responses, nine (a majority) of the thirteen recommended practices were implemented. The four "no" responses were primarily due to the fact that they dealt with evaluation results, and, in this district, more emphasis is placed on the overall and ongoing process than on specific results, and final assessment is not rated, written or filed, although it is discussed often and in depth. Pay raises are not directly related to evaluation results, although a merit factor is included in the complex system used to determine raises. The standards for the amount of raises given in this district are fairly constant, but the time span between raises creates a real differential. Principals do not receive an annual raise, but are rewarded financially within a ten to twenty month time span. Thus, if a principal's performance is less than expected, he may have to wait nearly two years for a raise, but if he shows definite improvement or consistent excellent performance, he may receive a raise after ten months. This salary plan appears to be a highly motivating factor for high-level performance without being punitive. Submitting written responses or appealing unfavorable evaluation results is not a factor, since evaluation results, other than the self-assessment prior to the post-conference, are not written. According to the assistant superintendent, any such disagreement would

be worked out privately in conference with the superintendent. He said that if the system is working well, there is no need for rebuttal or appeal, and if that were to occur, it would indicate poor communication, lack of honesty in interaction, lack of trust in the superintendent, and less than adequate understanding and implementation of the system. While in-service training is not tied to the individual principal's evaluation results, it is planned very carefully according to general district goals and problems common to most buildings which are part of a principal's individual goals. As such, this practice is probably even more commendable in that it works toward goals as opposed to dealing with deficiencies. Thus, nearly all of the recommended practices are implemented in this district, at least on an informal or unstructured basis. The questionnaire response indicated that principals were involved in the development of the system, but in the interview, it appeared that this involvement was probably limited to principal's discussion of the evaluation procedure in administrative council or with the superintendent.

Administrative evaluation based on management by objectives was the topic of a doctoral dissertation written by an assistant superintendent in this district in the early 1970's. The superintendent approved of the system recommended in that study, and made the unilateral decision that it would be used to evaluate all administrators in the district. This preference of the superintendent would seem to be the primary reason for the continued use of the system. Other causative factors are those which are

consistent with findings of the quantitative analysis: This is among the largest of the districts, with several principals; it is a district of medium wealth, and the principals are below-average in salary and in years of experience. Such districts tend to use Performance Objectives. Because of the size of the district, the superintendent has sufficient central-office staff that he can delegate much of the responsibility for direct supervision and evaluation of principals to an assistant superintendent. This designee appears to engage in a great deal of informal interaction, coaching and subtle direction of principals according to need. Some receive and/or want much more direction and feedback than do others, and he accommodates this difference in style to the extent that performance meets expectations.

The effects of the evaluation system in District Nine are generally positive. While the specifics of the formal system do not vary greatly from the previous two districts discussed, the way it is carried out, the importance it is given, and its effects are much different.

The superintendent and a majority of the principals felt that the evaluation system contributed to their professional growth. Some principals tended to separate evaluation from the MBO system of management, even stating that they were not evaluated. All felt, however, that formulating and working toward objectives helped them to grow professionally.

The superintendent indicated on the questionnaire that he was not satisfied with the system of evaluating principals in his

district. As this dissatisfaction was explored in the interview with the assistant superintendent, he indicated that, while the superintendent continued to be enthusiastic about the effectiveness of the system itself, he was dissatisfied with it operationally for two reasons. One, it is very time consuming when conducted properly and is sometimes neglected because of the time factor. Evaluation should be given higher priority and adequate time in order to achieve desired results. Secondly, the superintendent perceives that principals are not entirely satisfied with or committed to the system. He believes that some need more training in and understanding of it theoretically and operationally, and some simply need to give it higher priority as a management technique both in managing their own resources as well as those of their subordinates.

All but one of the principals indicated on the questionnaire that they were satisfied with the evaluation system. The one who was not satisfied was critical of the way the final phase of the system was implemented, not the system itself. He felt that the final phase should include a formal, written appraisal of the extent to which objectives were achieved and that this appraisal should be placed in the personnel file. He stated that the post-conference is very informal, without dealing with specific outcomes, and that it is occasionally not held. He felt that if earlier phases are to be taken seriously, the final phase must be empha-sized equally. Some of the positive comments included the value of self-assessment and goal setting with the help of the assistant superintendent and superintendent; the frequent informal, oral

assessment of how things are going, and the open team approach—discussing with other administrators what is good and what needs to be done to improve the school.

There appear to be several factors which produce positive effects in this district as opposed to Districts Seven and Eight which use similar systems. One is that there is a conscious effort to implement nearly all of the recommended practices. Secondly, the system is valued highly by the superintendent, who also appears to place equal importance on informal, frequent, positive interaction as well as honest communication, trust, team effort and rewards for good work. The difference here from other large districts is that the superintendent apparently recognizes that he does not have time for adequate contact with all principals and delegates this responsibility to an assistant superintendent who spends a great deal of his time in this task and acts as liaison between principals and the superintendent. The superintendent does devote personal attention to goal setting and periodic conferences. The superintendent's policy of not writing a final assessment is evidently in keeping with that of other superintendents that written negative assessment is destructive and accomplishes little, and general positive assessment alone is meaningless. In this respect, the actual evaluation procedures in this district do not appear to be consistent with written procedures in the evaluation packet, which at least some of the principals would like to see implemented. The following basic rules which are listed in the evaluation packet are apparently not being implemented:

a. Some sort of measuring device should be determined for future goals;

b. The post-conference should not be rushed; enough time should be scheduled to allow a thorough discussion of the situation; and

c. At the close of the post-conference the manager should summarize the appraisal indicating the strengths and weaknesses, agree upon tentative action steps to secure improvement, and provide a written statement summarizing the conference.

This system comes very close to systems which are most highly recommended in the literature with the exception of adequate emphasis on the final assessment phase. While most of the principals are apparently satisfied with the private, oral conference, at least one notes that as a deficiency. If, as noted in this district's evaluation procedures and by the superintendent in District Number Six, assessment is restricted to task-oriented goals and does not include personality traits, and if the written assessment is treated as confidential information between the evaluator and the evaluatee, then it may be possible to produce a final written assessment which is non-threatening and of real assistance to the principal.

The positive factors of evaluation practice in District Nine are summarized later in this chapter in conjunction with those in Districts Ten and Eleven.

DISTRICT NUMBER TEN

District Number Ten, which also uses evaluation System Number Ten, uses no standard evaluation form, and does not rate principals in areas or "expected" tasks as listed in the job description. Evaluation is tied specifically to mutually agreed upon goals which are "target" areas for the year. The superin-

tendent meets individually with the two principals at the begin-

ning of the year to determine these goals. Some are personal

goals, unique to the principal's building, and some are general

district goals toward which everyone works. While the goals are

written down, no specific action plan is written or detailed, nor

is a measurement of goal accomplishment specified.

Since the superintendent's office is in one of the buildings,

he states that he is probably more aware of the day-to-day acti-

vities in that building than in the other. However, he maintains

an office in the other building and spends one full day each week

there, plus frequent additional visits. He has frequent informal

contact with both principals and regular meetings with the super-

intendent's cabinet, composed of the two principals and three

central office administrators, where progress toward goal accom-

plishment is regularly discussed. Through his meetings with the

assistant superintendent of curriculum and instruction, he gains

insight into each principal's performance in that area. He

emphasizes that evaluation is an ongoing process, that evaluation

is occurring in every contact he has with a principal or any aspect

of his school. He encourages principals to attend seminars and

seek out information to assist in goal attainment. In the cabinet

meetings, he regularly asks, "What have you done (in the areas of

a given goal)?" "What have you learned?" "Tell us about it." In

private meetings with principals, often when they come to him

with a problem, he encourages them to analyze and solve the

problem for themselves, with his comments limited to such things

as "Have you considered...?" or "That sounds good, like it would work." He stresses that being a good listener and giving positive feedback are highly effective techniques in evaluation and supervision.

At the end of the academic year, the superintendent meets in a fairly lengthy conference with each principal to discuss goal accomplishment. He then summarizes this conference in a two to three page report, including the principal's perceptions as well as his own. He has the principal review the summary to see if he agrees that it is a fair assessment of the conference. Both sign this report, the principal receives a copy and a copy goes in his file. According to the superintendent, the principal is free to add anything he wishes, but no principal has yet done so. He attributes this apparent agreement to his efforts to write a comprehensive report of the conference.

Like most other districts, there is no procedure for the principal to appeal evaluation results, and apparently no need is felt for such a procedure. The superintendent stated that principals could, if they chose, go to the school board to appeal their evaluation, but that no one had ever done so. He felt that if he did an adequate job of evaluation and was sensitive to any dissatisfaction or lack of communication, principal appeal would not be an issue. The only other recommended practice which is not implemented in this district is tying evaluation results to pay raises. The superintendent feels this system is as it should be, and that he uses his subjective assessment of job performance,

as well as several other factors, in determining what a principal's raise is to be.

According to the superintendent, when he came to this district, there was no formal system for evaluating principals. He implemented the present system, which he has been using successfully for at least thirty years—"before people were talking about MBO." He stated that at least once a year he reviews the system with his cabinet, and they continue to indicate that they are satisfied with the system as it is, and do not wish to change it.

This is a district of high wealth, low principal salary, and one of the three small districts which indicated the use of Performance Objectives. The principals have above average years of experience in education. While most small districts did not use Performance Objectives, most high wealth, low salary, high experience districts did. It did not appear, however, on the basis of the superintendent interview, that size, wealth, salary or experience were causative factors in the type of system used here. The superintendent believes in the system, has been developing it over a long period of time, and it apparently works well. He does not use the system because of its current popularity, but takes some pride in the fact that he started using it many years ago. He says it is a practical, uncomplicated approach and is, in his experience, equally effective with a large or small number of evaluatees. He stated that when he had ten principals to evaluate in another district, he delegated to others many of the tasks he now assumes, but that he would not delegate the frequent, informal

contact or goal setting process with people who report directly to him. This evidence supports the premise that the superintendent's influence is the primary causative factor in the use of Performance Objectives in this district.

The superintendent and one of the principals felt that the evaluation system was a major factor in principal professional growth. The one principal who did not concur supported his response by saying that he had not taken courses as a result of evaluation and that his professional growth was due primarily to self motivation. This viewpoint is probably not inconsistent with the superintendent's theory of evaluation; he appears to view self-motivation as an important effect of evaluation and, in fact, promotes it.

Both principals indicated their satisfaction with the evaluation system. One felt that other dimensions, such as staff evaluation of the principal, might improve it. The other was highly enthusiastic and stated that it was extremely helpful to him to be able to have extensive interchange of ideas with the superintendent. He said the system was practical, low-key, non-threatening, and enabled them to "get the job done" because they all knew where they were headed. Although the superintendent indicated on the questionnaire that he was not satisfied with the system, he stated in the interview that this dissatisfaction was because he did not believe you should ever be "satisfied" with anything in education, that there was always room for improvement in even the best of processes.

It is significant that these two principals with above aver-
age years of experience and below average salaries are very
positive, not only about their evaluation system, but about the
overall working relationship. This situation would appear to be
a strong reinforcement to the previously stated conclusion that
frequent, honest, positive, informal team effort is a highly
important factor in effective evaluation systems. The superin-
tendent stated that even his formal system is very informal, that
if two people can sit down and talk about something, agree on
where to head and what they should do, then you could probably
eliminate the formal, written aspect. Sometimes, he says,
paperwork can be a barrier to getting things done. The positive
factors of this evaluation system are summarized later in this
chapter in conjunction with similar factors in Districts Nine
and Eleven.

DISTRICT NUMBER ELEVEN

District Eleven, the last of the four districts which indi-
cated the use of System Number Ten, employs a checklist rating
system similar to District Eight as well as a Performance
Objectives System.

The principal rating form used in this district includes
eleven areas of principal responsibility with four to seven speci-
fic items within each of these areas. Each item is checked M
(Meets or surpasses), N (Needs Improvement), or NA (Not Able
to Assess). This rating form parallels the items in the principal
job description.

At the beginning of each academic year, the principal generates a list of objectives, including items noted in the previous evaluation. The principal and superintendent review the objectives together. Routine, maintenance items are eliminated. Goals are above and beyond the job description (with the exception of specific problem areas) in areas which can produce observable, measurable improvement of the individual principal's performance or in the overall system. Once goals are stated, it is the principal's responsibility to work toward them; no written action plan or time line is developed. Throughout the year the superintendent is in each building once a week or more. He hears of and observes the decisions principals make, the activities that go on, the grievances that are filed and the like. He feels that it is important not to be in the school too much; he does not want the principal or the staff to feel that the superintendent is running the building. He strives to maintain "full communication" and cooperative effort with principals on an ongoing day-to-day basis, noting that this process is essential to effective evaluation.

At the end of the year, the principal and superintendent meet to discuss the year's performance and the degree to which stated goals were attained. The superintendent then writes a narrative evaluation on goal attainment, which the principal reviews. The superintendent rates the principal on the checklist and conducts a final conference to discuss both parts of the evaluation. The principal is free to react to the final assessment at this time. Copies of both parts of the final evaluation

go to the principal, his file, and, unlike most districts, to the board of education. Salaries are determined at this point. Everyone receives the same base percentage raise, with a range of one to three percent added according to the degree to which expected performance was surpassed. This additional amount is determined subjectively by the superintendent on the basis of evaluation results; no point system is used to coørelate the two. In addition to the formal evaluation results, the superintendent writes a comprehensive, personal letter to each principal at the end of the year, summarizing his overall assessment of the principal's performance and suggesting areas for improvement. This letter, unlike formal results, is confidential. The superintendent stated that he expected the principal's list of goals in the fall to include the suggestions from that letter.

According to the superintendent questionnaire, all of the recommended practices are implemented with the exception of a procedure for appealing unfavorable results to a higher authority. The interviews with principals and the superintendent would substantiate this with one exception as noted by the superintendent: principals do not and have not participated in the development of the system by which they are evaluated.

This superintendent has been in this district one year and he implemented this system when he came. He had developed the system in previous districts and found it successful. When asked how he initiated the system with principals in this district, he stated, "I just told them. I told them this is the way it's

going to be." As in District Number Ten, there is little doubt
that the reason this system is used is that it is a system the
superintendent chooses to use; he has developed it and found it
effective, and sees no reason to change it. He stated that he
has found, in the past, that principals prefer this system after
they have gone through it and found that it is a painless process,
that it is not "high-powered," that they can be comfortable with
it, that it is based on honest communication, and that it is
efficient. The superintendent believes this system is efficient
regardless of the size of the district, which explains why this
small district, unlike most other small districts, used this
Performance Objectives System. The fact that this district is
of low wealth and low principal salary does not seem to be a
causative factor. It is important to note that this particular
system does not demand a great deal of the principals' or super-
intendent's time, and, thus, is time and cost efficient for any
situation.

In response to an interview question as to whether it would
make much difference in the way the school system functioned if
formal evaluation were discontinued, the superintendent was
emphatic in his belief that formal, written evaluation is
necessary. He believes that people must have specific goals
in order to improve, otherwise they simply coast along, and that
is not the type of operation he wants. He believes that all
people need honest feedback from others on how they're doing
and to what degree they're doing it. This feedback serves as
a stimulus, he feels, to conscientious people, and promotes

personal and organizational growth.

In keeping with the superintendent's perception of the effectiveness of this evaluation system, principal's reactions to it were primarily favorable. Only one of the two principals indicated that the evaluation system was a major factor in his professional growth, but the other noted that it was one of many factors and, thus, not major. He noted that evaluation definitely did motivate him to improve his performance. Both principals, who have been evaluated by a variety of systems in the past, indicated satisfaction with the present system. Both noted that they knew what was expected of them and what they would be evaluated on and that they worked with the superintendent to set goals in advance and to assess attainment at the end of the year. Both stated that they valued the superintendent's suggestions for areas of improvement and that they felt the system was fair and objective.

Districts Nine, Ten and Eleven have several positive factors in common which are important to the evaluation process. These factors tend to be those which are lacking in Districts Seven and Eight and which lead to dissatisfaction where they are lacking. Common positive factors exist in the last three districts despite some distinct dissimilarities in the districts: one district is very large, with many principals and two are small with few principals; principals in one small district have above average years of experience while the other two have below average; the superintendent in one district is new to the district while the

other two have many years of tenure; the age and management
style of the three superintendents vary greatly. Some of the
similarities of these districts may or may not have a bearing
on the effectiveness of evaluation: all are of low to medium
wealth, they do not appear to be dealing with problems of chang-
ing enrollment patterns, and all principals receive below average
salaries.

There are several common positive factors in these districts
which contribute to satisfaction with evaluation. One very
important factor evident here is that these three districts
implement nearly all of the recommended evaluation practices as
compared to relatively few in Districts Seven and Eight. While
the specifics of the evaluation systems in Districts Nine, Ten
and Eleven vary, all have been developed and found effective over
a period of years by the superintendents. The superintendents
value these systems, take pride in them, and place a great deal
of importance on them. While principals in these districts have
not been involved in developing the systems, they have the oppor-
tunity to review them and receive training in them as needed.
They also see value in the systems and place importance on the
process, if not, in all cases, to the degree that the superinten-
dents do. While the system in the larger district is more complex
and time-consuming than are those in the other two districts,
each of these superintendents sees that sufficient time is devoted
to the process for it to be effective; they do not neglect it.
At the same time, they express concern for the amount of time

principals have to devote to evaluation. In the larger district,
an assistant superintendent spends a great deal of time super-
vising and evaluating principals, as do the superintendents in
the other two districts. Documentation of negative results is
de-emphasized, with problems being dealt with privately and
confidentially (much as was found in Performance Standards
Districts). Most importantly, in each of these districts, princ-
cipals work closely with peers and a superior; they set mutual
goals; they receive guidance in growing professionally; they
evaluate themselves; the evaluator listens to, reacts to and adds
to that evaluation; attention is given to reaching consensus on
final comprehensive assessment whether or not it is written; and
each principal receives feedback from a superior whose adminis-
trative skills he respects and who is thoroughly familiar with
the principal's overall performance. Regardless of the conditions
of the individual district, these factors appear to be of primary
importance to effective evaluation of principals.

Five of the twenty subject districts indicated the use of
Evaluation System Number Eleven, which is the same as System Ten
except that the "evaluatee completes a self-evaluation prior to
conference with his evaluator; evaluator places his evaluation
on same form with evaluatee's; both evaluations are discussed in
post-evaluation conference."

DISTRICT NUMBER TWELVE

The first of the five districts using System Eleven, District
Twelve, although indicating the use of the system, in actuality

used a system based mostly on a checklist rating, with little attention given to setting and writing goals or the manner in which they were to be achieved.

Each spring, principals prepare a self-evaluation on a standard checklist form which includes a section for narrative assessment in each area. The superintendent fills out this form, also. He bases his assessment on any input from the board which he feels is valid; input from assistant superintendents; calls and communication he has received from parents, students and teachers; and other informal observation and hearsay. He rarely visits the schools during the day, but sees the principals in meetings, at athletic events, and, at times, socially. The principal and superintendent meet to discuss the assessments they have conducted prior to the conference. After the conference, the superintendent prepares a final assessment on the same form, taking the principal's assessment into account, but making final decisions himself. This form is signed by both, the principal receives a copy, and a copy goes in his file. The principal's self-evaluation is not retained. If the principal did not agree with the final formal assessment, he could respond and this response would be attached to the evaluation. However, such a response has not occurred in the ten years this superintendent and the two principals have worked together. Salary increments are based on a numer of factors, and the superintendent takes evaluation results into account. While the evaluation conference lets the principal know what to work on for the following year, he may

or may not write these things down as goals. According to the superintendent, goals are generally not written.

This district implements only seven of the thirteen recommended practices. Evaluation results are not used specifically in determining pay raises. Reassignment is apparently not a factor, since according to the superintendent, "These principals are an institution in themselves. I couldn't change their assignment or remove them if I wanted to." Like most districts, there is no procedure for appealing evaluation results. The superintendent does not have recent training and competency in goal oriented evaluation, nor does he visit principals periodically for the purpose of evaluation. No remediation or in-service is planned on the basis of evaluation results.

The reason for the use of this particular system was difficult to determine. According to the superintendent it was developed by him, the two assistant superintendents, and the principals some time ago and they continue to use it. One factor, as noted by the superintendent, is that it takes very little time and does not create any problems. The fact that there are only two principals and that the principals and superintendent have worked closely together for many years, and "have no problems" is probably another factor. The superintendent noted that one principal will retire soon, and that when there is a new principal, he will have to devote more time to that principal's evaluation. He also indicated that the retiring principal, under the early retirement plan, may devote his part time employment the subse-

quent year to the development of a new administrator evaluation system. While the superintendent did not have any specific ideas for what this new plan should be, the principal himself did have, and the system he has in mind would be very close to System Eleven to which this district apparently pays only lip service at this time.

This is a medium sized district of medium wealth. The principals are among the lowest paid in the study and among the highest in years of experience. In this instance, the lack of emphasis on formal evaluation might be due to the fact that principals are highly experienced. The superintendent noted that he felt the principals might be apprehensive about a more highly structured, documented evaluation system because "it could be used against them or hurt their salary." While it is true that, overall, principals' salaries tend to be lower in districts using Performance Objectives, and it is also true that this system is not actually a Performance Objectives System, the existing system has certainly not had a positive effect on principal salary level.

This was the only district in the study where the principals' and superintendent's perception of the effects of evaluation were unanimously negative. None of them felt it contributed to professional growth and none of them was satisfied with the system. The superintendent was aware that the principals were not satisfied with the system and stated that they had discussed their dissatisfaction although they have not changed it yet. He mentioned twice that the retiring principal would probably work on revising the

system. He stated that the principals probably would just as
soon not have evaluation, that they don't value it, and would
probably perform in about the same way if they had no evaluation.
The principals, however, indicated that they would like to have
an evaluation system which was more meaningful, to have the
superintendent more involved, to have more contact with him, and
to have him know more about what they are doing so he could pro-
vide them with positive feedback and suggestions for ways to
improve their performance.

The similarities between this district and District Eight
are worth noting as a possible key to factors in unsatisfactory
evaluation systems. Both districts are medium sized, of medium
wealth, low principal salary and high years of experience. In
both districts, it appeared that little time or attention were
paid to evaluation. The systems and relatively few practices
which were indicated appeared to be more a matter of paying lip-
service to what was currently popular than thoughtfully developed
systems which were actually implemented and valued. Principal
frustration and dissatisfaction were evident. Principals did
not mention their comparatively low salaries and high years of
experience, but it would be logical to assume that this situation
contributes to their dissatisfaction. Principals in both districts
wanted the superintendent to be more aware of the total operation
of their schools based on his on-site observation; on comprehensive,
objective data, and on open and honest communication between them.
They wanted feedback on what they were doing and suggestions for

ways in which they could improve and deal with the many problems they face in the management of these large schools. They wanted to work with the superintendent toward mutually agreed upon, pre-determined goals which would improve their personal management techniques as well as the overall system. In these respects, they were also like principals in District Seven. The factors which are lacking in these two districts are nearly identical to the factors which are present in Districts Nine, Ten and Eleven where satisfaction with the evaluation system was nearly unanimous. Principals in all five of these districts receive lower than aver-age salaries, which apparently is not a factor in satisfaction with evaluation.

DISTRICT NUMBER THIRTEEN

The evaluation system in District Number Thirteen is based on a form which combines a checklist rating which pertains to admin-istrative functions with a goal oriented procedure which pertains to person management areas. Both parts are included on a four page standardized form, with additional pages attached for the goals procedure as needed. In the spring, each principal fills out this form in self-evaluation. It includes space for listing items, or goals, accomplished in the previous year as well as a "summary list of plans" for the ensuing year. The checklist includes fourteen areas of administrative functions with specific descriptors for each area and space for comments; these areas are rated from 1 (Outstanding-Top 5%) to 5 (Unsatisfactory-Lower 50%). The superintendent goes over this form with the principal and if

he agrees with the self-evaluation, it santds as the final
assessment; if he does not agree, he writes an evaluation on the
same form. The superintendent's evaluation is discussed and both
forms are filed. At the end of the year the superintendent writes
the principal a personal letter summing up his assessment of the
principal's performance. Salaries are determined after evaluation,
and while evaluation results have some bearing on salary, raises
are determined subjectively by the superintendent.

Periodically throughout the year, the superintendent holds a
conference with principals to discuss their strengths and weak-
nesses and to suggest ways of improving performance and solving
problems. He makes a point to be in each school severl hours each
week as well as to attend school activities. During these times
he observes the principal's performance and, where necessary,
points out needed changes. In regular administrative meetings
general district problems and goals are discussed with an open,
honest interchange of ideas. The superintendent use various tech-
niques to reinforce and recognize excellent performance.

Ten of the thirteen recommended practices are implemented in
this district. The superintendent indicated that he does not
have recent training and competency in evaluation. In the inter-
view, he criticized graduate administration programs for not
requiring training in this area. He felt that evaluation, like
many practical areas, is learned on the job--sometimes by trial
and error. He believes that there probably is no written, formal
evaluation system which does much to improve performance. In-

service training in this district is not tied to evaluation
results formally. Principals are told about their weak areas,
and it is up to them to do whatever is necessary to correct them.
The goal-assessment section of the evaluation form included sections
for giving evidence of professional growth and listing memberships
in professional organizations. Like most districts, there is no
procedure for appealing unfavorable evaluation results or reassign-
ment to a higher authority other than the evaluator. This was one
of the few districts where appeal had been an issue, or at least
where the superintendent was willing to discuss the situation.

This superintendent believes very strongly that one of the
primary purposes of formal evaluation is to provide documentation
for releasing principals who are not performing adequately. He
believes that they should be told what their weaknesses are and
helped to correct them as much as is realistic. If they do not
demonstrate improvement, they should be released. He cited two
instances where principals had been dismissed. In one instance,
when the principal was asked to resign, he did so immediately.
The superintendent felt that the principal knew he was not effec-
tive, was not able to change, and was relieved to be out of the
situation. In the other instance, the principal stated initially
that he would not resign and would fight the dismissal. The super-
intendent told him, "You can do it easy, or you can do it tough.
But you're going." The principal went to one board member
privately to try to gain a "power base," but this attempt "back-
fired" when other board members interpreted his action as under-

mining the superintendent's authority. The principal then resigned. It is important to note that in situations such as this, regardless of the quality of the principal's performance, he has practically no realistic avenue of appeal. Since a superintendent is the agent of the school board, they generally will (and should) back his decisions. There is no state hearing board in the state of Illinois for appealing principal's dismissals, the school code does not provide for any such procedure, and due process cases in courts in these instances have proven futile when the process has been followed as prescribed by law. In this study, with this one exception, superintendents indicated that such appeal was not a problem, was not necessary, and principals, with one exception, did not bring it up (one principal noted that he felt he should have input into the evaluation as well as some means of appealing assessment with which he did not agree). In District Thirteen, the superintendent did provide some rights of professional due process in that he documented unacceptable performance and made an effort to assist the principal in remediation over a period of time before he asked him to resign. At that point, however, the principal had no further realistic avenue of appeal.

The reason for the use of the evaluation system in this district is, according to the superintendent, a combination of accidental and purposeful development. When he first became superintendent, there was no formal evaluation. He began using a formal system of his own then "in order to have something to hang my

hat on when talking to the board about raises for and reassignment or dismissal of administrators." Soon after that, he involved principals and assistant superintendents in developing the present system and form, with heavy emphasis on self-evaluation. This system "fits" the superintendent's philosophy of the purposes of formal evaluation which are to 1) provide documentation for salary increases, reassignment and dismissal and 2) encourage personal goal-setting and self-assessment. While he believes strongly that frequent personal interaction promotes improved performance, he does not believe that formal evaluation does. He stated that if you are interested in your job and are able to do well and grow, you will set personal goals, perform well and improve in ability. He believes that evaluation, in itself, will not bring about high level performance nor promote positive change to any great degree. If such a system existed, he would certainly want to use it, but he does not believe it does. He believes that good salaries do motivate principals to do a good job.

While the salaries of principals in this district fell in the below average category, they were just below the mid-point and were comparable to or higher than others in that general geographic area. In this respect, then, they might be considered well-paid, in keeping with the superintendent's philosophy. The fact that these principals have above average years of experience may contribute to their ability to function independently and to evaluate themselves. The evaluation system is time and cost-efficient, which is undoubtedly an important factor in this large, low-wealth district.

None of the principals nor the superintendent feel that the formal evaluation system is a major factor in principal professional growth. All of the principals expressed satisfaction with the system. While the superintendent was not satisfied with the system, he does feel that it accomplishes as much as a formal system can and does not know of a better system. The superintendent stated that principals probably did not see much value in or place much importance on the formal evaluation. He felt that they did value the informal, frequent, open communication, as he does. Only one of the principals made any comment on the evaluation system, and he stated that "there isn't much to it; the superintendent doesn't write anything. It's mostly just discussion of goals and how we're doing. It works very well." The superintendent stated that without the formal system, principals would do the same things anyway. "If they foul up, I'll get on them verbally, but probably not in writing. If they do things right, they won't hear much about it; if not, they'll hear about it." From the superintendent's broader perspective of the purposes of formal evaluation, it appears that the evaluation system in this district accomplishes what he expects it to accomplish: principals are self-motivated to perform well, to work toward goals, and to grow professionally. If they are not, or will not, or can not, they will hear about it, and, if they still do not, documentation exists and they will probably be released.

One important implication for evaluation is that in this

large district, rather than attempting to use a highly complex system to coordinate principals' efforts, evaluation is purposely very simple in structure and relies heavily on self-evaluation and informal interaction, contact and feedback. The key to satisfaction with this formal evaluation system is similar to the situation in District Two. The superintendent is very honest in letting principals know he places little value on formal evaluation and makes no pretense of it beyond simple, once-a-year assessment. While this system admittedly does not accomplish many of the purposes of evaluation as recommended in educational literature, such honesty appears to be essential to open interaction and mutual respect.

DISTRICT NUMBER FOURTEEN

In District Fourteen, neither the superintendent nor the principals were interviewed, and no principals' responses to the questionnaire items were obtained. Therefore, very little data were available for narrative analysis. The superintendent, on the questionnaire, indicated the use of Evaluation System Eleven and that all recommended practices were implemented except tying pay raises to evaluation results and providing a procedure for appeal of unsatisfactory results. The superintendent indicated that the evaluation system was a major factor in principal professional growth but he was not satisfied with the system. He denied the request to contact principals in the district and for the follow-up superintendent interview. This is a district of medium size, high wealth, high principal salary, and high average

years of principal experience in education. Any inferences or conclusions drawn from this minimal data would be speculative, and therefore was not attempted.

DISTRICT NUMBER FIFTEEN

The evaluation system in District Fifteen was, without doubt, the most complex and highly structured of all those examined in this study. The system implements nearly all of the recommendations for Performance Objectives Systems as well as the recommended practices. It was the only district (where data were available) where Management Appraisal was included in detail in Board Policy and Procedure. It was also apparent that the stated system was actually implemented in its entirety.

In a one page policy statement, the board's purposes and objectives for management appraisal are detailed and the superintendent is given the responsibility for developing and implementing an appraisal system which will achieve the stated objectives. It is followed by an eleven page procedural statement which spells out the specific process for implementing board policy. An outside management consulting firm was retained to develop a compensation plan which was adopted by the board and is now a part of the overall evaluation system. The appraisal system itself was developed by the superintendent and a team of administrators. A fifteen-page administrators' notebook includes introduction, background and development, purposes, key concepts, philosophy, definition, the board policy statement, basic assumptions underlying the plan, and the appraisal system itself. This system is used for all administrative

personnel, divided into five category levels which specify who will conduct the evaluations for each category. Principals are alone in the highest category, report only to the superintendent and are evaluated by the superintendent. Central office administrators are in the second category, lower than principals.

The description of the complex appraisal system is summarized here and is limited to the evaluation of principals. After the end of the academic year, each principal prepares a preliminary draft of the three sections of the Individual Appraisal. Section One is devoted to objectives in position responsibilities, taken directly from the job description to insure overall satisfactory performance. Each item receives a percentage weight, and the total percentage weight for this section must be within the range of 30 percent to 60 percent. Section Two objectives pertain to three to six priority items related to the job description, or unique organizational goals. These are specific, measurable tasks. Each of these items is weighted and the total weight for Section Two must be within the range of 30 percent to 50 percent. This section includes a descriptive plan for a statement of rationale, action plan and timeline, and method of evaluating the end product for each objective. Section Three includes objectives for personal skills or competencies which need attention. The total weight for Section Three must fall in the 10% to 20% range. The total for all three sections must equal 100 percent. In an initial conference, the principal and superintendent review the preliminary draft and revise as necessary. The superintendent prepares the final plan,

reflecting decisions made in the conference. The principal and
superintendent retain a copy. This plan is completed before the
end of July.

Throughout the year, at least one progress conference is
held to review progress toward goal attainment. The superintendent
provides guidance and assistance as needed, both in the formal
conference and in his daily contact with principals, informally,
in their buildings. A summary statement of progress conferences
is written by the superintendent, who retains a copy and gives
one to the principal.

In June, the principal prepares a preliminary draft completing
the appraisal form. He rates his accomplishment of each objective
according to predetermined criteria, on a scale of one to six.
This rating number is multiplied by the pre-determined percentage
weight, and the total of these factors for all three sections is
calculated. Documentation for each objective is included as
appropriate. In the appraisal conference, the superintendent and
principal review this draft, and make revisions as necessary.
Both have ample opportunity to voice their viewpoint to achieve
consensus, but if consensus cannot be reached, the superintendent
has the final say. The superintendent prepares the final copy
of this assessment. Only he and the principal receive a copy;
it is not available to the board, the personnel office, or any
other person.

An appraisal summary is prepared by the superintendent to
calculate the Total Performance Rating and resulting compensation.

The total rating falls into one of four Salary Adjustment Levels.
Salary increases are based on a formula which includes an $\underline{X}$ factor,
or base raise, and a $\underline{Y}$ factor corresponding to the four levels of
performance. Expectations for upward movement within the salary
range are specified in the administrator's notebook.

In this district, all but two of the recommended practices
are implemented. In regard to unsatisfactory results, the super-
intendent's final appraisal stands and there is no provision for
response or appeal. This practice is by design and no objections
to it were apparent. The superintendent stated that organizational
effectiveness depends on having someone who makes final decisions.
That person is obligated to discuss the situation, listen, and be
flexible, but has the final responsibility for making a decision
when consensus cannot be achieved. He stated that the high degree
of principal involvement in developing goals and assessing results
is a primary reason that disagreements are almost always resolved.
He believes that two people with a common interest can almost
always resolve a problem related to that common interest by work-
ing together toward a solution.

The eighteen basic assumptions in the administrator notebook,
as well as the statements of purposes and objectives echo many of
the recommended practices found in educational literature and the
design of the system implements these practices.

The primary reason this system is used is apparent in the
introduction to the administrators notebook:

It was developed as a result of dissatisfaction expressed by members of the Board of Education and the staff with some of the past methods of appraising and compensating members of the management team. In addition to dissatisfaction with past methods, there was a desire to focus the district's resources toward more precisely defined goals, particularly the improvement of teaching and learning in the district. The procedures developed in the plan are intended to relate appraisal primarily to tne results achieved by the individual during the review period and to relate compensation adjustments to that appraisal.

It is fair to assume that a large percentage of the people living in this high socio-economic level suburb are in upper-level management positions and are familiar with MBO as developed in business. This affinity for business processes is reflected in the board's action, not only in directing the development of this type of system, but in retaining a management consulting firm at the onset of the developmental stage. It is also reflected in the fact that this community has a superintendent who is highly knowledgable of and supportive to the type of management system that they view as effective. The principals in this district are among the highest-paid principals in tne study and lowest in years of experience in education. Both hold doctoral degrees. Their relative youth and nigh level of educational background makes it likely tnat tney, as wellas the superintendent, nave recent training in and familiarity with the concepts of Performance Objectives Evaluation Systems which are currently in vogue. In this district, tnen, it seems reasonable to conclude tnat tne type of people in tne community and the people they have chosen to run their school system are primarily responsiole for the type of evaluation system in effect.

The superintendent, in the questionnaire responses and in the interview, was very positive about the effectiveness of the system in terms of principal professional growth and his satisfaction with it. He felt that the principals probably do not value it as much as he does. He felt sure that they would agree that it is good management, but felt they might also see it as a time-consuming chore. He acknowledged that the system is very time-consuming, but felt it was well worth the effort.

His perception of principals' feelings about the system was quite accurate. Both stated that they were satisfied with the system, that it was equitable and objective and couldn't be criticized, that it gives direction and a plan of action for the year which they must follow, and that they didn't know of a better system. They expressed respect for the ability of the superintendent; one stated, "He's good and that makes all the difference. I wouldn't want to be evaluated this way by a nincompoop." However, both principals, one more strongly than the other, stated that the system was very involved, cumbersome, awkward, and an unnecessary exercise. One stated that he missed the informal assessment they used to have. Only one of the two felt the system contributed to professional growth. The other stated, "If you're a principal, that far along, then professional growth should come from within; you don't need an evaluator." One of the principals stated that he knew his own strengths and weaknesses better than anyone else, but that it was good to have that verified and reinforced by someone else. This observation supports

the superintendent's belief in the forced objectivity of the system. While he believes there is no pure objectivity, the closest you can come to it is to merge the subjective views of two people with a common interest.

The evaluation system in District Fifteen is exemplary according to the standards recommended in most educational literature. Unlike any other system in this study, it quantifies the performance growth of an individual and he is rewarded accordingly in pay raises. The system was very carefully developed, written and implemented. High value and importance are placed on it by the board and superintendent, and, to a somewhat lesser extent, by the principals. Adequate time is devoted to all phases. Fair and comprehensive documentation is available to support pay raises and reassignment and to provide accountability for the management and instructional processes. Yet the question must be raised: Do the results justify this enormous investment of time and money? One principal stated that he missed the informal assessment they used to have. Has an important element of evaluation been lost with the emphasis on quantification? Is the overall management of this school district really better than if these principals and the superintendent were to talk about what they are doing without formal, documented goals, action plans and measurement? While the data obtained in this study cannot provide a definitive answer to these questions, it at least urges a closer look at the recommendations in the literature. Many other superintendents use a very low-key, informal approach

to evaluation which appears to be successful. It may be that

such systems are equally as effective as that in District Fifteen.

DISTRICT NUMBER SIXTEEN

District Sixteen, fifth of the five districts which indicated

the use of Evaluation System Eleven, is carefully structured and

planned, but much less complex and time-consuming than the system

in District Fifteen.

Board Policy, like that in most districts, simply states that

evaluation of all staff is to be done. A three-page procedural

statement includes the administrative evaluation plan as well as

a statement of philosophy. Job descriptions, upon which the evalu-

ation plan is based, are included in board policy. These job

descriptions are regularly reviewed and revised by the administra-

tive team, which is comprised of all administrators in the district.

The philosophy statement discusses the necessity of adminis-

trative evaluation in various forms:

> Evaluation is both informal and formal. Informal evaluation
> consists of day-to-day contacts and observations by super-
> visors of the administrators they supervise. The formal
> evaluation augments this ongoing process. The formal system
> primarily focuses on the administrator's job description.
> Supplementary to this are annual performance goals which are
> viewed primarily as self-improvement activities.

As stated, the formal system is based on a "current and detailed

job description, written, when possible, in behavioral terms." In

the spring of each year, the principals write a self-evaluation,

based on the job description and any other specified goals. This

is a narrative evaluation, with no standard form. The job descrip-

tion and pre-stated goals provide the format for the narrative,

which does not exceed three pages. This self-evaluation is submitted to the assistant superintendent who has been delegated to conduct the formal evaluation of principals. The assistant superintendent may write his own evaluation of the principal in the same format (as stated in the procedures) or he may review the principal's evaluation, noting additions and revisions of various points according to his assessment. The two then meet in conference to review the evaluation and to reach agreement on the various points of assessment, including goal attainment if they choose. The assistant superintendent writes a final report as a result of this conference, and the preliminary report(s) is attached. The principal may submit a statement of clarification or rebuttal to the final report. A form is provided with a check-list of various items which are to be attached and placed in the principal's file: 1) the principal's self-evaluation, 2) the assistant superintendent's evaluation, 3) the final evaluation report, 4) suggestions for supplementary goal setting for the following year (this may be deferred), 5) the principal's job description, and 6) the principal's statement of rebuttal and clarification if one has been submitted. Before the conference, the assistant superintendent reviews his assessment and the self-evaluation with the superintendent who may suggest changes or additions, and the final evaluation report is reviewed and approved by the superintendent before it is filed. At the end of the year the superintendent writes a long, personal letter to each principal, summing up the year's performance, noting particular

achievements, and making suggestions for areas to work on for further growth. In the fall, each principal may write goals for his individual performance. These are supplementary to the job description, or "icing on the cake," according to the superintendent. A form is provided for these goals, including a statement of expected outcomes for assessment, procedures to be used for achievement, and target dates. Throughout the year, the superintendent and assistant superintendent have frequent, on-the-job contact with each principal through which the informal evaluation process occurs, as stated in the evaluation procedures.

In this district, all but one of the recommended practices are implemented. The one which was checked "No" on the superintendent questionnaire regarded the planning of in-service training specifically according to evaluation results. For the most part, principals pursue professional growth areas according to their individual goals. Professional growth may be a shared activity within the administrative council: either a common goal develops and all work toward growth in that area, or one administrator may share what he has learned with the group, thus, providing in-service for all. The superintendent gave an example of this process: One principal set as a goal that he would become a better listener. He attended a seminar on listening processes, did extensive reading, and consciously tried to apply the concepts and techniques. Periodically, he shared these concepts and techniques with the administrative council, who also began applying them. This activity let another administrator to study transactional and interaction

analysis, which he shared with the group. The superintendent believes that the council's interaction and problem-solving processes are greatly improved, and highly effective, partly as a result of the chain of events which evolved over a period of time. (The superintendent's own personal communication style undoubtedly is a major factor in this process as well.)

Most of the other practices are not only implemented, but are regarded as being highly important. The job description, as the basis of evaluation, is an up-to-date, meaningful document. The superintendent, whose office is in one of the buildings, maintains an office in the other building (as does the assistant superintendent) and spends at least one day a week working in that office and with that principal. Because of the importance placed on regular, informal contact with and supervision of principals, the superintendent gives high priority to spending time in the buildings with the principals.

One practice which is implemented here, where principals can appeal unsatisfactory results to a higher authority other than the evaluator, was indicated in only one other district (and on the basis of limited data, it was questionable whether it was, in reality, implemented there). The superintendent sees the administrative council as a higher authority than he is. All problems and conflicting opinions are aired openly and honestly in council, and debate continues until consensus is achieved. This consensus becomes the final decision, with the general support of the group. The superintendent has been in that position

for several years, and he states that only twice has he made a unilateral decision when consensus could not be reached. He works actively at being an equal member of this group, encouraging democratic processes. Thus, the procedure for appeal exists, although differences over evaluation results have never been brought to the group. The superintendent stated that, during the four years the current evaluation system has been in existence, there have been no objections to evaluation results. He credits the strong emphasis on the job description (as opposed to personal traits), self-evaluation and frequent interaction as the reasons for this absence of disagreement. He states that, while a principal would be welcome to bring disagreements on evaluation results to the administrative council or to the school board, he does not believe a principal would want to do so. He believes that principals would prefer to keep evaluation results private and confidential, working out any disagreement through discussion with the assistant superintendent and/or with him.

It is important to note that, of the five districts using various forms of Evaluation System Eleven, stated satisfaction with the system and its effect on professional growth increased in proportion with the number of recommended practices which were implemented, in the perceptions of both principals and superintendents. (See Appendix D.) Thus, it can be reasonably concluded that the implementation of such practices is, in fact, a positive contributing factor to effective evaluation procedures.

The reason for the use of this evaluation system in District

Sixteen appears to be due to the democratic functioning of the administrative council under the guidance, but apparently not the dictate, of the superintendent. The school board and community do not appear to be an influence in this respect as they were in District Fifteen. This is a lower socio-economic community made up primarily of blue-collar workers. Members of the school board are not college educated nor in upper-level management positions. They strongly support the superintendent and prefer leaving administrative decisions, including evaluation practices, to him and the administrative team.

Five years ago, the superintendent's council decided to develop a new system of administrative evaluation to replace the subjective rating system which had been in effect. They read extensively and examined many different systems and models of evaluation. They invited a management consulting firm (the same one used in District Fifteen) to submit a proposal for designing an evaluation system. While they did not retain the firm to design the plan, the superintendent indicated that many of the basic premises of their system were based on the proposal. They decided they wanted to develop their own plan, incorporating the best of what they had learned, but tailored to their individual needs. The man who was assistant superintendent at that time also held a high ranking office in ASCD. The experience gained in this position, plus the information and services available to him probably were important resources in the development of the system. However, whatever other influences played a role in the development of the system, it was readily

apparent in the interview that the system is a direct reflection of and in complete compatibility with the superintendent's style and philosophy of management.

As implied earlier, the effects of principal evaluation in this district were unanimously viewed positively. Principals and the superintendent believed that the system contributed to principal professional growth and were highly satisfied with the system. In several other districts where principals indicated satisfaction with the system, it was due to the fact that evaluation was simple, took little time and did not interfere with their work. This factor was not the reason for satisfaction with evaluation in District Sixteen. The system, while not highly complex or time-consuming, was carefully developed and highly valued. Principals said that it does take time, but that they take it seriously because it provides direction, gives them pride in their work, and improves the total organization. They give it high priority as an effective management process and believe that it causes real growth. They value the extensive interaction, both informal and formal, with the assistant superintendent and superintendent in regard to their performance. They obviously are gratified by recognition of their successes, but they also welcome suggestions for improvement, which ultimately lead to greater success.

One principal observed that there was no need to appeal evaluation results to "others." He felt that evaluation in this district was extremely fair, and to take any disagreements to any other authority would dissipate the power of the superintendent

and the administrative team. He said that if this evaluation system resulted in negative results, then the principal was probably performing ineffectively. In such a situation, he said, a principal's alternatives were to "get better, find another job, or get fired." Both principals expressed strong positive feelings about the assistant superintendent and superintendent. They respect them, value their judgment and welcome their suggestions. As one principal noted, "This system might not be so good in another district, with different kinds of people at the top." Here, as noted in other districts where a high degree of satisfaction was expressed with the evaluation system, there is also high degree of respect for and satisfaction with the superintendent personally. It seems likely that the personal style and ability of the superintendent plays a key role in the effectiveness of evaluation.

The evaluation systems in Districts Fifteen and Sixteen both appear to be very effective in terms of promoting professional growth and satisfaction with the superintendent personally. It seems likely that the personal style and ability of the superintendent plays a key role in the effectiveness of evaluation.

The evaluation systems in Districts Fifteen and Sixteen both appear to be very effective in terms of promoting professional growth and satisfaction with the system. As the only two districts which mentioned the use of an outside consulting firm, these districts both used the same firm, although District Sixteen did not retain them beyond the proposal stage. In both districts, high

value and importance is given to evaluation, and both systems
have been carefully developed and implemented. Both districts
have two high schools and two principals, and in both districts
the principals have low average years of experience in education.
Both districts implement nearly all of the recommended evaluation
practices.

While both systems meet the basic definition of Evaluation
System Eleven, they are, in practice, quite different. District
Fifteen's system is highly structured and quantified, much like
the MBO systems in business, while District Sixteen places secondary
emphasis on the goal-setting process, and gives high priority to
following the job description and to informal evaluation. It is
the only district which includes the informal, day-to-day team
work as a part of the formal, written system. Principals in District
Sixteen appear to have played a much greater role in determining
the type of evaluation system than in District Fifteen.

District Fifteen is a high socio-economic area and the princi-
pals receive high salaries. The school board appears to be involved
to a great extent in the management process, and the superintendent
is definite in his belief that his position must retain the power
and authority of final decision-making in order for the organization
to be effective. While he works closely and in a positive manner
with principals, the structure of management here seems to be much
more highly defined in terms of levels of authority.

District Sixteen, on the other hand, is an industrial area
with a much lower socio-economic level. Although it has a higher

assessed valuation than District Fifteen, this district appears
to be facing financial problems. Principals receive lower than
average salaries. The school board here is more than willing to
leave the running of the schools to administrators. This super-
intendent, perhaps more than any interviewed, believes in and oper-
ates in a highly democratic manner, to the point that nearly all
management decisions are made by consensus of the administrative
team.

The evaluation system in each district is highly compatible
with the superintendent's management style. It may be that this
is an important factor in the specific type of system which is
effective in a school district. It is logical to assume that a
superintendent would be more effective in the evaluation process
if that process were compatible with his management style than if
it were not. If this is true, then it would also be logical that
a superintendent should integrate this factor into the evaluation
system as it is being developed, and should not give away this
authority in deference to team effort. This factor would not
preclude the involvement of principals in the development of the
system, however. It would suggest that there is no one evaluation
system which is appropriate for all districts or all administrators.

While the principals in District Sixteen voiced more enthu-
siastic, positive perceptions of their evaluation system, principals,
as well as the superintendents, in both districts were satisfied
with the system and viewed it as a highly effective management tool.
Further data, particularly in the areas of financial effectiveness

and educational outcomes, would be needed to make judgments as
to the actual results of these two systems.

Districts Seventeen and Eighteen indicated the use of Evalu-
ation System Twelve, the highest level and most complex of the
evaluation categories. It incorporates all of the aspects of
Systems Ten and Eleven, plus "the evaluator consults with other
individuals, including evaluatee's peers and/or staff, students,
and parents, before completing his part of the evaluation form;
only the evaluator's evaluation appears on completed form." While
this system does not place as much importance on including the
self-evaluation on the final form, it is more comprehensive in the
data collected for the final assessment.

DISTRICT NUMBER SEVENTEEN

In District Seventeen, no interview was conducted with the
superintendent, thus, data were limited to the superintendent
and principal questionnaire responses and brief interviews with
all principals. Neither written district policy and procedures
nor the evaluation instrument were available for inclusion in
the analysis.

On the basis of these limited data, it appeared that the
evaluation model was somewhat complex and that it was not actually
implemented as stated. According to principals, the primary
emphasis is on the rating of predetermined tasks plus assessment
of personal objectives developed cooperatively with the superin-
tendent. Apparently, in the spring each principal does a self-
evaluation, then has a conference with the superintendent to go

over the evaluation and discuss personal objectives for the following year. It may be that the evaluation model is very much like tne one indicated, but that what actually happens is limited to the self-evaluation and a conference.

Responses on the superintendent questionnaire indicated the implementation of ten of the thirteen recommended practices. Since none of these was validated with the superintendent in an interview, the extent to which they are actually implemented and the importance they are given is not known. As in most other districts, tnere is no procedure for principals to appeal unsatisfactory evaluation results. The superintendent indicated that he does not implement the practice of periodically visiting and observing principals for the purpose of evaluation, and principal in-service training is not determined by evaluation results.

Since it is not clear what specific type of evaluation system is used in this district, and since limited data are available, it is difficult to determine why they do what they do. Principals indicated that the system has been in effect for some time, so perhaps it is in effect because of lack of impetus to change it. According to principals, the process is not fully implemented according to the model because it is very time-consuming and the predetermined tasks on the rating scale are outdated. One principal stated that the evaluation system is consistent with the superintendent's management style. These principals receive above average salaries and have average years of experience. It may be that the superintendent does not place a great deal of emphasis

or importance on evaluation, but has highly competent, well-paid principals whom he leaves essentially on their own to do their jobs and to evaluate themselves.

While the superintendent indicated on the questionnaire that he felt evaluation contributed to professional growth and that he was satisfied with the system, only two of the three principals felt it contributed to professional growth and only one indicated satisfaction with the system. It appears that these principals, aware that the superintendent does not give significant time and importance to the system, value the system accordingly. One principal said the system was all right, that it was better than most. He gave the impression that it got the job done and did not get in his way. The other two were very negative about the system, felt it was outdated, time-consuming if conducted properly, and simply was not done. They felt evaluation should be given high priority and should be a vehicle for better management, but, as one said, they were "buried in inertia" and do not spend the necessary time on evaluation. Both felt the system should be changed. The reactions of these principals give credence to the theory that principals do want meaningful evaluation which will help them to improve their performance.

DISTRICT NUMBER EIGHTEEN

Evaluation System Number Twelve, used in District Number Eighteen, has been in effect just one year.

This Performance Objectives System is structured into three categories of appraisal, very much like the three categories used in District Fifteen. The first category included the various tasks

in the principals' job description; the second pertains to specific
measurable objectives of individual performance drawn from district
goals, the job description and personal growth; and the third deals
with the personal functioning of the individual administrator.

Over the summer, the principal prepares objectives based on
self-assessment; previous evaluation by his evaluator and from his
staff; and on input from the board, superintendent, peers and his
building advisory council which includes building administrators,
teachers, parents and students. A form is prepared with these objec-
tives statements with criteria and evaluative questions for each.
These are reviewed with and approved by the superintendent.
Throughout the year, the principal takes the planned steps toward
achievement of the objectives, meeting periodically with the super-
intendent for progress conferences. The superintendent spends
little time in the buildings but meets at least once a year with
each building advisory council and sees principals informally, in
meetings and in progress conferences. At the end of the year the
principal prepares a self-appraisal of the achievement of performance
objectives along with a summary of major accomplishments throughout
the year. He may attach supportive material. This appraisal is
submitted to the superintendent and a final conference is held to
review the self-appraisal. The superintendent, using primarily
the data submitted by the principal, plus various other information
he has, prepares a final evaluation, appraising performance and
effectiveness in the three appraisal areas. He rates the overall
performance as Unsatisfactory, Competent, or Highly Effective.
A copy of this appraisal goes to the principal, the superintendent,

and to the board if they wish to see it. Salary increases are
not tied diecretly to the final evaluation results although they
are taken into account. The evaluation record does provide
documentation which aids the superintendent in obtaining raises
for principals from the board.

Eleven of the thirteen recommended practices are implemented
in this district. As in most other districts there is no pro-
cedure for appeal. The superintendent stated that if the process
is carried out properly, there should be no need for such appeal.
Properly formulated objectives and periodic review (and modifi-
cation if necessary) are key to satisfaction with results, he
feels. It is also necessary for the superintendent to be flexible
in writing the final summary, incorporating the position of the
principal if it differs. Principals may attach a response if
they choose, but they have not chosen to do so. The second prac-
tice which is not formally implemented is the planning of in-service
directly according to evaluation results. The superintendent stated
that individual in-service is more likely to be tied to objectives,
with principals seeking resources which will aid them in achieving
objectives.

Principals and other administrators were involved in the
development of the appraisal plan the previous year, although the
superintendent says he would approach the procedure differently
if he were to do it again. When he came to the district, he
submitted his preferred evaluation system to administrators in
rough form. They reacted to it and he made various adjustments

according to their reactions.  This react-revise process went

on until all agreed on the system.  The superintendent feels it

would have been better to provide them with comprehensive informa-

tion on evaluation and develop their own plan from there (much as

was done in District Sixteen).  He feels that in this way there

would be more commitment to the system and  better understanding

of it.  As it is, he does not feel administrators thoroughly

understand the process or have the training and knowledge necessary

to work through the objective setting and attainment process effec-

tively, although he has conducted several in-service sessions on

this process.  The results of the system which was developed in

District Sixteen and the commitment to that system would bear out

this superintendent's view in District Eighteen.

Although the superintendent indicated on the questionnaire

that he had sufficient time in his work schedule to evaluate

principals and that he periodically observed them for the purpose

of evaluation, these practices do not appear to be implemented to

any great extent.  In the interview, the superintendent stated

that he was not able to spend as much time in buildings with the

principals as he should.

The reason this system is used in District Eighteen is apparent.

The superintendent appears to be very knowledgable in appraisal

systems and has acted as a consultant in this area nationwide.

He has used this system, in its basic form, in previous districts

and has been satisfied with it.  It has been recognized and advo-

cated by a national educational organization.  While he did not

actually impose the system in this district, it was his original proposal with various revisions. It was implemented rather quickly when he assumed the superintendency and he stated that he wished he had taken more time in its implementation and development.

While the superintendent indicated that he felt the system contributed to professional growth and that he was satisfied with it, the principals generally did not. One of the three believes that it will contribute to his professional growth in his personal motivation to achieve objectives. He indicated that the system will be satisfactory if the superintendent does what he says he will do. He did not believe the first year of the system provided adequate time to judge it. He was doubtful if the superintendent would carry it out as stated. He felt it would take a lot of time and that the superintendent did not give it sufficiently high priority. Another principal was critical of the system, primarily because the superintendent made final evaluative decisions without sufficient information. The third principal was critical of the same thing. He did not feel the superintendent really knew what kind of job he was doing; that he "wasn't there," and was basing his judgments on hearsay evidence. This principal did state that he had benefitted greatly from having his staff evaluate him and planned to continue the practice. These principals' dissatis-faction with a system with which the superintendent is satisfied is similar to other districts where this difference in perception occurred. They do not have a commitment to the system or see real value in it, perhaps because 1) they were not truly involved in

developing it, 2) they may not thoroughly understand how the superintendent wants it to function, 3) they perceive that the superintendent does not really value it because he does not give it high priority in actual practice, and 4) they lack frequent, on the job, positive and ongoing interaction with the superintendent regarding the way they do their jobs. They vary greatly in salary, age and years of experience, yet they tend to be unanimous in the way they perceive this evaluation system. The factors which appear to cause dissatisfaction with evaluation in this district are common in systems which are not perceived as effective.

Two districts indicated that no written, formal evaluation system of any kind was used to evaluate principals.

DISTRICT NUMBER NINETEEN

In District Nineteen, data on the types of informal assessment were limited, as the superintendent was not interviewed and the principals were interviewed very briefly. On the superintendent questionnaire, he stated that there was no formal evaluation of principals; it was all on an informal basis. He indicated that, as a result, the recommended practices were not implemented in any written form. While one principal had no comment on the system, the other indicated that informal evaluation is going on every day through contact with the superintendent.

The reason this informal system is used is probably, as the one principal stated, "It works fine." The superintendent and principals have worked together for many years, and feel no need

for written evaluation: "I don't see how formal evaluation would improve what we're doing now." The one principal indicated that if an unknown new principal were to come in, they might need a more formal system. This is a medium size, high wealth district, with above average principals' salaries and above average years of experience. The fact that the principals have been in this relatively small district for some time, working with this superintendent, would indicate that they may work somewhat autonomously in their buildings, but with frequent informal contact with the superintendent. There was no indication that any of these administrators had any real familiarity with recent developments in management appraisal. This lack of information may be a factor in the lack of formal evaluation.

The superintendent did not respond to the items on professional growth or satisfaction with the system. While both principals indicated that formal evaluation (or the lack of it) did not contribute to their professional growth, both were satisfied with the manner in which they are evaluated. The fact that their salaries are above average may be a contributing factor with their satisfaction with things as they are. One principal stated that the superintendent is a good administrator and a good friend, and gives valuable help and assistance when it is needed.

DISTRICT NUMBER TWENTY

In District Twenty, the last district in this analysis, a great deal more data were available. All principals were interviewed briefly and the superintendent was interviewed in depth.

While there is no evaluation instrument and nothing is recorded
as evaluation, the "informal" system here is , in fact, very close
to Evaluation System Number Twelve except that it is not in
written form.

As the superintendent stated, evaluation in this district is
not a separate function: it is part of the total process of doing
the best possible job of educating young people. The entire staff
is involved in a network of committees working toward identified
common goals with a calendar of progress points for achieving
those goals. Each principal meets regularly with his building
teacher councils, departmental groups, parents' advisory council,
and student council. Various "task force" committees meet as they
work on district goals and programs. The superintendent meets
regularly with his cabinet, which includes all principals and
assistant superintendents, as well as the various other committees
as needed.

The administrative cabinet meets frequently in the summer for
half-day sessions. During this time they review "where they are
and what they need to work on," bringing input from the various
groups they work with and from national meetings and seminars
they attend. Initially, these meetings are similar to "brain-
storming" sessions. Through this process, needs are identified
and a "theme" for the coming year is established. Depending on
the area, district or individual building (or both) goals are
identified. Each building principal works with his staff to
develop an action plan for their building to work toward identified

goals. Committees are established, and a calendar of progress
and completion dates for the year is developed. The assistant
superintendent of instruction plans in-service activities for
the teaching and administrative staff according to these goals.

Throughout the year, the various individuals and groups
function to carry out their part of the overall plan. The super-
intendent meets regularly with the administrative cabinet where a
great deal of open, honest interaction occurs on the progress of
their work. If tasks are not being accomplished according to the
calendar, they analyze that situation and attempt to correct it.
The superintendent is in the buildings often, not only to see
principals, but to meet with people involved in the various projects
or to observe them in operation. He is never in a building "just
to wander around, but for a specific purpose." If a principal's
personal performance is less than satisfactory, the superintendent
may meet with him privately to deal with it, but more often than
not, according to the superintendent, any deficiency is taken care
of in cabinet meetings. "If one person is not performing, it affects
the entire program, and his peers will probably get on him about it."
In this sense, because the programs, from district to buildings to
departments, are interlaced, the people involved monitor each other.

At the end of the year, the principal submits an annual report
on what he has accomplished that year. The superintendent combines
this report with those of others in specific buildings for a build-
ing file. Based on these data, he prepares an annual report for
the board on where they are and what they have accomplished. The

board's reaction to this report may provide direction for new or ongoing goals in this cyclical process.

According to the responses on the superintendent questionnaire, only five of the recommended practices are implemented in this district. Many of the practices are related to a formal, written evaluation process and, thus, are not formally implemented. However, just as evaluation is occurring in this district, most of the practices are implemented, if in an informal manner.

Those practices which are not implemented are omitted by design. Principal pay raises are not tied to their performance at all. All principals and assistant superintendents are on the same salary range, and the only differential is for years of seniority. As a new person is appointed, his salary will be lower than the others, and he will receive larger yearly raises until his salary is commensurate with the others. The superintendent does not believe that money is an effective reward or motivator unless it is in significantly large amounts, which is not realistic in a school system. He believes that each member of the team, at various levels of the team, should be expected to do a good job and that all should be paid equally. This observation would seem to substantiate the apparent lack of effect of salary on principal's satisfaction with evaluation in other districts in this study.

Since there are no written evaluation results, there is no need for response or appeal. If performance is unsatisfactory, it is dealt with at the time it is occurring. Usually the principal will work with the appropriate assistant superintendent to resolve problems, but if conflict exists or continues, the

superintendent works it out with them, in a sense as mediator. He

does not believe in using the board as a ploy or force in resolving

conflict regarding the level of principal performance.

If a principal were doing continuing unsatisfactory work,

(although such a situation has not occurred), the superintendent

would build a written file, beginning with a summary of a conference

pinpointing deficiencies and expected change. This conference and

documentation would be followed by a period of remediation. If

change did not come about, a written remedial plan would be prepared

with a specific time line for change, and the board would be apprised

of the situation. If change did not occur, the principal would be

released.

From the interviews, it appears that most other practices are

implemented, some according to specific design, and some as they

are needed in the process.

The reason for the use of this informal system is also by

design, certainly not because of a lack of knowledge or initiative.

The superintendent believes in the value of this team-goal oriented

approach. He stated:

> Don't assume there is no evaluation going on because we don't
> have a formal written process. When people know what their
> goals are, what their role is in accomplishing them and when
> the job is to be done, assessment of results is obvious.
> When one member of an athletic team isn't doing his part,
> the whole team looks bad and it's usually obvious who is
> not performing. Then it's up to the coach, and to some
> extent the rest of the team, to find out what's causing
> the problem and get it corrected. Running a school is much
> the same.

The superintendent states that the cabinet has discussed develop-

ing a more formal system and that they may do so, that various members

of the team are investigating various evaluation systems as part of their in-service. He says the lack of documentation "haunts him a little," and that he can imagine situations where this lack of written plan or record might be a problem. If a more formal plan is adopted, he would want to follow essentially the same process, just with more documentation. However, they have limited time now, and he is hesitant to add more paperwork to their schedules. This is one of the larger districts with many of the same problems as other large districts. It appears that the planned network of interaction here provides a system for contact, communication and joint effort which was not found in other large districts except through a formalized Performance Objectives System.

The superintendent indicated on the questionnaire that he did not believe evaluation was a major factor in professional growth and that he was not satisfied with the system. In the interview, he indicated that the primary reason for these negative answers was that he felt the items referred to a formal system, which they do not have. However, he is also having some doubts regarding the lack of documentation, and he and the cabinet would probably not be considering change if they were entirely satisfied. He does not, however, want to give up the "shared responsibility" system they now have for a more formal system which might place emphasis on recording negatives as opposed to working together toward positive goals. Two of the four principals indicated that the evaluation system was a major factor in their professional growth. This difference appeared to be due more to whether they perceived

what they were doing as part of evaluation or if they felt there

was no evaluation. Three of the four indicated strong satisfaction

with the system and for the team effort the superintendent promoted.

The fourth principal, while he was not negative about the superin-

tendent's method of operation, felt strongly that they needed a

more formal, documented system of evaluation. If, as the superin-

tendent maintained, there are "no holds barred" in their openness

in cabinet sessions, it is likely that this one principal is

responsible for their considering change. It is also likely that,

due to differences in personality and management style, some

principals need more recognition for individual accomplishment,

and, thus, would not gain sufficient satisfaction from this

"shared responsibility" approach.

The superintendent in District Twenty, and some members of

the administrative team, are involved in a dilemma of evaluation

which is present in many districts, particularly large ones: the

lack of time to document the various stages of evaluation in order

to provide for accountability. This district has dealt with the

dilemma somewhat differently from other districts in the study.

While some other districts do not attempt a Performance Objectives

process, or merely pay lip-service to it, or spend much time and

effort documenting it, this district engages in the process very

effectively but documents very little. However, in spite of the

superintendent's claim that there is no formal evaluation here,

there is some documentation, and the system could be formalized

without a great deal more effort. The calendar of target dates

found in subject districts, the various factors which appear to
influence the use of these systems and practices, and the effects
of the use of these various systems and practices.

A wide range of types of evaluation systems were found, from
no formal evaluation at all to highly complex and sophisticated
Performance Objectives Systems.  Even where several districts
used the same basic type of system, they still varied a great deal
in actual implementation.  No two districts were exactly alike in
the systems they used.

In the eight categories of Performance Standards Systems,
only three were used in any of the subject districts.  Four of
the five which were not used involved highly unilateral, subjective
assessment by the evaluator, with very little involvement of the
principal or emphasis on conferences.  The fifth type which was
not used in any of the districts was evaluation by a team of
evaluators.  Five of the twenty districts indicated the use of
a Performance Standards, or checklist rating system.  Two of the
five included self-evaluation by the principal on the same check-
list, the other three ratings were done by the superintendent only.
All included final conferences, with copies of the evaluation going
to the principal and to the superintendent's central file.  A
sixth district was in the process of changing from a checklist
rating system to a highly structured Performance Objectives System.

Twelve of the twenty districts used various forms of Perfor-
mance Objectives Systems.  Most of these systems used a checklist
based on the principals' job description or the job description
itself as the basis for evaluation.  These checklists were generally

considered the "givens" which guaranteed overall satisfactory performance. In some cases principals were rated on these items and in others they were treated as one phase of objectives. In most districts, objectives or goals for the year were treated as "extras," above and beyond the basic job role, generally for special district, building or personal project areas. A few districts limited evaluation to the setting and attainment of objectives, generally divided into organizational and personal areas, and this was part of the overall management and instructional process.

Of the two districts with no formal, written system, one was a highly structured, though unwritten, Performance Objectives System. Only one district reported that it had no evaluation system at all.

Most, if not all, of the districts placed a great deal of emphasis on informal, unwritten, ongoing evaluation which, in many cases, was not viewed as evaluation but as "coaching" or personal supervision, or as a team effort of shared responsibility. The type and extent of this evaluation varied greatly according to the district and the personal styles of superintendents as well as of principals.

Of the thirteen selected recommended evaluation practices, ten were implemented, in varying degrees, by the majority of subject districts. Interview data showed that, in some cases, these practices were probably not implemented to an extent where they proved effective. This omission was particularly evident in regard to the amount of time evaluators devoted to observation

and to evaluation in general. This failure to fully implement
practices was also a factor in items dealing with unsatisfactory
results: except in a few examples of extreme cases, unsatisfactory
results were dealt with privately and little was done, at least
on paper, in terms of response or remediation. Half of the
districts indicated that pay raises were tied to evaluation, but
in most of these ten districts, pay raises were determined
subjectively by the superintendent, who took evaluation into
account along with other factors. Only one district had a quanti-
tative measure of performance which was used to determine raises.
Thirteen districts indicated that in-service training was not deter-
mined specifically according to evaluation results. In several
cases such training was tied to district goals or specific projects
underway, or left to the individual principal to plan and pursue
according to individual goals or needs.

One practice which was not actually implemented in any of
the districts was providing a procedure for principals to appeal
unsatisfactory evaluation results to a higher authority other
than the evaluator. Only one district had an administrative
council which, according to the superintendent, could act as such
a higher authority if the principal elected to bring it up there.
He noted that disagreements were not likely to be brought up
since most principals preferred to settle such issues privately
with the superintendent. Superintendents presented a united front
on this issue: they believed that they were, and should be, the
final authority in such instances. Most indicated that disagree-

ments on results could generally be resolved privately. They did not see anything to be gained from a principal requesting a hearing with the school board, since boards generally have delegated this responsibility to the superintendent and would tend to back his judgments. Most superintendents indicated that, in an instance where a principal's performance continued to be unsatisfactory, specific plans for remediation should be made with target dates for change to be accomplished before dismissal occurred. Since principals were not asked to comment on this point specifically, their viewpoint on remediation and appeal is not known. Some did indicate, however, that if you were a principal, you ought to be able to perform effectively, otherwise you should not be in the job. No one raised the issue that they felt the need for such an avenue of appeal. It appears likely that such issues are dealt with "behind closed doors" and that the principals, in this study, at least, may prefer this policy. In cases which were cited where principals had been ineffective, they had been asked to resign, and, for the most part, had done so without appealing the fairness of their assessment.

While a wide variety of factors appeared to influence the types of systems used in districts, a few common trends seemed significant. Some common factors appeared to influence the implementation of a majority of the recommended practices.

One factor which was apparent in the frequency and the narrative analysis that appeared to have definite influence on the type of evaluation system used was the size of the district.

Larger districts were more inclined to use more highly structured

systems, with more documentation, and with common goal-setting

processes than were smaller districts. Smaller districts tended

to rely more on informal assessment with little documentation.

This finding is consistent with the findings of Barraclough[3]

and several other researchers of administrative evaluation. It

is logical that, as districts become larger and more complex,

where people are not working in close proximity, there is a

definite need for a structured system with common district goal

setting to insure that the various principals are working toward

similar ends. The lack of frequent contact also brings about a

need for documentation, both by the principal himself and by the

evaluator, for the purpose of accountability as well as of record.

In the study, the largest districts, with several principals,

had highly structured Performance Objectives Systems. The only

large district which did not report a formal, written system,

did in fact use a rather highly structured goal-setting and

attainment process, with a committee network, calendar of target

dates and annual reports taking the place of evaluation documents.

Another reason that such systems are found in large districts is

that they provide documentation for the superintendent to justify

salary increases for principals. Board members in such districts

are not likely to have the first-hand knowledge of each principal

and school as they tend to have in small districts, thus, docu-

mentation of performance is more important. Small districts

---

[3] Barraclough, _Administrator Evaluation_, 1974, p. 1.

which used Performance Objectives Systems tended to do so more
because they were the preference of the superintendent, and
the systems tended to be less formal with more emphasis on
personal interaction than on documentation.

Conversely, arge districts were not as inclined to implement
a majority of recommended practices as were small districts.
All small districts implemented a majority of the practices,
while only half of the large districts did. This difference
may be due to the fact that most of the practices required a
fairly large degree of time and involvement. The practices may
be easier to implement with smaller, close groups and become
less time efficient as the size of the administrative team
increases.

Higher wealth districts were more inclined to use the more
structured, and more costly to implement, Performance Objectives
Systems than were districts of lower wealth. WHile this finding
was to be expected, other monetary factors played a key role as
well. The effects of declining enrollments on state aid, the
state equalization formula and the socio-economic level of the
community also appeared to be influencing factors, although
these data were not examined in frequency analysis or in all
subject districts. Some districts with high per-pupil assessed
valuation were dealing with the problems of decreased budgets
and inflationary influences, and there was no indication that
such districts were able or willing to spend large amounts of
time and money on complex evaluation systems. Such districts

tended to use Performance objectives, but in a fairly simple unstructured framework.

High wealth and low wealth districts tended to implement a majority of the recommended practices more than did medium wealth districts. No clear reasons were evident for this difference. Implementation of recommended practices had a definite hearing on the perceived effectiveness of evaluation. It may be that districts of low wealth found them cost efficient because of the high return in effectiveness and that high wealth districts not only found them effective but were well able to afford the investment.

Districts in which principals' salaries were below the average were much more inclined to use the more complex structure of Performance Objectives Systems and to implement recommended practices than were districts with above-average salaries. Since no correlation was found between principals' average salaries and wealth or size of the district, these factors would not seem to be the cause. Principals with medium years of experience received higher salaries on the average than did principals with high or low years of experience. It may be that principals in this group are in their peak years of administrative performance, and, thus, are paid more and left more on their own (without evaluation monitoring) than are beginning principals or those nearing retirement age. The more experienced principals appeared to be less mobile, more secure in their jobs, and less competitive in the job market than did younger principals, which may account for

the lower salaries of principals with more experience. Inexperienced principals undoubtedly require more time in monitoring and supervising their performance; thus, the more complex systems are understandable. It may also be that principals who have been in their positions for many years need the motivation of goal setting and monitoring of performance in order to continue high level performance. There was also some evidence that superintendents wanted the documentation of achieved objectives to help them get equitable raises for principals. It may be that some districts with low principals' salaries have adopted Performance Objectives Systems to provide this documentation and obtain higher salaries.

A fourth factor which undoubtedly was a major influence on the type of system used and the practices which were implemented was the management style and preferences of the superintendent. While this factor was not measured quantitatively, it was definitely apparent in the interviews with superintendents. That this is a major influence is not inconsistent with the influences of size, wealth and salary: a competent superintendent would be likely to favor an evaluation system which was effective in a particular district, or at least to adapt his preferred system to the district. A few superintendents had established the system somewhat autocratically, some had let it evolve or stay the same over the years, some have taken principals' preferences into account, some have involved principals to a high degree in developing the system, and at least one uses a system the principals prefer

although it is not his choice. In all of these cases, however,
the superintendent has been in control, and, according to the
degree of autocracy or democracy in his management style, he has
established and implemented the system of evaluation. In most
districts, school boards delegate this responsibility to the
superintendent. In only one case was the use of a Performance
Objectives System by the mandate of the board, and even there,
the superintendent clearly agreed with and perhaps influenced
this action.

The effectiveness of the various evaluation systems and
implemented practices as perceived by superintendents and princi-
pals fell into rather distinct patterns, substantiated both by
frequency analysis and by the narrative analysis which was based
on interviews. Perceived effectiveness was limited primarily
to the contribution of evaluation to principals' professional
growth as judged by principals and superintendents and to expressed
satisfaction with the system.

One highly significant finding was that the type of evaluation
system used made no difference in the perceived effect on principals'
professional growth. There was no difference between this perception
of principals and superintendents in systems using Performance
Objectives than in those using Performance Standards or no formal
system. While superintendents in both groups perceived evaluation
as a contributing factor somewhat more than did principals in both
groups, there was no difference according to the type of evaluation.
(Sixty-five percent of all superintendents perceived evaluation as

a major contributing factor, while only half of all principals did so.) Most researchers surveyed in the literature concurred that professional growth was a primary purpose of evaluation, and Performance Objectives Systems were most highly recommended. This viewpoint was substantiated by the surveys of research by Barraclough[4] and other individuals as well as by the Educational Research Service.[5] The findings of this study would not support the premise that Performance Objectives Systems contribute to professional growth, a major purpose of evaluation, more than do other types of systems.

Principals, to a large degree, and superintendents, to some extent, expressed more satisfaction with Performance Standards Systems or no formal evaluation than with Performance Objectives Systems. These findings would appear to be a direct contradiction of the recommendations in the literature for the use of Performance Objectives. The reason for these findings was apparent in interviews with principals and superintendents. Complex, time-consuming Performance Objectives Systems are generally viewed as busy work which interfere with the more important tasks of running a large school. Principals, in particular, tended to favor a process which provided direction but which did not "get in their way." Many superintendents voiced the same opinion. Several systems which met the definition of Performance Objectives Systems were, in fact, designed in a fairly simple structure which did not

---

[4] Barraclough, Administrator Evaluation, 1974, p. 12

[5] ERS, Evaluating Administrative Performance, p. 9.

demand a great deal of additional time or paperwork.

On the other hand, the implementation of a majority of recommended practices did appear to make a real difference in perceived professional growth and satisfaction with evaluation, particularly in the perception of superintendents. In those districts which did not implement a majority of the practices, none of the superintendents felt evaluation contributed to professional growth and none was satisfied with their evaluation system. In districts which did implement a majority of the practices, 87 percent of the superintendents believed evaluation contributed to professional growth and 73 percent expressed satisfaction with the system (At least two superintendents in such districts who did not express satisfaction did so because they were always striving to improve the system; not because they were dissatisfied with the present system.) Of principals in districts which did not implement most practices, 39 percent felt evaluation contributed to professional growth and 47 percent were satisfied with the system. In districts which did implement the practices, 56 percent of the principals perceived professional growth and 74 percent were satisfied with the system. The difference between principals and superintendents in their perception of professional growth was probably due to the tendency principals had to separate their professional growth from the evaluation process and view it as a personal, self-motivated process, while superintendents generally had a broader perception which included motivating principals to want to grow professionally

and to do it on their own. Overall then, the implementation

of recommended evaluation practices, regardless of the structure

of the system, did appear to have a positive effect on principals'

professional growth and on satisfaction with the evaluation process,

as perceived by both principals and superintendents. It is likely

that implementing these practices also promotes positive, informal

and frequent interaction between principals and superintendents.

A multi-faceted factor which appeared to influence the per-

ceived effectiveness of evaluation more than any other was the

degree of mutual trust, esteem, openness, and frequency of inter-

action in the working relationship of the principal and superin-

tendent. While this factor was not included in the frequency

analysis (these characteristics are very difficult, if not impossible,

to measure accurately), its influence was readily apparent in the

interviews with principals and, in varying degrees, with superin-

tendents. Regardless of the complexity of the formal system, most

principals and superintendents placed major importance on "ongoing,

informal evaluation." The success of this informal evaluation

was apparent in those districts where superintendents placed high

priority on team effort and shared responsibility; where open,

even "no-holds-barred," interaction was encouraged within an

administrative council; where superintendents reinforced positive

performance and gave meaningful suggestions for improved perfor-

mance; where positive interrelationships were evident; where

principals expressed respect for the superintendent's adminis-

trative ability; and where the superintendent was frequently in

the schools and interacting with principals. Where these factors were lacking, so, too, was satisfaction with the evaluation system. In large districts where superintendents delegated other tasks to make time for this "informal evaluation" and/or where they delegated at least part of this responsibility to an effective assistant superintendent, satisfaction with evaluation was evident. Where superintendents did not take the time or delegate part of the responsibility, principals voiced a great deal of frustration and dissatisfaction. Several principals in the study expressed dissatisfaction with an evaluator rating them when he did not really know what was happening in their buildings. They expressed a desire for positive criticism and suggestions for improvement from an evaluator who knew their situation first-hand and who had a high detree of administrative skill.

Another major factor, closely related to the above, was the detree to which the evaluation process was valued in the district. Two areas, again difficult to measure, appeared to influence this "valuing." One was the degree to which the superintendent valued the evaluation system. In several districts, it became apparent that a fairly sophisticated system was "on paper," but was not actually put into practice. In those districts where it was apparent to principals that the superintendent did not place a great deal of time or importance on the evaluation process, neither did they, and evaluation was more of an exercise than a valuable tool. Where superintendents and principals appeared

to be honest with each other about not emphasizing evaluation, little dissatisfaction resulted. However, where superintendents told principals it was an important process, but did not give it time and attention, principals tended to be frustrated, felt cheated and were dissatisfied, not only with evaluation but with their general working situation. A second area which seemed to contribute greatly to the value principals placed on their evaluation was the degree to which they were involved in developing the system and to which they understood the process. The most effective systems seemed to be those where an administrative group conducted an extensive study of evaluation literature and practices and then developed a system (with the involvement of the superintendent) which incorporated the best of what they had learned with their individual district needs and their personal management styles. This group involvement was most effective where there was a relatively stable administrative staff. This process promoted commitment to the system and a real understanding of how it should work, and, thus, it was effective in that district.

This chapter has presented a quantitative and narrative analysis of the evaluation systems and practices in subject districts, and a summary of major trends drawn from this analysis. The following, and final, chapter presents conclusions and recommendations for the evaluation of principals, as well as suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Comparison of Recommended Systems and Practices

With Findings of the Survey

While a great many different recommendations for the evalu-
ation of secondary principals were reported in the review of
educational literature, general trends reported by the Educa-
tional Research Service[1] and the recommendations which were made
as a result of individual surveys of research by Poliakoff[2] and
others represented the consensus of leading authorities. In
this study, many of the same trends were found and many of the
recommendations were implemented. This was not an unusual
finding, as superintendents and principals in these large subur-
ban districts are generally well-qualified, experienced, familiar
with current research, and might be expected to implement the
recommendations of that research. Several districts had exem-
plary systems of evaluation. The findings which were unusual,
and perhaps most significant to this study, were the manner in
which some evaluation systems were developed and implemented,
and the perceived effectiveness of these systems.

---

[1] ERS, Evaluating Administrative Performance, pp. 2-20.

[2] Poliakoff, "Evaluating School Personnel," pp. 39-44.

241

The surveys of the ERS noted a growing trend toward the use of Performance Objectives Evaluation Systems[3], particularly in larger, more complex school systems. This trend was also found in subject districts, with 60 percent of the districts using some form of Performance Objectives. In the few districts which used such systems to manage the total educational process and which gave high priority to the system, the effects were generally positive and promoted common direction, even though principals often found them cumbersome. The primary disadvantage is the large amount of time required for developing and documenting the many phases. Some principals felt the process interfered ith "the real work." In some instances, simplified versions of these systems had been developed, and while they were given high priority, demanded much less time and were generally effective. In such systems, the evaluator and principals simply discussed the questions, "Where are we now? Where should we be headed? What should we concentrate on this year?" and repeated this process periodically, usually with brief documentation and target dates. In other cases, however, a complex system was "on paper", not given high priority, and was not only ineffective but produced negative perceptions. Other systems which were also perceived as effective, particularly in smaller districts, were those which used a checklist rating of Performance Standards as the formal system, but placed strong emphasis on

---

[3] ERS, <u>Evaluating Administrative Performance</u>, p. 2-22.

informal goal setting evaluation and interaction. In fact, any type of system which lacked this informal element was not perceived as effective. Thus, while recommended evaluation systems were used in most subject districts, their effectiveness was dependent on a variety of factors other than the structure of the system itself.

Of the thirteen recommended practices selected from the literature, it was found that most subject districts implemented a majority. Although these practices were not limited to any particular type of evaluation system, but were general recommendations, there was a strong correlation between their implementation and the perceived effectiveness of evaluation.

Recommended practices for guaranteeing principals' professional due process rights and an avenue of appeal to a higher authority other than the evaluator as part of the formal evaluation procedure were not implemented in the subject districts. Most superintendents stated that common professional due process rights would be effected if they were considering releasing a principal, that he would be given notice, a plan of remediation, and target dates for change before dismissal occurred. However, professional due process was not included in any of the procedural statements which were available. Likewise, no procedures were included for appeal of unsatisfactory evaluation results. Most superintendents maintained that they had been given the responsibility and authority by the board of education to make final decisions in such matters, and that exercising this authority was necessary to the effective

functioning of an organization. They also indicated that it was necessary to be adequately informed, flexible, unbiased and fair. While principals were not surveyed on this practice, none of them voiced any objections during the brief interviews. This situation was not in keeping with recommended practices in the literature. It is important to note, however, that writers on this subject generally represent the viewpoint of principals and not superintendents or school boards. If the absence of this practice contributed to ineffective evaluation or dissatisfaction among principals, it was not apparent in the findings of this study. However, based on the attention given this practice in the literature, and the absence of such data from principals in this study, this appears to be an important, and generally unresolved, issue.

One recommended practice which was found to be particularly important was that principals should participate in the development of the system by which they are evaluated. While 90 percent of the superintendents indicated on the questionnaire that this was implemented, it was apparent in interviews that this participation was limited in most districts to periodic review of the existing system or reaction to a superintendent's proposed system. In those districts where principals had been involved to a high degree in researching and developing the particulars of the system, a great deal of commitment to that system was evident and it was generally effective.

Recommendations found in many articles on evaluation emphasize the importance of frequent positive interaction; mutual planning,

trust and esteem; and meaningful suggestions for improvement of performance from the evaluator. Since these elements are difficult to define and quantify, few research studies are available on their effect on evaluation effectiveness. Yet, through the interviews it became apparent that these elements were crucial to the effectiveness of evaluation, whether as a planned part of the formal system or as informal evaluation which was neither designed nor documented.

Thus, in general, evaluation systems and practices recommended in the literature were found in subject districts, but it was also found that many subtle, intangible factors play a role at least as important as the structure of the formal evaluation system.

## Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions have been reached:

1. Formal evaluation of principals should be and can be conducted effectively in large suburban secondary schools.

2. The specific structure and type of evaluation system make very little difference so long as basic stages of a process and specific practices are present. No one type of system is appropriate for all districts, superintendents, or principals.

3. The evaluation process should include the following stages: A) Needs Assessment, B) Goal Setting, C) Action to achieve goals, and D) Final Assessment. Goals should be developed through the overall job description, specific organizational goals and personal

performance goals. A current job description may serve as a continuous, comprehensive checklist of overall performance, while organizational and personal goals should be set each year.

4. Principals must thoroughly understand, value, and be committed to the evaluation process for it to be effective.

5. Principal involvement in researching and developing the system by which they are evaluated are important factors in their understanding of and commitment to the evaluation system.

6. Principals tend to value and place importance on the evaluation system to the extent the superintendent values it and gives it his time and attention.

7. Where a new superintendent has previously developed an evaluation system of relatively simple structure which has proven effective, and to which he is strongly committed, such a system may be implemented successfully in a new district. If the system is complicated or unproven or if the superintendent does not have and demonstrate a strong commitment to it, it is not likely to be successful.

8. For evaluation to be effective, principals need to know what is expected of them (job description and goals) and by what criteria they will be assessed. Their participation in establishing these expectations and criteria and their agreement with them promote increased effectiveness.

9. Principals' self-evaluation and motivation to grow professionally are important factors in effective evaluation.

10. Principal participation in evaluation is a deterrent to negative reaction to and dissatisfaction with evaluation results.

11. The mechanics and documentation required of the principal in
the evaluation process should be present but simple. They should
contribute to and not detract from his carrying out the duties of
his job and achieving goals.

12. Ongoing informal evaluation is an essential element of overall
effective evaluation. Factors which must be present in successful
informal evaluation are frequent interaction; frequent presence
of the superintendent in the school for the purpose of observing
the principal's overall performance; honest feedback to the
principal based on that observation; and mutual respect, esteem
and honesty.

13. Negative feedback or criticism is most effective where it is
given orally at the time the situation occurs, is not documented,
and is treated confidentially; it is effective if the principal
perceives the superintendent as a skilled administrator who can
help him improve his performance and who is not trying to punish
him or build a file of negative records.

14. The absence of evaluation does not generally result in principal
satisfaction. Positive assessment alone, without suggestions for
solving problems and improving performance, does not result in
principal satisfaction with evaluation, in improved performance,
or in professional growth. Principals want meaningful and honest
evaluation from a superior whose administrative skill they respect.

15. If a superintendent does not perceive value in a formal eval-
uation system, principal satisfaction and performance will be higher
if he conveys that perception to them honestly than if he claims
to endorse a formal system but does not value or implement it.

16. The structure and processes of the evaluation system, both formal and informal, should be compatible with the superintendent's management style for them to be effective. The variations in the degrees of authocratic and democratic processes which are effective for a superintendent in general management will be similarly effective in the specific area of principal evaluation. A superintendent should retain sufficient control of the evaluation process to enable him to implement this factor.

17. For evaluation to be effective, the evaluator must work in close contact with the evaluatee in all stages of evaluation and on an ongoing basis. If superintendents evaluate principals effectively, they must have time for this contact. In larger districts, they should delegate some of their other duties to make time for this contact or they should delegate part of the responsibility for this contact to an assistant, maintaining close contact with the process at all stages.

18. Practices which contribute to effective evaluation are more difficult to implement in large districts than in smaller districts due to the elements of time, the number of people and schools, and complexity of the organization. In such districts more planned effort must be devoted to a formal evaluation system with attention to documentation, communication, and coordinated effort. The structure of the organization, the district budget, and planned conference time must be designed to meet these needs. The implementation of these practices appear to be time and cost effective in terms of professional growth and satisfaction with the system,

regardless of the size or wealth of the district.

19. Highly complex evaluation systems are more costly in terms of time and money than are simpler systems. The time and cost effectiveness of such systems may be, but are not proven to be, better than in less complex systems.

20. Principals in subject districts who are at the mid-point of their careers are paid more and are evaluated less formally than are beginning principals and principals who have been in the same position for many years. More time and effort may be necessary to motivate and assist younger and older principals to grow professionally and to perform at a high level of administrative skill. Principals of middle years of experience may be more self-motivated and capable and, thus, may perform well without close supervision and evaluation.

21. Systems of determining principals' salaries and salary increments were not generally found to be tied closely to formal evaluation results. If salary increments are viewed as fair, they are generally viewed as satisfactory. There appears to be little correlation between the salary a principal receives and his satisfaction with the evaluation system. There are two notable exceptions. If a district pays high principal salaries to attract and keep good principals, and if principals perceive this practice as a sign of esteem for their ability, they are more likely to be satisfied with their evaluation as well as with their working conditions in general. The reverse does not appear to be true. Where high salaries are not given it does not

necessarily result in dissatisfaction. Only where principals are dissatisfied with evaluation practices and also receive low salaries do they express dissatisfaction with those salaries.

## Recommendations

On the basis of recommended systems and practices from educational literature and the conclusions which have been reached in this study, recommendations can be made which may be beneficial in the development of formal evaluation systems. This survey and analysis was limited to large suburban secondary school districts, thus, the recommendations are likely to be effective in secondary suburban districts with student enrollments of 3,500 to 20,000 and with two to ten principals. It is also likely that they would be effective in other districts of similar size and administrative organization. Basic to these recommendations is the assumption that an evaluation system should be developed by the principals who are to be evaluated and the superintendent and any assistant superintendents who play a role in principal evaluation, and that the system should be designed to fit the needs of the individual district. Thus, a process for development, as opposed to a specific system, is recommended here. Since most districts evaluate all administrators by the same system, this process is not limited to principals. The superintendent should take the leadership role in the process, supervising the various steps proposed here:

A. Establish an administrative team which will share the various responsibilities for managing the school district under the direction of the superintendent. Developing the evaluation

system by which they will be evaluated is one of their tasks.

B. Develop a climate of positive, open, honest interaction to deal with problems set goals and achieve mutual agreement both in the team and in personal relationships.

C. As a group, acquire a comprehensive knowledge of administrative evaluation theory and procedures. Attend seminars, bring in consultants, investigate the research and model programs, visit and observe other districts; pool knowledge. Review board policy and state guidelines or mandates.

D. Based on this knowledge, develop a list of practices, which the group mutually agrees are essential elements of effective evaluation for the district. Consensus of these practices must include the agreement and approval of the superintendent who, in most cases, has the final responsibility and authority for evaluation. These practices should deal with, but not be limited to, the following areas:

1. Developing job descriptions with procedure for periodic review and updating.

2. Who the evaluator(s) shall be. The size and organizational design of the district should be taken into account to insure that evaluators have sufficient time to devote to each evaluatee.

3. The amount of time and paperwork which can realistically be included to insure that various aspects of the system will not be neglected.

4. How evaluation will be documented; who will receive copies.

5. Various aspects of the administrator's role which will be evaluated, including the job description, organizational responsibilities and personal management techniques.

6. Flexibility to adjust evaluation to changing conditions.

7. Provisions for self-evaluation.

8. Provision for the accumulation of sufficient, comprehensive, first-hand knowledge of overall performance data on which final assessment will be based.

9. Provision for various cyclical stages within a yearly evaluation period.

10. Provisions for relating administrative in-service to evaluation goals and results.

11. The degree and manner in which informal, continuous interaction between the evaluator and evaluatee will be incorporated as part of the formal system.

12. Steps which will be taken when unsatisfactory evaluation results occur.

13. The relationship of evaluation results to salary increases.

14. Manner of in-service in the administrative evaluation system for new members of the administrative team.

15. Provision for periodic review and revision of the evaluation system.

16. Statement of philosophy and purpose of evaluation.

E. Design and document the formal evaluation system, incorporating the agreed upon practices. Specify the format of documentation and/or the evaluation instrument. Provision for the following phases of evaluation should be included:

1. Needs assessment in areas of the job description, the organization, and personal management techniques.

2. Establishing goals based on the job description, the organization, and personal management techniques. Determining how goal attainment will be assessed.

3. Action which will be taken by the evaluator and evaluatee to achieve goals, including periodic assessment, target dates and procedure for revision.

4. Final assessment and beginning of new cycle.

While the process of developing an evaluation system in this manner requires time and effort, it seems essential for the effective functioning of an evaluation system and provides for thorough understanding of and commitment to the process by all members of the group. The evaluation system which results from this developmental process need not be highly time-consuming nor complex. Simplicity of documentation will minimize the amount of time required for the formal evaluation and should promote informal interaction and assessment.

Districts which presently have a reasonably satisfactory system of administrative evaluation might review the steps in the proposed developmental process in order to evaluate their system and perhaps improve it. It may be that incorporating a few basic elements or practices which are not currently in effect would promote a more satisfactory system. On the basis of the survey results, examples of elements which might be added are: final written assessment by the evaluator, simple documentation of an existing process, providing workshop time for assessing district needs, improvement of interaction skills through in-service activities, elimination of cumbersome aspects of the existing system which cause dissatisfaction, emphasis on the evaluator's role in providing constructive criticism and meaningful suggestions for goal attainment, reorganization of the evaluator's responsibilities to provide time for on-site observation and interaction, and periodic review sessions to insure common understanding of the evaluation system.

## Suggestions for Further Research

The findings of this study have raised many questions regarding administrative evaluation which go unanswered. If it is true that the actual structure of the formal evaluation system has little impact on the perceived effectiveness of evaluation, then it is most important to further identify those factors which do have an impact.

Howsam and Franco have suggested that too much time and effort has been devoted to developing formal evaluation systems which are

ineffective, and that this time could be better devoted to developing organizational climates conducive to performance and mutual understanding of administrative processes and behavior.[4] The findings of the study appear to bear out this observation. There are certain basic evaluation processes which should be implemented, but, as one experienced superintendent suggested, "Good administrators did this long before we heard of MBO's. You sit down with your people and talk about where you are, where you ought to be headed, how you will get there, and how you will know when you've arrived. As long as you all agree on these things, it probably isn't even essential to write them down. But you do need to talk about it and act in a concerted effort." If an effective organizational climate--the "informal evaluation" referred to so often in the interviews--is basic to effective evaluation, then further research in this area is needed. Most factors involved in such an organizational climate are intangibles such as trust, honesty, respect, esteem and interaction. As a result of this study, it is suggested that further research be conducted in an effort to identify and define these factors, determine the extent of their effect on evaluation, and develop methods of fostering them where they are lacking.

Another element of evaluation which warrants further research is the assessment of actual results of evaluation in terms of management and organizational efficiency. If it were found that

---

[4]Howsam and Franco, "Evaluation of Administrators," pp. 7 and 40.

the highly complex, time-consuming goal oriented systems did result in higher management and organizational efficiency, then such systems could be recommended over simpler, more informal systems. If they do not, then the less complex systems would certainly be preferred since they are less costly and, on the basis of this study, seem to be favored by most principals and superintendents.

Finally, the area of professional due process and appeal for principals when their evaluation results are unsatisfactory or they face dismissal needs further study. The difference in the perceptions of superintendents in this study from the recommendations in the literature are distinct. Both of the "sides" reported here may be biased. The perceptions of principals, including those who have been dismissed, need to be determined. Various avenues of appeal to objective authorities need to be explored and tested. While it is reasonable that principals are entitled to these rights, it is possible that they themselves see no need for them; that, as management personnel, they should not appeal management decisions; or that such procedures are not actually feasible with present school district organizational structures and state school codes. However, further research and development in this area would be helpful in answering the questions which at present are unresolved.

## Summary

It can be concluded that the results of this study have provided some further insight into principal evaluation systems

and practices as they are recommended in educational literature
and implemented in the subject school districts. Some of the
important factors in effective evaluation have been identified
and suggestions have been made for studying others. A process
for the development of an effective principal evaluation system
has been proposed, based on the in-depth analysis of evaluation
systems and practices in subject districts.

William Pharis summarized the essence of evaluation as the
answer to the question, "How are we doing as principals?"[5]
The findings of this study may contribute to an effective means
for finding that answer.

---

[5] Pharis, "Evaluation of School Principals," p. 36.

LIST OF REFERENCES

WORKS CITED

Anderson, B. Robert. "Administrative Team in Motion: Evaluation
    and Team Work Result in Effective Administration."
    School Management, 17 (March, 1973), 19-24.

Andrews, Richard L. The Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory:
    Preliminary Manual. Seattle, Washington: Bureau of School
    Services and Research, University of Washington, 1970.

Arikado, Marjorie, and Musella, Donald. "Toward an Objective
    Evaluation of the School Principal." The Headmaster
    (Winter, 1974), 13-15.

Armstrong, Harold R. "Performance Evaluation." National Elemen-
    tary Principal, 52 (February, 1973), 51-57.

Barraclough, Terry. Administrator Evaluation. Washington, D.C.:
    National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1974.

    . Administrator Evaluation, Educational Management Review
    Series #15. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educa-
    tional Management, 1973.

Battelle Memorial Institute. Increasing the Effectiveness of
    Educational Management: A Research Proposal. Columbus,
    Ohio: Columbus Labs, 1968.

Beall, Lewis L. "Evaluating the Principal: Case Study No. 7."
    Thrust for Education Leadership, 22 (November, 1972),
    36-39.

Brick, Michael, and Sanchis, Robert. "Evaluating the Principal:
    Case Study No. 4. "Thrust for Education Leadership, 2
    (October, 1972), 32-37.

Brown, Richard. "The Truth About MBO." "Wisconsin Education
    Association Journal, 105 (September, 1972), 12.

Buser, Robert L., and Stuck, Dean L. Evaluation and the Principal.
    Springfield, Illinois: Illinois Principals Assocation, 1976.

Campbell, Roald F. The Evaluation of Administrative Performance.
    Paper presented at American Association of School Adminis-
    trators Annual Convention, Atlantic City, New Jersey,
    February, 1971.

Carvell, James. "Evaluating Administrative Performance: Case Study No. 6." Thrust for Education Leadership, 2 (November, 1972), 31-5.

Castetter, William B., and Heisler, Richard S. Appraising and Improving the Performance of School Administrative Personnel. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Center for Field Studies, University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education, 1971.

Chicago Tribune. September 28, 1977.

Culbertson, Jack A. Evaluation of Middle-Administrative Personnel: A Component of the Accountability Process. Paper presented at the American Association of School Administrators Annual Convention, Atlantic City, New Jersey, February, 1971.

_____. Performance Objectives for School Principals. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1974.

Dallas Independent School District. Administrators Professional Evaluation. Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, 1974-5.

Denney, Robert. "A Rating Scale for Elementary Principals." American School Board Journal, 149 (December. 1964), 11-12.

De Vaughn, J. Everette. Policies, Procedures and Instruments in the Evaluation of Teacher and Administrator Performance. Atlanta, Georgia: Davis Associates, Inc., 1971.

Educational Service Region of Cook County. Cost and Financial Resources, Cook County Elementary and High School Districts, Research Report #2000. Chicago, Illinois: Educational Service Region of Cook County, 1977.

_____. Directory of Suburban Public Schools. Chicago, Illinois: Educational Service Region of Cook County, 1978.

_____. Cook County Suburban Public School Principals Salary Study, Research Report #1001. Chicago, Illinois: Educational Service Region of Cook County, 1978.

Educational Research Service. Evaluating Administrative Performance. Washington, D.C.: ERS, 1974.

_____. Evaluating Administrative Performance, ERS Circular Number 7. Washington, D.C.: ERS, 1968.

_____. Evaluating Administrative/Supervisory Performance. Washington, D.C.: ERS, 1971.

Goslin, William L. "Evaluation of Administrative Performance by a School's Teaching Staff." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin. (December, 1974), 72-81.

Good, Carter V. Introduction to Educational Research. 2nd ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.

Gorton, Richard A. "Guidelines for the Evaluation of Principals." Wisconsin School News (February, 1976), 9-10.

Gothold, Stuart E. Principal Evaluation. Los Angeles, California: Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, Educational Planning Center, 1973.

Greene, Robert E. Administrative Appraisal: A Step to Improved Leadership. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1972.

Hacker, Thorne. "A Word of Warning." School Management, 16 (June, 1972), 29.

Hickcox, Edward S. "Assessment of Administrative Performance—The Road Not Taken." The Journal (January, 1975), 5-8.

Highland Public Schools. Educational Leadership by Objectives. Highland, Indiana: Highland Public Schools Educational Service Center, 1971.

Howsam, Robert B., and Franco, John M. "New Emphases in Evaluation of Administrators." National Elementary Principal, 44 (April, 1965), 36-40.

"How to Make Your Staff Accountable for What It Does - Not What It Is." American School Board Journal, 161 (March, 1974), 32-6.

Illinois Office of Education. Guidelines for Fair Treatment of Administrators. Springfield, Illinois: State Board of Education, 1975.

Ingraham, William W., and Keefe, John E. "Values of Management by Objectives." School Management, 16 (June, 1972), 28-9.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Knezevich, Stephen J. Management by Objectives and Results -
A Guidebook for Today's School Executive. Arlington,
Virginia: American Association of School Administrators,
1973.

Kostes, Tom P. "An Analysis of the Process of Evaluating Ele-
mentary School Principals in Selected School Districts,
Cook County, Illinois." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation,
Loyola University of Chicago, 1979.

MacQueen, Warren Finley. "Evaluating the Job Performance of
the Public High School Principal." Unpublished Doctoral
Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1969.

McCleary, Lloyd E. Competency Based Educational Administration
and Application to Related Fields. Paper presented at
Conference on Competency Based Administration, Arizona
State University, Tempe, Arizona, January, 1973.

Melton, George, et al. The Principalship: Job Specifications and
Salary Considerations for the 70's. Washington, D.C.:
National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1970.

Mrdjenovich, Donald, and Meitler, Neal. "Evaluation and Perfor-
mance Compensation for Administrators." Wisconsin School
News (February, 1976), 11-12.

Nichols, Everett W. "Performance of Principals in the Accounta-
bility Syndrome." National Association of Secondary School
Principals Bulletin, 56 (May, 1972), 94-102.

Oberg, Winston. "Make Performance Appraisal Relevant." Harvard
Business Review, 50 (January-February, 1972), 61-7.

Pharis, William L. "Evaluation of School Principals." National
Elementary Principal, 52 (February, 1973), 36-8.

Poliakoff, Lorraine. "Recent Trends in Evaluating School
Personnel." National Elementary Principal, 52 (February,
1973), 39-44.

Redfern, George B. "Legally Mandated Evaluation." National
Elementary Principal, 52 (February, 1973), 45-50.

_____. "Principals: Who's Evaluating Them, Why and How?"
National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin,
56 (May, 1972), 85-93.

Rosenberg, Max. "How Does Your Principal Rate?" Teacher, 91
(May, 1974), 25-7.

_____. "How to Evaluate Your Principals Without Scaring (or Turning) Them Off." American School Board Journal, 160 (June, 1973), 35-6.

_____. "The Values of School Principal Evaluation." Education, 91 (February-March, 1971), 212-14.

Towns, Robert Mayfield. "A Survey of the Procedures for Evaluating the Performance of Secondary Public School Principals in Michigan." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1974.

Verbeke, Maurice. "Competency-Based Administrative Evaluation." Administrators Quarterly, New Jersey Council of School Administrators (Fall, 1974), 19 and 33.

Wells, Lewis A. "Evaluation of Administrators: Issues and Practices." Oregon School Study Council, 19 (June, 1976)

## SUPERINTENDENTS SURVEYED

Augustus, William. Thornton Township High School, District 205, Harvey, Illinois. Interview, July 26, 1979.

Bickert, Roderick. New Trier High School, District 203, Wilmette, Illinois. Interview, July 12, 1979.

Byrne, David. Leyden Community High School, District 212, Franklin Park, Illinois. Interview, July 10, 1979.

Carrabine, Richard. Bloom Township High School, District 206, Chicago Heights, Illinois. Interview, July 26, 1979.

Gibbs, Wesley. Niles Township High School, District 219, Skokie, Illinois. Questionnaire only.

Gilbert, Edward. Township High School, District 214, Mt. Prospect, Illinois, Interview, July 9, 1979.

Holt, Charles. Proviso Township High School, District 209, Maywood, Illinois. Questionnaire only.

Labat, Margaret. Evanston Township High School, District 202, Evanston, Illinois. Questionnaire only.

Ondrus, Joseph. J. Sterling Morton High School, District 201, Cicero, Illinois. Questionnaire only.

Peckenpaugh, Donald. Consolidated High School, District 230, Palos Hills, Illinois. Interview, July 12, 1979.

Rachford, Edward.  Homewood-Flossmoor High School, District 233,
    Flossmoor, Illinois.  Questionnaire only.

Reber, Donald.  Lyons Township High School, District 204,
    LaGrange, Illinois.  Interview, July 10, 1979.

Sheely, Forrest.  Glenbrook High School, District 225,
    Glenbrook, Illinois.  Interview, July 10, 1979.

Short, Richard.  Maine Township High School, District 207,
    Park Ridge, Illinois.  Interview, July 9, 1979.

Swanson, John.  Oak Park-River Forest High School, District 200,
    Oak Park, Illinois.  Questionnaire only.

Verchota, James.  Thornton Fractional High School, District 215,
    Calumet City, Illinois.  Interview, July 11, 1979.

Warren, James.  Rich Township High School, District 227,
    Park Forest, Illinois.  Interview, July 26, 1979.

Webb, William.  Community High School, District 218,
    worth, Illinois.  Interview, June 27, 1979

Wheat, Robert.  Bremen Community High School, District 228,
    Midlothian, Illinois.  Interview, July 11, 1979.

Zdeb, Carl (designee of Supt. Richard Kolze).  Township High
    School, District 211, Palatine, Illinois.  Interview,
    July 13, 1979.


PRINCIPALS SURVEYED
    Interviewed Summer, 1979

Anderson, Raymond.  Evanston Township High School East.

Barryman, John.  Rich Central High School.

Bieber, George.  Bremen High School.

Clouser, John.  Maine East High School.

Coburn, James.  Maine West High School.

Cochrane, Alfred.  Maine North High School.

Cox, David.  New Trier West High School.

Davidson, George.  Sandburg High School.

Duffy, James.  Glenbrook North High School.

Ellis, Richard. Lyons Township North High School.

Fyfe, Donald. Elk Grove High School.

Goins, Roland. John Hersey High School.

Hillesheim, Thomas. Hoffman Estates High School.

Hoese, Robert. Rolling Meadows High School.

Hosler, Galen. Niles East High School.

Howard, Thomas. William Fremd High School.

Johnson, Roger. Lyons Township High School South.

Keith, James. Andrew High School.

Lowe, Lloyd. Richards High School.

McBain, Philip. Oak Forest High School.

McGee, Ralph. New Trier East High School.

Maunos, Nicholas. Niles West High School.

Martin, Jack. Forest View High School.

Maxeiner, Robert. Thornton Fractional South High School.

Miller, Clarence. Buffalo Grove High School.

Millikin, Thomas. Proviso East High School.

Mutz, William. Shepard High School.

Nash, McKinley. Evanston Township High School West.

Neubauer, Eugene. Bloom Trail High School.

Newendorp, Leonard. Palatine High School.

Perry, William. James B. Conant High School.

Radziejeski, Paul. Thornton Fractional North High School.

Roberts, Edward. Hillcrest High School.

Reed, James. Tinley Park High School.

Salato, Salvatore. Thornridge High School.

Sandefer, Albert.  Rich East High School.

Schreiner, William.  Glenbrook South High School.

Shaffer, George.  Leyden East High School.

Sheehy, John.  Stagg High School.

Shirley, Thomas.  Wheeling High School.

Smith, Charles.  Homewood-Flossmoor South High School.

Smith, John.  Thornton High School.

Spacapan, Edward.  Prospect High School.

Steckel, James.  Bloom High School.

Thompson, Charles.  Leyden West High School.

Vallicelli, Arthur.  Proviso West High School.

VanderWeyden, George.  Homewood-Flossmoor North High School.

Waara, Bruno.  Arlington High School.

Watson, Clyde.  Maine South High School.

Weimer, Carl.  Schaumburg High School.

Weldy, Gilbert.  Niles North High School.

Yates, Donatta.  Eisenhower High School.

APPENDIX A

PART I                    SUPERINTENDENT QUESTIONNAIRE          Code #

PLEASE CIRCLE <u>YES</u> OR <u>NO</u> IN RESPONSE TO EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:

1. Do principals have a written job description which specifies their responsibilities and which is periodically reviewed?

2. Do principals participate in the development of the system by which they are evaluated?                                         YES    NO

3. Are principals made aware of procedures and instruments for evaluation prior to the time of evaluation?                       YES    NO

4. As part of your evaluation practice, are the unique needs of each building used as one criterion for the evaluation of the principal of that building?                                               YES    NO

5. Are principal's formal evaluation results used in determining pay raises and reassignment?                                   YES    NO

6. If evaluation results are unfavorable or if principals do not agree, does your system include a procedure for principals to submit a written response which is attached to the evaluation?               YES    NO

7. If evaluation results are unfavorable or if principals do not agree, does your system include a procedure for principals to obtain a review by a higher district authority or review board other than the evaluator?   YES    NO

8. Do evaluators have sufficient time in their work schedule to properly conduct the evaluation of principals?                      YES    NO

9. Do evaluators have recent training and competency in comprehensive, objective, goal-oriented evaluation of administrative personnel?    YES    NO

10. Do evaluators periodically visit and observe principals in their usual working area for the specific purpose of collecting data for evaluation?   YES    NO

11. Are principals evaluated at least once a year?                     YES    NO

12. If evaluation results are unsatisfactory, is specific remediation planned, in writing, and implemented before the next evaluation?      YES    NO

13. Is the type and content of principal in-service training determined specifically according to the results of their evaluations?      YES    NO

14. In your judgment, is your principal evaluation system a major factor in principals' professional growth?                        YES    NO

15. Are you satisfied with the quality of your present principal evaluation system?                                                 YES    NO


    May I contact the principals in your district to ask their response to Questions 14 and 15?                                      YES    NO

    May I make an appointment with you for a follow-up interview?    YES    NO

**PART II**                    <u>SUPERINTENDENT QUESTIONNAIRE</u>          Code #

OF THE 12 EVALUATION SYSTEMS LISTED BELOW, PLEASE CHECK THE <u>ONE</u> WHICH
MOST CLOSELY DESCRIBES THE SYSTEM OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION USED IN YOUR DISTRICT

(The first eight systems include the use of a standard form listing items of
desired principal performance. Each item is rated either numerically, by
selecting a descriptive phrase, or by written comments. The last four systems
include the use of goals or objectives which are formulated for each individual
principal at the beginning of the evaluation period. They may also include
checklists of prescribed characteristics.)

_____1.    Unilateral evaluation by evaluator; no evaluation conference(s); no notification
           of evaluation outcome to evaluatee unless unsatisfactory rating is given

_____2.    Unilateral evaluation by evaluator; no evaluation conference(s), but evaluatee
           is either shown or given a copy of completed form

_____3.    Unilateral evaluation by evaluator based on conference(s) between evaluator and
           evaluatee during evaluation period; no post-evaluation conference is held, but
           evaluatee is either shown or given a copy of completed form or letter report

_____4.    Unilateral evaluation by evaluator; post-evaluation conference between evaluator
           and evaluatee to discuss rating received; evaluatee <u>may</u> also either be shown or
           given a copy of completed form

_____5.    Evaluations are conducted by team of educators; chairman compiles summary
           evaluation and holds post-evaluation conference with evaluatee to discuss the rating

_____6.    The evaluator and evaluatee agree on major areas of responsibility for evaluatee;
           evaluator rates evaluatee on his performance in each major area; post-evaluation
           conference is held to discuss the evaluation

_____7.    The evaluatee rates himself and evaluator rates evaluatee; these evaluations are
           discussed in a conference, but only the evaluator's rating, which may or may not be
           modified as a result of the conference, appears on the completed form

_____8.    The evaluatee rates himself and evaluator rates evaluatee; both evaluations are
           discussed in conference; both evaluations appear on completed form

_____9.    The evaluatee completes a self-evaluation form, including establishing goals for
           next evaluation period; completed form is submitted to evaluator, who adds his
           comments as to accuracy of evaluatee's evaluation. Post-evaluation conference
           is held to discuss completed form.

____10.    The evaluator and evaluatee, in conference, establish mutually agreed upon
           performance goals for evaluatee, within his major areas of responsibility; evaluator
           rates evaluatee on his accomplishment of performance goals and performance in areas
           of responsibility; post-evaluation conference is held to discuss the evaluation

____11.    Same as #10 above, except that evaluatee completes a self-evaluation prior to
           conference with his evaluator; evaluator places his evaluation on same form with
           evaluatee's; both evaluations are discussed in post-evaluation conference

____12.    Same as #11 above, except that evaluator consults with other individuals, including
           evaluatee's peers and/or staff, students, and parents, before completing his part of
           the evaluation form; only evaluator's evaluation appears on completed form

APPENDIX B

## PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE ANSWER YES OR NO TO EACH ITEM:

1.  In your judgment, is the principal evaluation
    system used in your district a major factor
    contributing to your professional growth?          _____

2.  Are you satisfied with the principal evaluation
    system which is currently used in your district?   _____

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS REGARDING YOUR PRINCIPAL EVALUATION SYSTEM:

APPENDIX C

SUPERINTENDENT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. BASIC QUESTION: Will you describe the process you use in evaluation of principals?

   POSSIBLE FOLLOW-UP SPECIFIC QUESTION:

   a. Does actual practice vary from written policy?  If so, how?
   b. Does evaluation go on over a period of time or is it a one-occasion process?  If the former, what happens at the various stages?
   c. What formal instruments are used?
   d. What does the evaluator do if the results are negative?
   e. What can the principal do if the results are negative? Is he likely to do that?
   f. How are evaluation results used? Salary? Reassignment?
   g. What kind of follow-up to evaluation is used?
   h. The experts recommend_____.  Why doesn't your district incorporate that?

2. BASIC QUESTION: Why do you use the process you use?

   POSSIBLE FOLLOW-UP SPECIFIC QUESTIONS:

   a. How was the system developed?
   b. What are its advantages?
   c. What are its disadvantages?
   d. How does cost and time affect what you do?
   e. If you had more (smaller districts) or fewer (larger districts) principals, would you evaluate differently?
   f. What is your single major purpose of evaluation?
   g. Does a principal's salary influence the way he is evaluated?
   h. Does a principal's years of experience influence the way he is evaluated?

3. BASIC QUESTION: What are the effects of your evaluation process?

   POSSIBLE FOLLOW-UP SPECIFIC QUESTIONS:

   a. What do you want the effect to be?  Is that usually the case?
   b. Does evaluation affect the principal's performance?  If so, how?
   c. In general, is the evaluation process viewed positively or negatively?  Do the principal and/or the evaluator welcome it-- see it as an opportunity to progress--or would they just as soon avoid it?
   d. Are you satisfied with the evaluation system you use?
   e. Do you think principals are satisfied with the evaluation system?
   f. Is there anything you'd like to change or do differently? If so, do you plan to make these changes?  Why or why not?

APPENDIX D

SUMMARY OF DATA

| DISTRICT | TYPE OF FORMAL EVALUATION SYSTEM | NUMBER OF PRACTICES IMPLEMENTED | CHECKLIST | WRITTEN OBJECTIVES | SIZE (STUDENT ENROLLMENT) | WEALTH (ASSESSED VAL./PUPIL) | PRINCIPAL AVERAGE SALARY | PRINCIPAL AVERAGE EXPERIENCE IN EDUCATION | PROFESSIONAL GROWTH FACTOR % PRINCIPAL YES RESPONSES | SUPERINTENDENT | SATISFACTION WITH EVALUATION % PRINCIPAL YES RESPONSES | SUPERINTENDENT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 6 | 7 | x | | Medium | Medium | High | Average | 0 | No | 100 | No |
| 2 | 6 | 12 | x | | Medium | Low | High | Average | 75 | Yes | 100 | Yes |
| 3 | 6 | 9 | x | | Small | Low | Low | Average | 50 | Yes | 100 | Yes |
| 4 | 7 | 11 | x | | Small | Medium | High | Low | 50 | Yes | 100 | Yes |
| 5 | 7 | 11 | x | | Small | Medium | High | Average | --- | Yes | --- | Yes |
| 6 | *8 | 12 | * | * | Small | Low | Low | Below Aver | 100 | Yes | *50 | Yes |
| 7 | 9 | 6 | x | x | Large | Medium | High | Average | 60 | Yes | 15 | Yes |
| 8 | 10 | 9 | x | x | Medium | Medium | Low | High | 30 | Yes | 0 | Yes |
| 9 | 10 | 9 | | x | Large | Medium | Low | Below Aver | 60 | Yes | 80 | Yes |
| 10 | 10 | 11 | | x | Small | Low | Low | Above Aver | 50 | Yes | 100 | *No |
| 11 | 10 | 12 | x | x | Small | Low | Low | Below Aver | 50 | Yes | 100 | Yes |
| 12 | 11 | 7 | x | *x | Medium | Medium | Low | High | 0 | No | 0 | No |
| 13 | 11 | 10 | x | x | Large | Low | Low | Above Aver | 0 | No | 100 | No |
| 14 | 11 | 11 | *- | - | Medium | High | High | High | --- | Yes | --- | No |
| 15 | 11 | 11 | x | x | Medium | Medium | High | Low | 50 | Yes | 100 | Yes |
| 16 | 11 | 12 | | x | Small | High | Low | Low | 100 | Yes | 100 | Yes |
| 17 | 12 | 10 | x | x | Medium | High | High | Average | 60 | Yes | 30 | Yes |
| 18 | 12 | 11 | | x | Medium | Low | Low | Above Aver | 30 | Yes | 30 | Yes |
| 19 | None | 1 | | | Medium | High | High | Above Aver | 0 | No Resp. | 100 | No Resp. |
| 20 | None Written | 5 | | | Large | Medium | Low | Above Aver | 50 | No | 75 | No |

*See Narrative Analysis

Ann E. Ludwig

School of Education
Administration and Supervision
Doctor of Education

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Ann E. Ludwig has been read and

approved by the following committee:

> Dr. Melvin P. Heller, Professor and Chairman Department
> of Administration and Supervision, Loyola

> Dr. Jasper J. Valenti, Professor Department of Ad-
> ministration and Supervision, Associate Dean, School
> of Education, Loyola

> Dr. Philip M. Carlin, Associate Professor Department
> of Administration and Supervision, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the

dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies

the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated

and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the

Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

_May 15, 1980_
Date

_M P Heller_
Director's Signature