



1984

A Study of the Practices and Procedures Utilized to Determine Elementary Principals' Salaries in Selected School Districts of Lake County, Illinois

Lawrence M. Baskin
Loyola University Chicago

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



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Baskin, Lawrence M., "A Study of the Practices and Procedures Utilized to Determine Elementary Principals' Salaries in Selected School Districts of Lake County, Illinois" (1984). *Dissertations*. 2240.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/2240

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1984 Lawrence M. Baskin

309

A STUDY OF THE PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES
UTILIZED TO DETERMINE ELEMENTARY
PRINCIPALS' SALARIES IN SELECTED
SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF
LAKE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

by

Lawrence M. Baskin

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the School of
Education of Loyola University of Chicago in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

January

1984



Lawrence M. Baskin

Loyola University of Chicago

A STUDY OF THE PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES
UTILIZED TO DETERMINE ELEMENTARY
PRINCIPALS' SALARIES IN SELECTED
SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF
LAKE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Statement of the Problem

What are the actual practices and procedures utilized to determine elementary principals' salaries in selected school districts of Lake County, Illinois?

Purposes For This Study

The major purposes for conducting this study were to determine:

- a. How administrative evaluation systems are utilized to determine elementary principals' salaries.
- b. The most important factors considered when determining elementary principals' salaries.
- c. The specific roles played by Superintendents and Principals when determining elementary principals' salaries.
- d. How recommended practices and procedures for determining principals' salaries in the literature compare with what is taking place in practice.

A secondary purpose was to identify advantages and disadvantages for principals electing to formulate unions for collective bargaining purposes.

Methods and Procedures

A questionnaire was developed and provided Superintendents to (1) establish methods utilized to determine principals' salaries; (2) establish systems utilized to evaluate principals; (3) identify the prevalence of principals' job descriptions and; (4) ascertain whether or not the Superintendent and a Principal would consent to an interview.

A structured interview was developed to obtain data from ten Superintendents and ten principals in selected school districts relative to: (1) principals' job descriptions; (2) practices and procedures for evaluating principals; (3) practices and procedures for determining principals' salaries; (4) roles of Superintendents and Principals when evaluating and compensating principals and; (5) collective bargaining for principals' salaries.

Findings

1. Compensation should be commensurate with assessed contributions to the organization.
2. Factors which influence salary determinations for principals include: (1) market pricing for similar positions; (2) past practices; (3) ability of the school district to pay; (4) socio-economic level of the community; (5) level of students within the school; (6) number of contractual days of employment; (7) academic preparation and; (8) tenure in the position.
3. Principals' salaries are most often established through salary schedules, merit pay plans and job evaluation systems.

4. Superintendents and Principals regard instructional leadership as the most important element of the elementary principalship.
5. In seventy percent of the study's school districts job descriptions are not utilized for evaluation purposes.
6. The major purpose for evaluating principals is to improve instructional leadership skills.
7. The most frequently used criterion for evaluating principals is "mutually accepted goals and objectives."
8. While Superintendents consider the "going rate" for the principalship the most important criterion when determining principals' salaries, Principals consider public relations activities as the most important criterion.
9. The total percentage salary increase paid teachers positively influences the total percentage salary increase paid to principals.
10. In seventy percent of the participating school districts, Superintendents award merit pay which is not recognized by Principals.
11. Superintendents and Principals agree that poor salaries and unfair treatment are catalysts for Principals entering into collective bargaining.
12. Principals in this study would not enter into collective bargaining for salaries primarily because they are treated fairly and are vehemently opposed to collective bargaining and unions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to thank Dr. Melvin P. Heller, director of his dissertation committee, for his support, advice and cooperation throughout the preparation of this study. Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Philip Carlen, Chairman of the Department of Administration and Supervision of Loyola University of Chicago and to Dr. Frederick Lunenberg for their assistance as members of the author's dissertation committee.

Also, a special mention of appreciation and thanks to Beverly Franzen for her faithful assistance in typing and editing the manuscript, Dr. Robert Boos for his encouragement and support throughout the preparation of this dissertation and Paul Baskin, recently deceased, and Ruth Baskin for their patience and encouragement throughout the author's life.

Finally, the author is deeply grateful and indebted for the faithful assistance, unfailing encouragement and love given to him by his wife, Barbara Sue and his children, Lindsay Michelle, Jaime Lynn and Traci Cheryl.

VITA

Lawrence M. Baskin, son of Paul and Ruth Baskin, was born May 27, 1947, in Rochester, New York.

His elementary and secondary education was obtained in the public schools of Rochester, New York, where he graduated in June, 1966. In 1970, he received a Bachelor of Science degree, majoring in history and education, from Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois, and in 1973, he graduated from Loyola University of Chicago with a Master of Education degree in school administration and supervision.

He began his professional career in September, 1970, as a teacher in East Maine Elementary School District No. 63, Niles, Illinois. From 1970 to 1973, the author instructed social studies to seventh and eighth grade students.

In 1973, the author was an administrative intern at Loyola University of Chicago while serving as Assistant Principal in Wheeling Community Consolidated School District No. 21.

He became a full time administrator in Wheeling Community Consolidated School District No. 21 in September, 1974, and served the district as Junior High School Assistant Principal and Elementary Principal until June, 1979.

In July 1979, the author was appointed Upper Grade Principal in Libertyville Elementary School District No. 70 and from 1981 to the present he has served as Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. | ii |
| VITA | iii |
| LIST OF TABLES | ix |
| CONTENTS OF APPENDICES | xii |
| Chapter | |
| I. INTRODUCTION. | 1 |
| Justification for the Study. | 1 |
| Purpose for the Study. | 8 |
| Limitations of the Study | 10 |
| Definitions. | 11 |
| II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE. | 14 |
| Factors Considered When Determining Salaries Philosophy, Practices and Principles Considered When Determining Manage- ment Salaries. | 15 |
| Job Descriptions and Compensation Administration | 20 |
| Major Factors Influencing Salary Determinations. | 28 |
| Actual Methods, Practices and Procedures for Determining Salaries. | 33 |
| Summary | 49 |
| Appraisal Systems Utilized To Determining Salaries. | 51 |
| Purposes for Appraising. | 51 |
| Tasks, Duties and Functions of Principals | 66 |
| Summary. | 69 |
| Principals and Collective Bargaining | 70 |
| Summary. | 79 |

| Chapter | Page |
|---|------|
| III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES | 80 |
| Review of the Literature | 80 |
| Selection of the Population. | 81 |
| The Survey Instrument. | 82 |
| The Interview. | 82 |
| Anaylsis of the Data | 84 |
| IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA | 86 |
| Major Purpose 1 - Identify and Analyze Suggested Practices and Criteria for Determining Principals' Salaries in the Literature | 87 |
| Major Purpose 2 - Determine How Adminis- trative Job Descriptions and Evalua- tion Systems Are Utilized to Determine Principals' Salaries. | 89 |
| 2.1 Identify the Various Duties, Tasks and Functions Which Comprise Principals' Job Descriptions | 90 |
| Presentation of the Data. | 91 |
| Analysis of the Data. | 101 |
| 2.2 Identify Criteria Utilized to Evaluate Principals. | 110 |
| Presentation of the Data. | 111 |
| Analysis of the Date. | 113 |
| 2.3 Identify and Analyze the Procedures Utilized to Evaluate Principals. | 119 |
| Presentation of the Data. | 120 |
| Analysis of the Data. | 123 |
| 2.4 Determine the Extent of Principal Participation in His Own Evaluation | 125 |
| Presentation of the Data. | 126 |
| Analysis of the Data. | 127 |
| 2.5 Identify and Analyze Specific Criteria Which Are Most Important in Determining Principals' Salaries. | 129 |
| Presentation of the Data. | 129 |
| Analysis of the Data. | 132 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Major Purpose 3 - Determine The Most Important Factors Considered When Determining Principals' Salaries. | 134 |
| 3.1 Identify and Analyze Factors Superintendents Consider Most Important When Determining Principals' Salaries | 135 |
| Presentation of the Data. | 135 |
| Analysis of the Data. | 141 |
| 3.2 Identify and Analyze Factors Principals Consider Most Important When Determining Principals' Salaries | 145 |
| Presentation of the Data. | 145 |
| Analysis of the Data. | 150 |
| 3.3 Compare and Contrast Superintendents' and Principals' Responses. | 153 |
| Analysis of the Data. | 153 |
| Major Purpose 4 - Determine The Roles Played By Superintendents and Principals In Determining Principals' Salaries | 158 |
| 4.1 Identify and Analyze the Roles Played by Superintendents and Principals As Determined by Superintendents. | 159 |
| Presentation of the Data. | 160 |
| Analysis of the Data. | 163 |
| 4.2 Identify and Analyze the Roles Played by Superintendents and Principals As Determined by Principals | 164 |
| Presentation of the Data. | 164 |
| Analysis of the Data. | 167 |
| 4.3 Compare and Contrast Superintendents' and Principals' Responses. | 167 |
| Analysis of the Data. | 168 |
| Determine the Advantages and Disadvantages Of Collective Bargaining By Principals | 170 |
| Analysis of the Data | 175 |
| V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 183 |
| CONCLUSIONS | 183 |
| Identify and Analyze Suggested Practices and Criteria For Determining Principals' Salaries in the Literature | 184 |

| Chapter | Page |
|--|------|
| Determine How Administrative Job Descriptions and Evaluation Systems Are Utilized to Determine Principals' Salaries | 186 |
| Determine The Most Important Factors Considered When Determining Principals' Salaries | 187 |
| Determine The Roles Played By Superinten- dents and Principals In Determining Principals' Salaries | 188 |
| Determine Advantages and Disadvantages Of Collective Bargaining By Principals. | 189 |
| Recommendations For Futher Study | 190 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY. | 192 |
| APPENDIX A | 198 |
| APPENDIX B | 200 |
| APPENDIX C | 201 |
| APPENDIX D | 202 |
| APPENDIX E | 203 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. Factors and Sub-factors for Job Evaluations. . . . | 46 |
| 2. Administrative/Supervisory Evaluation Data | 47 |
| 3. Administrative/Supervisory Salary Structure. . . . | 48 |
| 4. Number of School Districts With Collective Negotiation Units and Percent of Responding Districts in ERS National Survey, by Enrollment, 1982-83 | 73 |
| 5. Lake County Enrollment Data. | 83 |
| 6. Lake County Assessed Valuation Data. | 83 |
| 7. Lake County Per Pupil Cost Data. | 83 |
| 8. Frequency of Superintendents' and Principals' Responses Regarding Principals' Tasks, Duties and Functions. | 92 |
| 9. Frequency of Superintendents' and Principals' Responses To: How Are Job Descriptions Utilized? | 95 |
| 10. Frequency of Superintendents' and Principals' Responses To: Are The Elements Of the Principal's Job Descriptions Stated As Tasks, Duties or Responsibilities? | 96 |
| 11. Frequency of Superintendents' and Principals' Responses To: Has The Principals' Job Description Been Utilized For Evaluating Purposes? | 98 |
| 12. Frequency of Superintendents' and Principals' Responses To: Has The Principals' Job Description Ever Been Utilized To Determine Salaries? | 99 |
| 13. Frequency of Superintendents' and Principals' Responses To: What Are The Major Purposes For Evaluating Principals? | 111 |

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| 14. Frequency of Superintendents' and Principals' Responses To: What Are The Specific Criteria Utilized To Evaluate Principals? . . . | 112 |
| 15. Frequency of Superintendents' Responses To: How Would You Describe The Principals' Evaluation System? | 120 |
| 16. Frequency of Superintendents' and Principals' Responses To: How Often Are Principals Informally Evaluated? | 122 |
| 17. Frequency of Superintendents' and Principals' Responses To: What Are The Specific Procedures Utilized To Evaluate Principals? . . . | 127 |
| 18. Frequency of Superintendents' and Principals' Responses To: What Are The Most Important Criteria Considered When Determining Principals' Salaries? | 130 |
| 19. Frequency of Superintendents' Responses To: Method Utilized To Determine Principals' Salaries | 131 |
| 20. Superintendents' Responses To: How Are The Results Of Principals' Evaluations Converted Into Salary Determinations? | 136 |
| 21. Superintendent Responses To: Tasks, Duties And Functions Considered When Evaluating and Paying Principals. | 137 |
| 22. Superintendents' Responses To: Other Factors Which Are Most Important When Determining Principals' Salaries | 139 |
| 23. Principals' Responses To: How Are The Results Of Principals' Evaluations Converted Into Salary Determinations? | 146 |
| 24. Principals' Responses To: Tasks, Duties And Functions Considered When Evaluating And Paying Principals. | 148 |
| 25. Superintendents' Responses To: Roles Played In Evaluating Principals | 160 |
| 26. Principals' Responses To: Roles Played In Evaluating Principals. | 165 |

| Table | Page |
|---|------|
| 27. Superintendents' and Principals' Responses To: Factors For Entering Into Collective Bargaining. | 171 |
| 28. Superintendents' and Principals' Responses To: Advantages Of Collective Bargaining. | 172 |
| 29. Superintendents' and Principals' Responses To: Disadvantages Of Collective Bargaining. | 173 |
| 30. Intregative Table | 179 |

CONTENTS OF APPENDICES

| | Page |
|--|------|
| APPENDIX A Letter to Members of Jury Regarding Field Testing of the Superintendent's Questionnaire and Structured Interview | 198 |
| APPENDIX B Questionnaire Completed by Superintendents | 200 |
| APPENDIX C Letter from Employing Superintendent | 201 |
| APPENDIX D Letter to Superintendents Explaining the Questionnaire's Purposes. | 202 |
| APPENDIX E Structured Interview | 203 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Justification for the Study

As one contemplates the present educational milieu with the past, it comes as no surprise that various factors have caused elementary school principals to become increasingly aware of demands to satisfy parents, students, school boards, community leaders, government bodies and the like. The term accountability has been utilized to describe this phenomenon. Exemplified by national assessments, opposition to tax referenda, increased citizen participation and mandated testing, this movement has had a substantial effect upon educational administration.¹ In essence, accountability, as applied to schools, has caused principals to justify organizational as well as personal performance levels.

Stress, which is attendant to accountability, is presently considered an occupational hazard. To a large degree, this stress comes as a result of the changing role of the principal. While in past decades principals were credible

¹American Association of School Administrators, "Theme Six: Accountability, an Enduring Expectation," The American School Superintendency 1982. A Summary Report, 1982 (Arlington, Virginia: The American Association of School Administrators): 67-68.

professionals provided with wide latitudes in decision making, this is no longer the case.

Accountability has caused principals to share decision making with a variety of groups and yet be held personally responsible for those decisions.² Such decision making has been exceedingly difficult in view of the variety of decisions to be rendered, the often found need to be expeditious, the polarization of politically disparate groups, the adverse media attention, the vulnerability from those having "an ax to grind," and the constant threat of litigation.³ Beyond external forces which demand the principal's attention, research indicates the role of the principal in the development and maintenance of a viable environment for learning is fundamental.⁴ Within the text of, The Role of Elementary School Principals: A Summary of Research, the Educational Research Service (ERS) points out while administrators feel pressure from public scrutiny, spend more time completing paperwork and meeting with various groups, effective principals are firm leaders, accessible to students and teachers

²Maurice Vanderpool, "School Administrators Under Stress" Principal 4 (March 1981): 39.

³Ibid., p. 39.

⁴National Association of Elementary School Principals, "Study Confirms Principal's Role" Capitol Comments (July 16, 1982): 6.

and have a substantial impact upon the educational process.⁵ From studies conducted by the ERS in California, Delaware, Maryland, Michigan, New York and Pennsylvania, it was determined "the greatest asset of an exemplary school is its firm leadership and because of that leadership, students in exemplary schools believe that they can control their own destinies."⁶

The report further indicated that principals in exemplary schools:

- a. Create a sense of direction for the school.
- b. Execute their designated leadership role.
- c. Foster academic expectations.
- d. Recruit their own staff.
- e. Have particular competence in one area of the curriculum, such as reading or mathematics.⁷

Accountability and the demands of a changing role have had a residual effect of producing a greater number of responsibilities. When compared with principals of the recent past, current principals have greater responsibilities in the areas of staff recruitment, personnel administration, staff evaluations and public relations. While most often

⁵ Educational Research Service, The Role of Elementary School Principals: A Summary of Research (Arlington, Virginia: Educational Research Service, 1982), p. 43.

⁶ Ibid., p. 43.

⁷ Ibid., p. 43.

additional responsibilities bring commensurate authority, such is not always the case in elementary school administration.⁸

Faced with increasing stress attendant to the accountability movement, increased role demands and greater responsibilities, it is obvious principals' attention is pulled in several directions and no one administrator will achieve equal success in all necessary tasks. The principal can expect to encounter an endless number of priority-choices, all necessitating his full attention and changing as circumstances dictate. Decisions relative to which priority-choices will receive the most immediate attention will be a measure of administrative savvy. As one ponders the above referenced caveats, it becomes apparent the task may be well beyond the physical capacity of any one individual. In view of this, the principal might wonder: "Who is taking care of me?" and "When do I get mine?"⁹

Compensation is a reward for services rendered an organization.¹⁰ In our society there exists an implied contract that individuals exchange time, expertise, skills and

⁸George B. Redfern, "Accountability: Echoes From The Field" Principal 4 (March/April 1976): 44.

⁹Vanderpol, Principal, p. 40.

¹⁰J. D. Dunn and Frank M. Rachel, Wage and Salary Administration: Total Compensation Systems (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976), p. 18.

effort for money or a salary. When employees perceive they are not receiving a salary which is commensurate with their worth, the organization will begin to be deprived of the employee's skills.¹¹ If capricious reasons are provided for salary determinations, mainstay employees, in particular, will provide the organization time while withholding knowledge and skills.¹² Principals are mainstays of the school district. To ensure the effective and efficient operation of school districts, the manner in which principals' salaries are determined is quite important.

A study to establish procedures for determining principals' salaries is most significant. Upon a review of the literature, it is apparent a comprehensive review of the topic is lacking. While numerous books and periodicals refer to administrative salaries as related to appraisal systems, relatively little is written with respect to practices and procedures utilized to determine principals' salaries. A scholarly study of the subject would embellish the body of literature.

The methods utilized to determine administrative salaries may have deleterious effects upon principals' morale. When Superintendents and School Boards arrive at principals'

¹¹Theodore Cohen, Roy A. Lindberg, Compensating Key Executives In The Small Company (New York: AMACOM, 1979), p. 2

¹²Ibid., p. 2.

salaries, implicit is the assumption that such decisions result from considerations of a multi-factorial nature. Among the factors which might be considered when establishing salaries include job performance, tenure in a position, student achievement, etc. However, beyond the identification of criteria, a practice or process for converting criteria into salary determinations must be well-founded and understood. Salary determinations which are based upon vague abstractions could precipitate a lack of administrative sharing, trust and support for one another. The importance of maintaining collegiality among administrative team members is well established. Ill-founded salary determinations may cause considerable difficulties for Superintendents and School Boards as they endeavor to maintain high morale within the administrative team.

Among the serious problems experienced by school districts at the present time are those concerned with community members clamoring for increased services. Demands for additional special education, social, psychological and academic programs follow on the heels of diminishing financial resources. Beyond the fact that an inflationary spiral has caused fixed costs to increase considerably, the federal government has assumed a frugal posture when underwriting education costs and declining enrollments have resulted in diminished state support where resource equalizer formulas are utilized. Perhaps as never before, inter-district com-

petition for available funds has intensified dramatically. As district resources become even more scarce, prudent practices and procedures for determining salaries will become particularly important for Superintendents and School Board Members.

An increasing phenomenon in education is the utilization of state collective bargaining laws as a springboard for principals to unionize. A manifestation of the accountability movement and buttressed by diminishing financial resources, collective bargaining presents principals with a vehicle for securing guarantees which are typically negotiated with school boards by teachers and Superintendents. Beyond securing formal contract agreements regarding work year, grievance procedures, sick leave, travel, etc., principals are interested in negotiations which would also lead to salary determinations. At the present time, principals are among the only certified professionals within the educational setting which does not negotiate salary with the Board of Education. A study of practices and procedures utilized to determine principals' salaries could be quite helpful to Superintendents and School Board members who wish to enhance salary determination methods while also dissuading principals from formulating administrative unions.

In previous paragraphs, cogent reasons for pursuing a study of practices and procedures for determining principals' salaries have been delineated. In addition to inquisitive individuals who find salary determinations an attractive sub-

ject, school Superintendents and Boards of Education will find this study to be a most valuable resource.

Purpose for the Study

Specific questions which will be addressed by this study will include:

- a. How are administrative evaluation systems utilized to determine elementary principals' salaries?
- b. What are the most important factors considered when determining elementary principals' salaries?
- c. What are the specific roles of Superintendents and principals in determining elementary principals' salaries?
- d. How do recommended practices and procedures for determining principals' salaries in the literature compare with what is taking place in practice?

A secondary question to be addressed by this study includes advantages and disadvantages of principals electing to formulate unions for collective bargaining purposes.

The following are statements which will direct data collection for a comprehensive analysis:

1. Identify and analyze suggested practices and criteria for determining principals' salaries through a comprehensive review of the literature.
2. Determine how administrative job descriptions and evaluation systems are utilized to determine principals' salaries.
 - 2.1 Identify the various duties, tasks and functions which comprise the principal's job description.

- 2.2 Identify criteria utilized to evaluate principals.
 - 2.3 Identify and analyze the procedures utilized to evaluate principals.
 - 2.4 Determine the extent of principal participation in his own evaluation.
 - 2.5 Identify and analyze specific criteria which are most important in determining principals' salaries.
3. Determine the most important factors considered when determining principals' salaries.
 - 3.1 Identify and analyze factors Superintendents consider most important when determining principals' salaries.
 - 3.2 Identify and analyze factors principals consider most important when determining principals' salaries.
 - 3.3 Compare and contrast Superintendents' and principals' responses.
4. Determine the roles played by the Superintendents and principals in determining principals' salaries.
 - 4.1 Identify and analyze the roles played by Superintendents and principals as determined by Superintendents.
 - 4.2 Identify and analyze the roles played by Superintendents and principals as determined by principals.
 - 4.3 Compare and contrast Superintendents' and principals' responses.

5. Compare and contrast the most consistently recommended procedures and criteria for determining principals' salaries found in the literature and in the practice.
6. Determine the advantages and disadvantages to collective bargaining by principals.
 - 6.1 What are the advantages and disadvantages of collective bargaining by principals cited by Superintendents and principals?
 - 6.2 Compare and contrast Superintendents' and principals' responses.
 - 6.3 Determine whether principals would agree to become members of unions for collective bargaining purposes.

Limitations of the Study

1. A significant limitation of the study is the population of Lake County, Illinois, elementary school districts which represent a fraction of the aggregate number of school districts in the State of Illinois, midwest and United States. Since Lake County elementary school districts do not represent a norm relative to student attendance, assessed valuation, per pupil expenditures and the like, the study does not purport to have a universal application.
2. This study is limited by the reliability and credibility of information gleaned from mailed questionnaires and personal interviews. Indeed, the construction and content of questions comprising the study's questionnaire

and interview were tested by a panel of educational experts. Upon the panel's review, suggestions were analyzed and needed alterations made to render the instruments free from ambiguities and unclear wording.

3. The recording and analysis of the information presented within the text of the study are limited by the interpretations of the researcher.
4. Additional limitations to this study include:
 - A. Only elementary Superintendents and principals comprised the population.
 - B. A minimum number of ten Superintendents and ten principals were included as target members of the population. An explanation of how this sample was selected appears in Chapter III, Methods and Procedures.
 - C. The study is limited by the willingness of Superintendents and principals to participate in the study.
 - D. Another limitation would be the honesty and candor of Superintendents and principals discussing practices and procedures for determining principals' salaries.

Definitions

The following terms are utilized in this study and defined as follows:

Administration. Commonly-used term indicating middle to top levels of management in industry and business or its functions.

Benchmark. A standard with characteristics so detailed that other classifications can be compared as being above, below or comparable to it.

Board. Committee of considerable rank or importance in an organization (e.g. Board of Education, Directors).

Chief. Head of an activity. In an organization it is usually coupled with the name of a department or activity.

Classify. To arrange into classes of information according to a system or a method. Often used to group positions having like duties and responsibilities to be called by the same descriptive title or given the same pay scale.

Compensable Factors. Elements that describe the knowledge, responsibility and duty requirements of a particular job in such a way that it may be differentiated from other jobs according to its value and worth.

Cost-of-living-adjustment. Increase or decrease in wages according to the rise or fall of the cost of living.

Environment. The external conditions affecting an individual or a group.

Incentive. A reward, financial or otherwise, that compensates the employee for high or continued performance above standards. Also, a motivating influence to induce effort above the normal (wage incentive).

Job Description. A summary of the most important features of a job in terms of the general nature of the work

involved and the types of workers required to perform it efficiently. It describes the job, not the individual who fills it.

Job Evaluation. A determination of the relative importance of a particular job. A formal job evaluation typically involves the use of a measuring device composed of certain job characteristics with a definite range of numerical values or points assigned to each.

Manager. Person engaged in management functions. A title usually applied to a person of considerable rank and often coupled with an adjective or phrase to define areas of responsibility.

Merit increase or salary. A wage increase or salary granted because of the individual employee's merit.

Performance Appraisal or Evaluation. An organized and systematic method of judging the performance of an employee, usually for a specific period of time.

Salary. Compensation for a given period of time, such as weekly or monthly, rather than hourly.

Seniority or tenure. Rights, privileges and considerations accorded employees over other employees based on length of service.

Supervisor. Any person who directs the activity of immediate subordinates. Often a title applied to a group leader who heads a section of an organization.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

As indicated in the previous chapter, this study has four primary purposes: (1) Identify and analyze suggested practices and criteria for determining principals' salaries as identified in the literature; (2) Determine how job descriptions and evaluation systems are utilized to determine principals' salaries; (3) Determine the most important factors considered when determining principals' salaries; and (4) Determine the roles of Superintendents and principals in determining principals' salaries. A secondary purpose is to establish the advantages and disadvantages of collective bargaining by principals.

To accomplish the above-referenced purposes, a comprehensive review of related literature was conducted. Among the variety of sources perused were books, periodicals, documents, dissertation abstracts, unpublished corporate manuals, newspapers and articles. Upon a review of these sources, it was apparent that little, beyond oblique references, has been written about middle management salary administration in school systems. Further, there is a virtual absence of substantive material about suggested roles of Superintendents and principals in determining principals' salaries. Therefore, it was necessary

to rely upon literature written for corporate middle management compensation administration to accomplish the study's purposes. Additionally, valuable information was gleaned from a major international corporation wishing to maintain anonymity. Within the review of the literature, this corporation is referenced as the XYZ Corporation.

In Chapter II, the literature was reviewed in three parts: (1) Factors considered when determining salaries; (2) Appraisal systems used to determine salaries; and (3) Principals and collective bargaining.

Factors Considered When Determining Salaries

Philosophy, Practices and Principles Considered When Determining Management Salaries

The problem of awarding adequate compensation for services rendered has existed for many years. Interest in money and the materials it can buy is a substantial concern to the American worker. While the desire to amass great sums of money varies with individuals, there is little question it can make life easier and, perhaps, more enjoyable. Beyond food, clothing, shelter and other physical necessities of life, money can satisfy such psychological and social needs as self-esteem, recognition and acceptance by one's peers. The desire for income has caused increased salary demands from both public and private

sector employees and a greater attention to the management of compensation.

Every organization functions as a result of an implied contract where "people exchange their time, knowledge, skills and effort for money."¹ Money is often associated with change, growth and heightened standards of living. Patten has noted "there is something curious and socially revealing about the synonym for money that keeps cropping up in our daily language in America; namely we equate money with life."² As pay is viewed within the global context of human existence, rewards from work loom large as a source for personal incentives, satisfaction and motivation. Many theorists have agreed that pay, when administered appropriately, has a positive effect upon employee motivation, performance, quality of work and realization of organizational goals and objectives.³ The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) recognized the powerful impact of money and stated: "...where does power actually originate? One source is economic. As an employee it is necessary either to conform to the mandates of the job

¹Theodore Cohn and Roy A. Lindberg, Compensating Key Executives in the Smaller Company, (New York: American Management Associations, 1979), p. 1.

²Thomas H. Patten, Jr., Pay: Employee Compensation and Incentive Plans, (New York: The Free Press, 1977), p. 2.

³Ibid., p. 15.

or risk undesirable consequences...."⁴

Every organization has a number of middle management employees making critical decisions on a regular basis. For the organization to survive and experience a profitable existence, these middle management positions must be filled with qualified and competent individuals. Cheecks points out compensation planning for management has three major goals: re-training important personnel, stimulating profitable effort and attracting necessary additions to the management staff.⁵ An effective compensation plan can assist the organization and manager by ensuring salaries are comparable with that of other organizations, are commensurate with responsibilities, can be afforded by the organization, will recognize and reward exceptional performance, show a sensitivity for non-performance factors (tenure, inflation, etc.) and provide personal incen-

⁴American Association of School Administrators and National School Board Association, Evaluating the Superintendent, (Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1980), p. 20.

⁵John E. Cheecks, How To Compensate Executives, (Homewood, Illinois: Dow Jones-Irwin, Inc., 1974), p. 37.

tives to remain, perform and grow within the organization.⁶ Successful compensation plans pay for employee contributions rather than job content.

Cohn and Lindberg believe pay systems should be designed to realize organization goals and objectives, maintain quality individuals who are important to the organization, encourage and motivate employees to strive for excellence, pay for results through incentives and weighting of salaries which differentiate between routine and extraordinary performance, provide salaries which are perceived as fair and pay particular attention to management personnel.⁷

Compensation practices have substantial effects upon human behaviors. When developing such plans for management personnel, organizations should be aware managers wish to respect the organization for which they work, strive for self respect from their work and perceive themselves through their work.⁸ Enterprises which provide competitive salaries imply

⁶Cohn and Lindberg, Compensating Key Executives, p. 7.

⁷Cohn and Lindberg, Compensating Key Executives, pp. 23-26.

⁸Ibid., p. 45.

that they value their employees, possess high standards and recognize performance.

As alluded to earlier, compensation practices have been rather sterile and static. "Salary is one of the more backward areas of communications with employees," said Richard T. Whitman, a partner in Kwaska Lipton, an employee benefit consulting firm in New Jersey. "It's like sex in the 1950's. Everyone knew it existed, but no one felt comfortable talking about it."⁹ Whether comfortable or not, employees are applying internal and external pressures on companies to become aware of how salaries are determined.

Under threat of lawsuits or in hope of improving morale, more companies are trying, sometimes with the help of highly sophisticated computer models, to adopt unbiased systems of appraising pay. Perhaps more important, they are putting more effort into communicating those systems to employees.¹⁰

Presently, all aspects of public education are coming under close scrutiny as the public demands to become more aware of how tax dollars are being spent. In particular, much attention has been placed upon administrative and super-

⁹"Firms find it no longer pays to be secretive on salaries," Chicago Tribune, 23 May 1983, Business, p. 11-13.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 11-13.

visory personnel who typically earn between \$30,000 and \$40,000.¹¹ To those who must justify the cost effectiveness of district middle management, namely Superintendents and Boards of Education, compensation management should receive great attention.

Job Descriptions and Compensation Administration

Perhaps the most important instrument for effective appraisal and salary administration is the job description. However, there appears evidence job descriptions receive far less attention than required for appropriate development, updating and utilization. This is particularly true in school management. The AASA has recognized the relative importance of job descriptions but found they "are at an elemental stage"¹² of development and most are "static and not dynamic."¹³ A fundamental problem is determining precisely what is meant by a job description. Within the literature, references to "job analysis," "job evaluation," "job specifications," "job determinants" and the like are utilized as a synonym for job descriptions. To provide a reasonable foundation for subsequent discussions, the following definition would be in

¹¹ Kenneth W. Humphries, "This Evaluation System Lets You Know What Your Administrators' Jobs Are Worth", American School Board Journal (May 1981).

¹² American Association of School Administrators, How To Evaluate Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, (Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1977), p. 67.

¹³ Ibid., p. 67.

order. Henderson defines a job description as:

A summary of the most important features of a job in terms of the general nature of the work involved and the types of workers required to perform it efficiently. It describes the job, not the individual who fills it.¹⁴

When properly placed together, a job description should provide consistency for organizational decisions. Booth states that job descriptions are "a permanent record of a management decision that somebody is to perform certain work."¹⁵ When placed into a functional state, the description is a blueprint for job expectations. A job description should describe major responsibilities, tasks and duties for each position within an organization. When it is determined that actual responsibilities differ from those identified and/or defined in the description, Booth indicates "something is wrong" and "the difference needs to be reconciled."¹⁶ Differences between job descriptions and practices have been found to exist for various reasons. Within the school environment, job descriptions are created when employing personnel, accommodating unforeseen circumstances

¹⁴ Richard I. Henderson, Compensation Management: Rewarding Performance in the Modern Organization, (Reston, Virginia: Reston Publishing, 1976), p. 487.

¹⁵ Ronald R. Booth and Gerald R. Glaub, Planned Appraisal of the Superintendent, (Springfield, Illinois: Illinois Association of School Boards, 1978), pp. 52-54.

¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 52-54.

and adjusting duties to conform with job satisfactions and/or dissatisfactions.¹⁷ For whatever the reason, job descriptions should be maintained to accurately reflect current job tasks, duties and responsibilities.

The literature presents a plethora of uses for job descriptions. Among the more comprehensive listings of such uses are those which have been formulated by Berenson:

1. Establishes rational basis for salary determination.
2. Clarifies relationships among jobs.
3. Provides a greater understanding of each job by analyzing duties.
4. Helps revise organization's structure.
5. Establishes a basis for fixing functions and responsibilities in the organization.
6. Assists in performance appraisals.
7. Introduces new employees to their jobs.
8. Assists in placing employees in positions for which they are qualified.
9. Sets forth lines of authority.
10. Maintains operations continuity.
11. Provides data for proper channels of communications.
12. Indicates job specifications by listing personnel requirements.
13. Improves work flow.

¹⁷AASA and NSBA, Evaluating The Superintendent, p. 17.

14. Assists when reviewing existing practices within the organization.¹⁸

For management personnel, job descriptions should be stated in terms of responsibilities rather than mundane duties associated with rank and file employees.¹⁹

Additionally, job descriptions should generally be two pages in length with a concerted effort to ensure they are neither too brief nor too detailed.²⁰

In its most elementary form, job descriptions are used by an organization to set forth the responsibilities of a job or position as well as the extent of authority delegated to the employee completing the job. Therefore, job descriptions should be used as a basis for discussing promotions, most significant elements of the position and elements which have changed since prior discussions took place. When descriptions are utilized in this manner, managers and supervisors, in particular, become more aware of the comprehensiveness as well

¹⁸Conrad Berenson, Ph.D. and Henry O. Ruhnke, M.B.A., "Job Descriptions: How To Write and Use Them," Personnel Journal (1976): pp. 13-22.

¹⁹Patten, Pay: Employee Compensation, p. 205.

²⁰Berenson and Ruhnke, "Job Descriptions: How To Write and Use Them," pp. 13-22.

as the limitations of their positions. To fulfill the purpose for which job descriptions are established, they must be accessible. Berg states "when they are hidden it is tantamount to a librarian not allowing books out of the library to stay clean."²¹

A comprehensive, well written job description is essential for performance appraisals. The literature is replete with reference to the above fact. Prior to appraising one's performance, a mutual understanding of the various elements of a position must be agreed upon. Within a school setting, middle managers, or principals, must come to an agreement with Superintendents regarding the major functions of the school, nature and extent of one another's responsibilities in carrying out school functions and tasks to be fulfilled.²²

As indicated previously, many private and public sector organizations consider job descriptions essential for effective appraisals. Schools utilize job descriptions to varying degrees. However, where descriptions have been established to illustrate common elements within like positions, they have been of considerable benefit.²³ Particularly when evaluating common elements, the job description can play an important role.

²¹Berg, Managing Compensation, pp. 153.

²²Booth and Glaub, Planned Appraisal of the Superintendent, p. 55.

²³Dale L. Bolton, Evaluating Administrative Personnel in School Systems, (New York: Teachers College Press, 1980) p. 24.

While various managerial positions possess common elements, not all positions are homogeneous. Bolton suggests when appraising principals in school districts, utilize common "job descriptions for efficiency where possible; use unique job descriptions and MBO procedures for effectiveness where needed."²⁴

Writing in the Harvard Business Review, Harry Levinson states, "Performance appraisals are the Achilles heel of our profession. One reason is due to unsuitable job descriptions."²⁵ Where job descriptions buttress appraisal systems, they should be reviewed regularly and be mutually accepted by upper and middle management. Further, where subjective judgments relative to personal characteristics are commonly accepted as a part of the appraisal system, as in the school setting, references to such characteristics should appear on job descriptions.²⁶ Appraisal criteria, as found within the context of job descriptions, should show clear relationships between the process and expected outcomes. Particularly in principals' appraisal systems, expectations from job descriptions must be translated into goals and objectives which are measurable and meaningful

²⁴ Ibid., p. 25.

²⁵ Harry Levinson, "Appraisal of What Performance?" Harvard Business Review 54 (July-Aug 1976): 32.

²⁶ AASA How To Evaluate Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, p. 31.

to the administrator.²⁷ This process is central to the appraisal process.

The XYZ Corporation directs compensation and appraisal managers to prepare job descriptions in one of two different formats. For purposes of discussions, these formats will be designated as Format A and Format B. Format A is designed to be utilized with non-management personnel, presenting routines to be accomplished in short, concise statements with "sufficient detail to evaluate the position accurately."²⁸ Form B is designed for management personnel where detailed narratives are delineated "to provide specific information concerning various positions."²⁹

In addition to the uses for job descriptions which have been referenced previously, the instrument can be quite beneficial when determining salaries. Henderson states that job descriptions "provide services in a number of vital areas. Among the more important are personnel and compensation administration."³⁰ The description of positions allows compensation managers to make comparisons of positions from

²⁷Bolton, Evaluating Administrative Personnel, p. 31.

²⁸XYZ Corporation, "Guide To Preparing Job Descriptions," XYZ Corporate Compensation Administration Policy Manual, (1979), p. 1.

²⁹Ibid., p. 2.

³⁰Henderson, Compensation Management, p. 132.

within and outside the organization. A natural progression is the development of a salary structure from a job description which accounts for compensable factors of a like nature.

Positions requiring similar knowledge, skills, certification, responsibilities, etc. should have comparable salaries. When discussing salaries, Henderson further indicates:

Pay structures must accurately identify and permit the rewarding of jobs according to their contributions toward the achievement of organizational goals. One of the first steps in developing an equitable pay structure arises in the accurate and valid description of the job.³¹

³¹Ibid., p. 153.

Major Factors Influencing Salary Determinations

Compensation administration or salary determination is a process whereby organizations place monetary values upon services rendered. Patten indicates "compensation comes from a pricing of job structures....subject to the influences and peculiarities of the labor market(s) and to certain technical considerations..."³² Beyond compensable factors which appear in a job description, there are a number of additional elements which are valued by organizations and considered when determining salaries.

Perhaps the most obvious factor considered when determining salaries is personal performance. In a report for the Pennsylvania State Board of Education, The Leadership Liaison Task Force stated "since evaluation and compensation usually tie together...references to compensation were considered a natural outgrowth of evaluation guidelines and criteria."³³ Performance, as measured through appraisal or evaluation systems, is basic to salary determinations. Patten indicates "it is impossible to make the necessary decisions about the payroll and career progress of employees

³² Patten, Pay: Employee Compensation, p. 273.

³³ Leadership Liaison Task Force, Administrative Evaluation: A Process For Discussion (Harrisberg, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania Board of Education (May 1982), p. 7.

without measuring their performance in some manner." ³⁴

However, there are occasions when salary determinations are a product of considerations exclusive of performance. Such is the case in school districts where job tenure transcends performance considerations when compensating teachers. However, when determining salaries for middle management personnel, an impediment to linking at least a percentage of salary to performance is the unwillingness to upper management to assume responsibility for such determinations.³⁵ VanAdelsberg points out:

Procedurally, technically, and legally, linking evaluated job performance to compensation is immediately possible. The common reasons given for its absence include:

- . Employee and union resistance
- . Department head and supervisory resistance
- . Insufficient precedent
- . Other agencies don't do it
- . Lack of funds
- . Absence of valid performance measurement systems
- . Previously tried and did not work
- . Not necessary³⁶

An in-depth discussion of performance as it relates to salary determination will be presented subsequently. However, for the purpose of presenting factors which influence

³⁴Patten, Pay: Employee Compensation, p. 343.

³⁵Henri VanAdelsberg, "Relating Performance Evaluation To Compensation of Public Sector Employers," Public Personnel Management 2 (March-April 1978): 76.

³⁶Ibid., p. 76-77.

salary, performance appraisal could not be disregarded herewith.

Associated with pay for performance is the establishment of monetary awards for exemplary performances. Such awards are provided on one occasion and do not become an addition to the employee's established salary. Belcher supports such a recognition for performance and states:

"Rewards for specific behaviors should not be added to the salary where it becomes indistinguishable from....having a good attendance record or performing other tasks."³⁷

While the awarding of money to recognize superior administrative performance in education is rarely considered, the A.A.S.A. supports the notion and suggests an MBO system be implemented "as a means to grant a bonus over and above the established salary."³⁸

To be equitable, salary administrators must consider the relative differentials in earnings which exist in comparable positions both within and without the organization. Where differentials are significant, deleterious effects may result. In such cases where positions do not have counterparts, pay on the basis of like characteristics should be

³⁷David W. Belcher, "Pay and Performance, " Compensation Review Quarterly 12 (Third Quarter, 1980): 47.

³⁸AASA, How To Evaluate Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, p. 67.

perceived as reasonable.³⁹ Bruce Ellig, corporate director of Salary Administration for Pfizer, Inc. says: "as far as we are concerned, the name of the game is competition."⁴⁰ Thus, to compete for administrative talent, organizations must pay equal to or greater amounts than rival organizations are paying. Even when establishing salaries for chief executives, market pricing plays a large role.

Beyond that which has been presented above, Booth and Glaub present other factors which influence educational administrator's salary determinations:

- . Comparisons of salary with other employees
- . Responsibility level of the particular job
- . Comparisons of salary with similar positions in other districts
- . Past practices in individual compensation
- . Established compensation policies in the district
- . District's ability to pay
- . Economic conditions in the community⁴¹

In their publication, Methods of Scheduling Salaries for Principals, the Educational Research Service, Inc. (ERS) indicates a variety of factors which may be used when determining principals' salaries. Included in these factors are instructional level of students in attendance such as

³⁹Ernest J. McCormick, Job Analysis: Methods and Applications, (New York: amacom, 1979), p. 312.

⁴⁰James L. Hayes, "Experts Probe Factors That Determine Salaries," American School and University (June 1978): 18c.

⁴¹Booth and Glaub, Planned Appraisal of the Superintendent, p. 56-57.

elementary, junior high or senior high school.⁴² Another factor is scope of responsibility in fulfilling tasks and duties which are associated with numbers of students, classrooms and staff members.⁴³ Additional factors include number of contract days, academic preparation, years of experience and supplementary considerations.⁴⁴

The National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) in conjunction with the ERS found salaries paid to principals were related to regions of the country, district enrollment and district per pupil expenditure levels.⁴⁵

Beyond performance appraisal, other major factors which effect salary determinations were identified by the AASA as size of school district, scope of duties and responsibilities and past practices.⁴⁶

Middle management positions have both common and unique factors which are considered when determining salaries. Every organization possesses a compensation policy which

⁴² Educational Research Service, Methods of Scheduling Salaries for Principals (Arlington, Virginia: Educational Research Service, 1975) p. 2.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 2.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 2-3.

⁴⁵ National Association of Elementary School Principals and Educational Research Service, "School Salaries, 1981: An NAESP/ERS Research Report," Principal 61 (March 1982): 27.

⁴⁶ AASA and NSBA, Evaluating the Superintendent, p. 37.

represents an aggregate of the factors presented above. While some policies are more formal and well-known than others, the fact remains these factors are considered when determining management salaries. This is especially true when determining elementary principals' salaries.

Actual Methods, Practices and
Procedures for Determining Salaries

The complexities of Salary Administration in private and public sector organizations are well documented. Particularly within public sector organizations, like school districts, factors as diminishing tax support and increased accountability demands have caused salary administrators to have more than a cursory interest in compensation policies and procedures. There is every reason to believe this interest will exist well into the future.

Whether private or public, every organization has an established compensation program. While some are more formal, fair and well accepted, a program designed to award money for employee services exists. In the following paragraphs, various means for awarding salaries to middle management employees, with specific reference to the educational setting will be presented.

Upon a comprehensive review of the literature, it became apparent there are three methods or procedures utilized to determine middle management salaries. These methods, while occasionally disguised by grandiose titles, synonyms



and acronyms, are most commonly known to be salary schedules, merit pay and job evaluation systems.

For the past decade, school districts throughout the nation have submitted salary information to the ERS. Publications such as the National Survey of Salaries and Wages in Public Schools continues to serve as an excellent source of comparative information for salary administration in education. After a thorough search of literature referencing salary schedules for principals, the most comprehensive treatment was conducted by the ERS. Methods for Scheduling Salaries for Principals, published in 1975, represents the most substantive information and most referenced regarding principals' salary schedules.

In the vast majority of cases, principals' salary schedules are placed together as both related and unrelated to teachers' salary schedules. When related to teacher schedules, principals are paid over and above what teachers are paid through indexing or dollar differentials.⁴⁷ In so doing, a principal's salary would be determined by multiplying an index number or adding a specific amount of money to a salary paid to teachers within a given school district. It is important to note whether utilizing an index or dollar differential, there is a direct correspondence between what teachers and principals are paid.

⁴⁷ ERS, Methods of Scheduling Salaries for Principals, p. 1-2.

Where principals' salaries are not a manifestation of teacher salaries, several approaches are taken when establishing a schedule. In some school districts, principals are paid an index or dollar amount of the Superintendent's salary.⁴⁸ In other districts, schedules are directly related to the salary paid the senior high principal or an average of the salaries paid local Superintendents.⁴⁹ No matter what the approach, when determining schedules as presented above, principals' salaries are related to salaries of other management personnel.

Salary schedules are constructed to provide financial awards for competence as well as responsibilities. While the following is not an exhaustive listing of compensable factors in salary schedules, it reflects the most commonly found elements. In some cases, schedules are constructed to distinguish among elementary, junior high and high school principals' salaries.⁵⁰ Implicit is the determination that it is more financially rewarding to administer a high school than an elementary or junior high school.

Another compensable factor often found in salary schedules is scope of responsibility.⁵¹ In most every school setting,

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 2.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 2.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 2

⁵¹Ibid., p. 2

increased numbers of students, staff and classrooms impact positively on overall responsibilities. Therefore, the larger the school, for example, the greater the responsibility assumed by the principal.

Other compensable factors associated with salary schedules include number of contractual days, advanced degrees attained, years of experience and supplemental factors as cost of living and inflation.⁵² While pay schedules may differ in appearance and number of compensable items, the factors referenced above are most often found in principals' salary schedules.

In order to earn more money on a salary schedule, the employee must receive a salary advancement to a higher incremental step. As is the case in most teacher salary schedules, principals' schedules may automatically advance an administrator's pay at the conclusion of one year's service. Beyond automatic advancement, some school districts require principals to pursue university course work, workshops and the like prior to an incremental advancement. Some principals advance one and, perhaps, two or three incremental steps resulting from positive performance appraisals. Related to incremental step advancement is the awarding of dollar amounts to individuals who have been at the top of the salary schedule and receiving no salary increases for some period of time.⁵³

⁵²Ibid., p. 3.

⁵³Ibid., p. 4.

As indicated earlier when discussing compensable factors, there are a variety of means for incremental advancement in operation.

It is important to be aware that when principals' salaries are related to teacher salaries, such may have negative effects upon management relations within the school district. Clearly, the propriety of principals "pulling" for teachers during salary negotiations is highly questionable. However, some argue that paying principals and teachers from contiguous determinates effectively places principals "out of management."⁵⁴

Another method for determining middle management salaries is through a merit pay system. Merit pay is a popular term used to relate job performance and salary determinations. Where performance appraisal systems can fairly and accurately measure individuals differences, merit increases are a viable means for determining salary increases. In most industrial societies there is a direct relationship between the quantity and quality of an employee's work and the size of his/her paycheck. The greater the quantity and quality of work, the greater the pay. Patten indicates, "employees who receive such

⁵⁴National Association of School Boards, "The Ways (not all good) Principals Are Paid," American School Board Journal 163 (July 1976): 21.

increases are deserving of them, and the concept of merit, while slightly paternalistic...is based upon a notion of 'goodness' in work."⁵⁵

While periodic references to successful merit pay plans in public sector organizations are found, they are not found very often. Though President Reagan and various other politicians have recently backed the concept of merit pay, particularly when determining school salaries, it has received a rather cool reception from educators. Van Adelsberg feels one reason why merit pay has not been embraced within educational circles is the fact that "supervisors do not wish to assume responsibility for discretionary duties,"⁵⁶ and therefore, are "denying the principal mechanism for rewarding exceptional performance and productivity."⁵⁷ Berg provides compelling remarks in support of several others who feel salary determinations should correspond directly to measured performance:⁵⁸

Dollar amounts should be based on performance. The issues are inseparable. The objectives of appraisal are to review accomplishments, discuss shortcomings, establish goals, develop strategies, reward performance and advance salaries. The first four deal with philosophical issues of performance. This is learning and growing. The last two deal with economic issues, how much and when.

⁵⁵ Patten, Pay: Employee Compensation, p. 281.

⁵⁶ Van Adelsberg, "Relating Performance Evaluation To Compensation," p. 79.

⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 74.

⁵⁸ Berg, Managing Compensation, pp. 228-229.

While the AASA supports the concept of merit pay and indicates such would provide incentives for greater accomplishments, the following assumptions must be placed into practice:

1. Existing salaries must be equitable and competitive.
2. Merit pay must be available in significant amount to make the incentive effort worthwhile in terms of take home pay.
3. Standards of accomplishment must be fair, realistic and beyond the possibility they could be rigged to enable the top boss to reward favorites.⁵⁹

To be sure, merit pay as the sole basis for determining principals' salaries has been successfully utilized in school districts. In the Madison Elementary School District, Phoenix, Arizona, principals are evaluated in five areas which are then weighted with regard to relative importance to the district. The five weighted areas include goal accomplishment (40%), performance of assigned duties (30%), professional growth (10%), peer rating (10%) and subordinate's rating (10%). Through this process, merit pay is determined through subordinate, peer and central office involvement.⁶⁰

Another school district experiencing considerable success with the establishment of merit pay practices is the Rialto Unified School District in California. Administrators in the Rialto district believe merit pay systems have failed

⁵⁹ William Schaefer and Bruce Read, "A Merit System for Evaluating School Administrators," Education Digest 48 (January 1983): 42-43.

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 43.

elsewhere as a result of an excessive concern for merit pay and little concern for evaluation processes and inservice training.⁶¹ Without proper attention to evaluation processes and inservice opportunities, merit systems encounter an apprehensiveness from a perceived arbitrary methodology for determining salaries.

Where successful merit pay plans have been found, common elements which tend to foster success have existed. Among these common elements is the formulation of a planning committee representing all levels of administration. Additionally, plans for merit systems have included management by objectives (MBO) principles.⁶² In terms of actual salary determination, successful systems allow for a high percentage (70%) of salaries to be determined by merit.⁶³

Within the school setting, merit pay can have a number of benefits. Along with accompanying MBO programs, merit pay can have a marked resemblance to effective incentive

⁶¹Larry G. Ruttan, "Administrator Merit Pay-Theory Into Practice," Thrust 8 (May 1979): 29.

⁶²Philip E. Gager and Gerald Tascano, "If you follow these proven guidelines, merit pay for administrators can succeed," American School Board Journal 167 (January 1980): 31.

⁶³Ibid., p. 31.

systems used in private sector enterprises.⁶⁴ Beyond incentives for quality performances, merit pay can maintain administrative accountability and treat principals as managers.⁶⁵

An effective way to answer public queries regarding salary determinations is by measuring the general worth of given positions. A method to accomplish this is through a job evaluation (not to be confused with performance evaluation). In school systems, defensible methods for determining the relative worth of positions as well as minimum and maximum salaries for given positions do not exist.⁶⁶ In Humphries opinion:

Job evaluation procedures, long used by business and industry, are overdue in public education; some school systems today have larger budgets and more employees than many business and industrial firms.⁶⁷

From a philosophic standpoint, employees expect salaries to be consistent with the demands of their positions. Job evaluation systems are methods for establishing indexes of job values. Such indexes are usually based upon job characteristics as perceived by evaluation committees and

⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 31

⁶⁵ Neal Meitler, "Merit Pay for Administrators," Illinois School Board Journal (November-December 1974), p. 31.

⁶⁶ Humphries, "This Evaluation System Lets You Know What Your Administrators' Jobs Are Worth," p. 32.

⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 32.

used as a means for determining salaries.⁶⁸ Most often, wage determinations are influenced by salaries paid by rival organizations for like positions. Therefore, a job evaluation provides an approach to arrive at parameters for salaries consistent with a job's perceived worth as well as its going rate on the open market.

The manner in which job information is collected for evaluation purposes is through a job analysis. When conducting such an analysis, the following information is typically collected:

- a. Job title or titles, including trade mechanics.
- b. Number of employees on the job, and their organizational locations.
- c. Materials, tools and equipment used or worked with.
- d. From whom work is received and to whom it is delivered.
- e. Hours of work.
- f. Conditions of work.
- g. Complete listing of duties, with an estimate of time spent on each group, classified according to daily, weekly, monthly and occasionally.
- h. Education and experience requirements.
- i. Promotional and transfer lines from and to the job.⁶⁹

Once the above information has been collected, a non-financial blueprint for comparing jobs is intact. From such a

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 33.

⁶⁹Jucius, Personnel Management, pp. 290-291.

blueprint or "yardstick," financial considerations regarding job worth can take place. It is through the job analysis that job A and job B are compared with the ultimate determination that job A is worth more in dollars than job B. How jobs are compared to determine relative worth differs from organization. However, four methods most often utilized include: job ranking, job grade, point systems and factor comparisons.

Within the ranking system, jobs are arranged in decreasing order of value to the organization. Typically conducted by a committee of supervisors, including line executives, jobs are rated in terms of difficulty and volume of work, responsibilities, supervision given and received, training and experience required and working conditions.⁷⁰ Once all jobs have been ranked, classes of six to ten are established and salary rates are determined.⁷¹ All jobs which comprise a given class are paid within the same dollar range.

In grade systems for position evaluations, jobs are classified by common elements. Particularly within this pay system, job descriptions are vitally important as common job elements are derived specifically from the description. The number of grades established will depend upon the number of

⁷⁰ Ibid., pp. 291-292.

⁷¹ Ibid., p. 292.

diverse tasks, duties, responsibilities and skills needed to be performed within the organization.⁷² Often, different grade systems are established for office, rank and file and management personnel.

The point system of job evaluation is the most widely used and considered to be the most accurate and dependable of the various evaluation systems.⁷³ In essence, points are established to correspond with important job elements. By applying points to elements, a quantitative expression of job worth is derived. To accomplish this, the following takes place:

- a. A listing of elements common to all jobs is formulated. The major elements often found are skill, effort, education, experience required and working conditions. It is recommended no more than six or eight such elements are used in the evaluation.
- b. Points are assigned to major and sub elements to serve as a "yardstick" for determining relative worth of a job.
- c. Through the application of points to job elements, quantitative units are added together to arrive at relative job worth.

⁷²Herbert J. Chruden and Arthur W. Sherman, Jr., Personnel Management, (Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing Co., 1976) p. 452.

⁷³Jucius, Personnel Management, p. 293.

- d. Upon an examination of scores, jobs are ranked.
- e. Dollar values for points or job ranking are then determined.⁷⁴

Within its Corporate Compensation Administration Policy Manual, the XYZ Corporation states that their position evaluation system:

is designed to implement our first statement of policy: "Establish and maintain, with Corporate consistency, equitable salaries and wages according to the complexity, responsibility, and similar factors of the positions."⁷⁵

The factor system for job evaluations is quite similar to the point system. The only significant difference is the utilization of specific, key jobs instead of job elements to measure relative worth. Therefore, the factor system can be considered more of a general method for evaluating jobs than the point system.

Through position evaluation, minimum and maximum salaries for administrative positions can be established which are commensurate with their value to the school district. From within salary ranges, specific wage determinations are deter-

⁷⁴Ibid., pp. 293-294.

⁷⁵XYZ Corporation, Corporate Compensation and Administration, (1979), p. 8.

mined through performance evaluations, thereby assuring pay for performance and not tenure. Too often, Superintendents and school boards establish salaries prior to considering realistic structures which would establish the relative value of one administrative/supervisory position as compared to another within the same school district.⁷⁶ The Association of School Business Officials (ASBO) recommends school districts create a point system for job evaluations composed of the following factors and sub-factors:

Table 1
Factors and Sub-factors for Job Evaluations

- I. Background
 - A. Education
 - B. Experience
- II. Application of Knowledge
 - A. Complexity
 - B. Latitude
- III. Supervisory Responsibility
 - A. Size
 - 1. Direct
 - 2. Indirect
 - B. Complexity
- IV. Contracts
- V. Integrity of Information
- VI. Impact of Errors
- VII. Time Requirement⁷⁷

⁷⁶ Association of School Business Officials, A Wage and Salary Program Based on Position Evaluations for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, (Park Ridge, Illinois: Association of School Business Officials of the United States and Canada, 1980), p. IV-V.

⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 2-8.

By assigning point values to sub-factors and multiplying the sum of each by a prorated value, a weighted score is realized. A graphic illustration of the above would appear in Table 2.⁷⁸

Table 2

Administrative/Supervisory Evaluation Data

Position _____ Job Description Dated _____ Job Evaluation Dated _____

| Factors | Sub-Factors | Numerical Values | | | | | | | Total Points | x Prorated Value | = Point Value |
|---------------------------------|---------------|------------------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------------|------------------|---------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | | |
| I. Background | A. Education | 35 | 70 | 105 | 140 | 175 | 210 | 245 | | 10% | |
| | B. Experience | 35 | 70 | 105 | 140 | 175 | 210 | 245 | | 15% | |
| II. Application of Knowledge | A. Complexity | 35 | 70 | 105 | 140 | 175 | 210 | | | 10% | |
| | B. Latitude | 35 | 70 | 105 | 140 | 175 | 210 | | | 10% | |
| III. Supervision Responsibility | A. Size | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1. Direct | 20 | 40 | 60 | 80 | 100 | 120 | 140 | | 7% | |
| | 2. Indirect | 20 | 40 | 60 | 80 | 100 | 120 | 140 | | 3% | |
| | B. Complexity | 30 | 60 | 90 | 120 | 150 | 180 | 210 | | 10% | |
| IV. Contracts | | 35 | 70 | 105 | 140 | 175 | 210 | | | 15% | |
| V. Integrity of Information | | 30 | 60 | 90 | 120 | 150 | 180 | 210 | | 5% | |
| VI. Impact of Errors | | 30 | 60 | 90 | 120 | 150 | 180 | 210 | | 10% | |
| VII. Time Requirements | | 35 | 70 | 105 | 140 | 175 | 210 | | | 5% | |

Position Point Total _____

⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 10.

To establish the salary structure from the data, points should be compared to present salaries. An inconsistency between position point values and actual salaries may reflect an emphasis upon tenure rather than performance. To finalize the determination of salaries, two decisions must be made. First, how many points should comprise grade levels? Second, how much money should be provided minimum and maximum grades?

Table 3 illustrates how a salary schedule for school administrators/supervisors can be constructed through the use of the ASBO job evaluation methodology.⁷⁹

Table 3

Administrative/Supervisory Salary Structure

| Level | Title | Minimum | Maximum |
|-------|--|-----------|-----------|
| I | Director, Secondary Education Director, Elementary Education | \$24,705. | \$32,605. |
| II | Principal, Senior High | 24,030. | 31,630. |
| III | Principal, 7-10 Director, Special Education | 23,360. | 30,710. |
| IV | Principal, Elementary Director, Plant Operations Director, Recreation/Adult Education, Director, General Administration | 22,660. | 29,810. |
| V | Assistant Principal, Secondary | 21,990. | 28,980. |
| VI | Director, Data Processing Curriculum Coordinator | 21,235. | 27,935. |
| VII | Supervisor, Financial Services Supervisor, Transportation | 20,565. | 27,065. |
| VIII | General Foreman, Maintenance | 19,950. | 26,250. |
| IX | Personnel Assistant, Professional Personnel Assistant, Non-Professional Supervisor, Payroll Accountant | 18,525. | 24,375. |

⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 14.

In all organizations, the salary awarded an employee depends upon the nature of the job performed. Within school districts, a central office administrator receives one salary level and a curriculum coordinator receives another. The difference between salaries is an issue management must be prepared to defend. Job evaluations endeavored to justify salaries paid by measuring positions in terms of skills needed, complexity and the like. The greater the demands and importance to the organization, the higher the evaluation and corresponding salary range. Job evaluations attempt to compare positions within an organization and establish reasonable internal and external pay ranges from which individual salaries are determined.

Summary

In summary, effective compensation practices can serve to heighten employee performance. The major goals of management compensation are to retain, motivate and attract those who perform vital functions for organizations. Whether compensating rank and file or management personnel, the literature emphasizes pay for contributions.

Job descriptions provide a blueprint for job expectations and levels of performance. When written properly, they may be utilized to arrive at salary determinations, show relationships between jobs, analyze duties, assist in performance appraisals, orient employees to new positions,

delineate lines of authority and the like. Where job descriptions are mutually agreed upon, compensable factors for comparing positions as well as persons is intact. For management personnel, such factors can be converted for use in management by objective systems.

As indicated previously, the literature supports the notion of pay for performance. The various factors which influence salary determinations include market pricing for the same or similar position levels of responsibility, past practices, established policies, organization's ability to pay and economy of the community. In school districts, principals' salaries are influenced by the level of students, number of students, number of staff, number of contractual days of employment, academic preparation and tenure in the position.

There are three distinct ways to establish principals' salaries: salary schedules, merit pay plans and job evaluation systems. Where principals are paid from salary schedules, most often these schedules are found to be manifestations of teacher salary schedules but endeavor to take into account uniquenesses of the principal's position.

Merit plans attempt to provide monetary awards to principals on the basis of performance. To be effective, merit pay must be accompanied by effective appraisal and staff development programs. Where successfully implemented, merit pay plans bring incentives for quality performance, treat principals as managers and maintain accountability.

Job evaluations establish indexes for job values. The various methods for conducting a job evaluation include ranking, grading, assigning points to job elements and weighting factors of key jobs. Once job values are established, position evaluations then determine specific salary awards.

APPRAISAL SYSTEMS UTILIZED TO DETERMINE SALARIES

Purposes for Appraising

Within each organization managers are subject to performance appraisals or evaluations. For compensation determination, appraisals are, indeed, quite important. Upon a review of the literature related to compensation administration, it is apparent in both private and public sector enterprises, pay should be commensurate with performance. This is particularly true when considering salaries for principals. In school systems, the evaluation of a principal's performance typically has to do with judgments about events and/or behaviors in light of predetermined objectives.⁸⁰

Bolton perceives evaluation to be:

a control mechanism that allows one to determine whether a person carries out responsible actions...one must evaluate process to determine if one is accountable. Evaluation contributes to the accountability process by becoming one of the actions for which everyone is responsible.⁸¹

⁸⁰Bolton, Evaluating Administrative Personnel, p. 8.

⁸¹Ibid., p. 8-9.

From an historic standpoint, evaluation practices in school districts followed similar patterns of development. While dates for various practices may not coincide, development of specific procedures followed a similar metamorphosis. Initially, school districts conducted informal evaluations with little planning, forethought or feedback. These practices were followed by report card evaluations where great attention was provided personal traits. As increased attention was provided duties and responsibilities of jobs, performance standards as well as pre-and post-conferencing became fashionable. With a greater reliance on performance standards, an interest in personal improvement in evaluations then occurred.⁸²

Upon a perusal of the literature, a plethora of purposes for appraising employees were found. In corporate circles, appraisals are conducted to satisfy employees' desires to be aware of their performance, communicate the degree to which previously established goals and objectives have been accomplished, highlight areas where an employee may improve, identify needed training programs, detect symptoms of employee dissatisfaction and ensure employees are continually aware of significant job duties and responsibilities.⁸³ In addition,

⁸²AASA and NSBA, Evaluating the Superintendent, p. 7-8.

⁸³Stanley B. Henrici, Salary Management for the Non-specialist, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978), pp. 143-144.

corporate appraisals establish qualifications for salary increases, rank employees against others who perform like tasks, identify readiness for transfers or promotions and provide a basis for determining specific monetary awards.⁸⁴

Within educational administration, principals' appraisal systems have changed from a means of judging traits and characteristics to a medium for planning, communicating, monitoring, coordinating and recognizing organizational and personal accomplishments.⁸⁵ This is particularly important in light of Cameron's views with respect to the essence of personal effectiveness:

It is well to remember that effectiveness, after all, is an artificial construct inherent in one's mind rather than in the nature of things. The idea of effectiveness, then, will always represent someone's values and biases and carry social and political ramifications.⁸⁶

Accepting Cameron's premise it is important that principals play a significant role in ultimate decisions regarding the determination of desired competencies as well as the degree of difference between desired and described competencies.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 143.

⁸⁵ Educational Research Service, *Evaluating Administrative Performance*, (Arlington, Virginia: Educational Research Service, Inc., 1974), p. 1-2.

⁸⁶ Kim Cameron, "Measuring Organizational Effectiveness in Institutions of Higher Education," Administrative Science Quarterly 23 (December 1978): 604.

As the principal form for making judgments about employee performance, a prime assumption attendant to appraisal systems should be that people are the most important resource within an organization and are capable of growth toward increased effectiveness.⁸⁷ In addition, it should be recognized that performance appraisal is fundamental to the management process and activities of a manager can either stimulate or impede the growth of employees.

As middle managers in school districts, principals have a significant effect upon the professional growth of employees. As none other within the school setting, the principal's activities impact most directly on the overall quality of education. In 1977, the AASA stated there was a "vital relationship" between quality school leadership and quality education.⁸⁸ Yet, principals' appraisal systems are often found to be less than satisfactory. Wells has found gross inconsistencies between major responsibilities of principals and factors which effect their performance appraisals.⁸⁹ Some of the problems associated with administrative appraisals emanate from a general lack of understanding regarding criteria to be evaluated,

⁸⁷ Howard P. Smith, Ph.D. and Paul J. Bouwer, Ph.D., Performance Appraisal and Human Development: A Practical Guide to Effective Management, (Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1977) p. XI.

⁸⁸ AASA, How To Evaluate Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, p. 37.

⁸⁹ Richard Frances Wells, "A Study of the Major Job Responsibilities of the Elementary Principal": (Ed.D. dissertation, University of North Colorado, 1978), Dissertation Abstracts International 39 (October 1978), p. 1987-A.

processes for measurement and procedures for analysis and interpretations.⁹⁰ Substandard performance appraisals may have negative effects upon salary determinations. The reluctance of school districts to recognize the direct correspondence between appraisals and pay is the major reason why school management has been less effective than business management and has created a demand for schools to become more business-like.⁹¹ Further, Booth and Glaub states:

It is inconsistent to encourage effective performance in an appraisal process and at the same time separate appraisal from compensation....Those who do not perform, do not deserve to be rewarded. Anything less defies logic.⁹²

Salary determinations should be a result of fair, honest and candid appraisals. Where an appraisal is not the influencing factor in pay determinations, the principle of a greater pay for greater results is negated. Where employees receive similar salary increases, Cohn and Lindberg indicate "you hurt those who do not fit into a neat category--the outstanding performer."⁹³

⁹⁰ Bolton, Evaluating Administrative Personnel, p. 27.

⁹¹ Booth and Glaub, Planned Appraisal, p. 83.

⁹² Ibid., p. 83.

⁹³ Cohn and Lindberg, Compensating Key Executives in the Smaller Company, p. 84.

To be effective, appraisal systems must consider the goals and aspirations of individuals as well as those of the organization. Berg supports this notion when stating:

appraisal systems which do not take into account the human element are not "performance" appraisals but "conformance" systems in which subjects' thoughts become standards for behavior, organized into categories of performance and assigned a rank under a bell-shaped curve.⁹⁴

In addition to considering and recognizing the human element in appraisals, organizations must set goals and objectives which become a blueprint for activities. While the human element is important, the organizational element is also important and should be included in appraisal systems. When discussing the elementary principal's role in particular, the AASA has indicated performance should be evaluated, to a large degree, in terms of "total contributions to educational systems."⁹⁵

Among the most important aspects of appraisal is determining precisely what is worthy of appraising. To accomplish this, the supervisor and employee must meet to establish criteria, expectations, goals, etc. which will

⁹⁴Berg, Managing Compensation, p. 228.

⁹⁵Educational Research Service, Evaluating Administrative Performance, p. 12.

comprise the evaluation process. Misunderstandings with regard to evaluation criteria need to be eliminated. Additionally, there must be an understanding of the purposes for which appraisals are conducted.⁹⁶ Taken to a natural conclusion, appraisals can be used to determine in-service activities, promotion, retention, salary and the like. A continued awareness of the purposes for appraising is essential in order to maintain direction, harmony and credibility.

Finally, when assessing one's performance, distinctions must be made between job responsibilities and job characteristics.⁹⁷ Since responsibilities are concerned with conditions and obligations and characteristics with traits and behaviors, the measurement of each must be conducted separately. While responsibilities can be measured discretely, as in performance objectives, characteristics are measured subjectively.⁹⁸ Since there are a continuum of personal characteristics which are associated with job success, it is suggested that these characteristics be evaluated by exception. When evaluating in this manner, mention of characteristics are made only at the time that an associated problem arises.⁹⁹ In most cases, performance appraisals should be

⁹⁶Booth and Glaub, Planned Appraisal, p. 27.

⁹⁷Ibid., p. 27.

⁹⁸Ibid., p. 42.

⁹⁹Ibid., p. 43.

concerned with measurable aspects of job responsibilities¹⁰⁰ which are beyond the routine. Minimum performance levels for routine activities should be treated much like job characteristics and evaluated by exception.¹⁰¹

Prior to the promulgation of an appraisal system, goals and objectives for the organization must be established. Performance standards of managers, while well defined, are undesirable if they do not support or corroborate the organization's goals and objectives.¹⁰² Within the school setting, groups of administrators should establish district goals in view of both internal and external forces.¹⁰³ Beach indicates organizational goals are important to managers because:

- a. Human beings are goal oriented and announced goals provide meaning to work.
- b. When employees are educated about objectives (of the corporation) so they believe in them, and there is less need for close control of their behavior. Self regulated behavior is then achieved.
- c. Objectives and guidelines for performance set the tone for action and establish the character of the organization.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁰ Renfro C. Manning, "Improving Principals' Performance Through Motivation and Evaluation," Spectrum, Journal of School Research and Information 1 (Spring 1983): 34.

¹⁰¹ Bolton, Evaluating Administrative Personnel, p. 84.

¹⁰² Richard S. Sloma, How To Measure Managerial Performance, (New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1980), p. 57.

¹⁰³ Bolton, Evaluating Administrative Personnel, p. 76.

¹⁰⁴ Dale S. Beach, Personnel; The Management of People at Work, (New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., 1975), pp. 55-56.

Beyond the establishment of goals and objectives, joint administrative initiatives should be taken to review the literature to determine how other organizations conduct appraisals, discuss most appropriate methodology, construct the program and, in the final analysis, institute the program.¹⁰⁵

In terms of school management appraisal programs, principals should be evaluated as a part of a total management system which is sensitive to individual differences. They should not be evaluated to meet preconceived molds where checklists of arbitrary standards are utilized for measuring effectiveness.¹⁰⁶ Instead, principals should be evaluated on mutually agreed upon goals, which may be modified, in a formalized manner.¹⁰⁷ Additionally, such evaluations should occur both in writing and verbally on various occasions during the school year.¹⁰⁸ Whenever possible, principals' evaluations should be augmented by soliciting performance appraisals from students, parents, teachers and other such clients beyond the direct supervisor.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁵AASA, Evaluating the Superintendent, p. 26.

¹⁰⁶Illinois Association of School Boards, "Evaluating Administrators," Illinois School Board Journal (March-April 1975): 19.

¹⁰⁷Ibid., p. 19-20.

¹⁰⁸Ibid., p. 20.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., p. 20.

Unfortunately, a variety of shortcomings have been associated with principals' evaluation systems. As a result, underserving administrators have been rewarded while superior administrators have gone unrewarded. Among the most serious of errors includes principals being unaware of assessment criteria and expected standards for their position. A study conducted by Deal in northern California showed that seventeen of thirty-four principals interviewed could not identify specific criteria used to formulate their evaluations.¹¹⁰ When asked what they perceived to be important criteria, most thought personality was equally as important as performance.¹¹¹

Another error frequently found in evaluation systems has to do with the establishment of objectives. When performance objectives are assigned by a superior, there is room for much confusion. Even when tasks are initially performed, there is no real assurance of a crystal clear understanding of the objective.¹¹²

While a lack of communications has frequently been used to describe a variety of management problems, particularly in terms of personnel assessments, communications is an im-

¹¹⁰ Terrance E. Deal, Sanford M. Dornbusch and Robert A. Crawford, "Villians As Victims," Phi Delta Kappan (December 1977): 274.

¹¹¹ Ibid., p. 274.

¹¹² AASA, How To Evaluate Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, p. 26.

portant ingredient for success. Infrequent meetings coupled with a weak commitment to the evaluation process leads to employees being reluctant to take risks and performing in a manner thought to be consistent with the superior's desires.¹¹³ Such pitfalls may explain the popularity of management by objectives systems where regular communications of progress are built into the program. Evaluations, to be meaningful, must take place in a sequential, cyclical and repetitive manner where information and data are built upon prior experiences.¹¹⁴

Other errors found in assessment practices are measuring performance without sufficient standards,¹¹⁵ job descriptions¹¹⁶ or challenging goals.¹¹⁷

Regarding the collection of evaluation data, such should be collected by the evaluatee as well as the evaluator to measure outcomes, examine processes, check if plans are being met and determine if procedures need to be altered or replicated.¹¹⁸ Collected evaluation data should not serve as a

¹¹³Ibid., p. 26-27.

¹¹⁴Bolton, Evaluating Administrative Personnel, p. 39.

¹¹⁵Booth and Glaub, Planned Appraisal, p. 35.

¹¹⁶Ibid., p. 35.

¹¹⁷Bolton, Evaluating Administrative Personnel, p. 122.

¹¹⁸Ibid., p. 89.

"ceremonial congratulations"¹¹⁹ written at the end of a school year but rather, as suggested above, as a means to facilitate cyclical activities for measuring and improving performance.

Basically, performance appraisals can be classified into two types with a great number of variations. These two types are those relating to characteristics, or traits, of the individual and those relating to job performance or results. Interest in measuring individual traits burst upon the industrial scene along with scientific management at the turn of the century.¹²⁰ Instruments commonly utilized to measure traits include simple ranking, graphic charts, forced-choice, and the like. One caveat attendant to trait measurement is the lack of correlation between high trait ratings and high performance.¹²¹ While trait measurement is useful for identifying problems and opening communications, it is considered subjective in nature, lacking in credibility, misleading and reflective of job suitability rather than job effectiveness.¹²² Characteristic or trait assessments are presently deemed inadequate when compared to performance evaluations. Within the

¹¹⁹Ibid., p. 111.

¹²⁰Henderson, Compensation Management, p. 322-333.

¹²¹Ibid., p. 333

¹²²Booth, Planned Appraisal, p. 31-32.

private sector, performance evaluations have been successfully utilized for many years. The AASA has indicated a number of school districts have embraced performance evaluations with great success.¹²³

Performance objectives, when mutually accepted, serve to identify performance priorities which lead to desired outcomes and culminate in job commitments.¹²⁴ The AASA points out:

An objective is a planned accomplishment, which, under specific conditions and on a given time frame, can be attained in accordance with predetermined evidences of accomplishment to help fulfill a related goal. While usually linked to an organization's goals, objectives can be concerned with personal performance.¹²⁵

When integrating personal goals with organizational goals, the net effect is moving from evaluating people to evaluating processes and outcomes where people are actively involved.

¹²³ AASA, How To Evaluate Administrative and Supervisory Performance, p. 7.

¹²⁴ Booth, Planned Appraisal, p. 45.

¹²⁵ AASA, How To Evaluate Administrative and Supervisory Performance, p. 32.

Management by Objectives (MBO) is a performance objective system which incorporates the mutuality referenced above. The AASA has stated the greatest value of MBOs' emanates from the identification of individual success with organizational success.¹²⁶

Smith indicates MBO's provide meaning to appraisal systems by forcing supervisors and employees to look into the future, focus attention away from personal characteristics, look into job activities and articulate what employees want to accomplish as well as what the organization would like them to accomplish.¹²⁷ Philosophically, MBO rests upon the promise that people work best if their activities have meaning and they have some notion of the higher purposes for what they are doing.¹²⁸

Within the educational setting, MBO systems have worked best where school boards have determined goals and translated them into measurable objectives for Superintendents and principals to accomplish. Based upon job descriptions and district goals, performance objectives for management personnel are mutually established. Where administrative evaluation systems

¹²⁶AASA, How To Evaluate Administrative and Supervisory Performance, p. 54.

¹²⁷Smith and Bouwer, Performance Appraisal, p. 7.

¹²⁸Karl Albrecht, Successful Management by Objectives, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978), p. 17-19.

have failed, it can be traced to an emphasis on personalities instead of results.

Some school districts have established principals' salaries through MBO evaluation systems. In such instances, performance contracts with the principal have the following characteristics:

- a. A description of the project, process or skills to be evaluated--including what is to be done, outcomes to be expected and procedures to be utilized--is established.
- b. A description of who will monitor progress is agreed upon.
- c. An agreement of materials, resources and aides needed to execute the contract is established.
- d. A determination of the frequency for which the evaluator/evaluatee will need to meet is made.¹²⁹

The above manner of determining salaries is conducted in a mutually accepted manner with regular and routine duties evaluated by exception.

¹²⁹ Bolton, Evaluating Administrative Personnel, p. 34.

Tasks, Duties and Functions of Principals

To appraise principals' performance for salary determinations, some agreement of tasks, duties and functions of the position are necessary. While several authors have written on the subject of administrative duties, tasks, functions, components and elements, hereafter, all such references will be termed "functions."

In 1916, Henry Fayol, of French extraction, was one of the first to identify administrative functions as planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating and controlling.¹³⁰ Fayol's work became the springboard for others to embellish. Luther Gullick in, "Notes on the Theory of Organization" proposed the acronym, "POSDCORB" for planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting.¹³¹ A contemporary of Gullick, Charles I. Barnard felt "the function of the executive is to serve as channels of communication...." and "related to all the work essential to the vitality and en-

¹³⁰ Henry Fayol, "The Administrative Theory In The State," trans. Sarah Grees in Papers On The Science of Administration, eds. Luther Gullick and L. Urwick (New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937) p. 103.

¹³¹ Luther Gullick, "Notes on The Theory of Administration," in Papers on the Science of Administration, eds., Luther Gullick and L. Urwick (New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937), p. 1-45.

duration of an organization."¹³² Barnard proposed the functions of administration as: "the maintenance of organizational communications, the securing of essential services from individuals and the formulation of purposes and objectives."¹³³

The AASA, in 1955, expressed the functions of administration as planning, allocating, stimulating, coordinating and evaluating.¹³⁴ Stimulated by the above, Russell Gregg set out to expand the functions when identifying decision making, planning, organizing, communicating, influencing, coordinating and evaluating.¹³⁵ Other authors, notably Ronald Campbell (1958), W. H. Newman and C. E. Summer (1967) also delineated administrative functions which resembled those previously mentioned.

Perhaps the most widely recognized and extensively analyzed of administrative functions are those presented by Stephen Knezevich in his book, Administration in Public Education. Knezevich identified sixteen functions and described them as anticipating, orienting, programming, organizing, staffing, resourcing,

¹³²Charles I. Barnard, The Functions of The Executive, 30th ed., (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), p. 215.

¹³³Ibid., p. 217-231.

¹³⁴American Association of School Administration, Staff Relations in School Administration, Thirty-Third Yearbook (Arlington, Va.: The Association, 1955) p. 17.

¹³⁵Russell Gregg, The Administrative Process in Administrative Behavior in Education eds. Ronald Campbell and Russell T. Gregg (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1957) p. 273.

leading, executing, changing, diagnosing, deciding, coordinating, communicating, politicing, controlling and appraising.¹³⁶

When considering the more recently identified regarding administrative functions, it is interesting to note Illinois is among the few states outlining the functions of the principalship:

The principal shall assume administrative responsibilities and instructional leadership, under the supervision of the Superintendent, and in accordance with reasonable rules and regulations of the board, for the planning, operation and evaluation of the educational program of the attendance area to which he is assigned.

The principal shall submit recommendations to the Superintendent concerning the appointment, retention, promotion and assignment of all personnel assigned to the attendance center.¹³⁷

In a 1982 research report, the ERS analyzed principals' job descriptions from across the nation and found the most widely held functions as curriculum development, paperwork, development and administration of a budget, supervision of building and grounds, recruitment and hiring of teachers, supervision and evaluations, interpretation of educational

¹³⁶Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Education, 3rd ed., (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1975), p. 36.

¹³⁷State Board of Education, Illinois Office of Education, The School Code of Illinois (St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Co., 1983), p. 56.

programs and actions relating to maintenance of health and safety.¹³⁸

Summary

Personnel evaluations, or appraisals, are conducted to communicate employee performance, indicate accomplishment of goals, highlight areas for improvement, rank employees for retention, promotion, etc. and determine salary increases. In school settings, principals' evaluations have changed from rating characteristics and traits to mutually assessing performance objectives. The literature indicates where school management lags behind business management is in the recognition of the association between evaluation and salary determination.

When evaluating management personnel, goals of the organization and the manager must be taken into account. Specifics relative to what should be evaluated, by what measure and by whom should be determined in a collegial manner. The literature supports the concept that principals should be evaluated in terms of the total management system and not some preconceived mold for performance. To accomplish this,

¹³⁸ ERS, 1982, The Role of Elementary School Principals: A Summary of Research, p. 3.

management by objectives is described as an effective means to evaluate principals' performance.

Perhaps the most widely recognized listing of school administrative tasks, duties and functions are those described by Stephen Knezevich as anticipating, orientating, programming, organizing, staffing, resourcing, leading, executing, changing, diagnosing, deciding, coordinating, communicating, politicing, controlling and appraising. The ERS buttressed Knezevich's functions when indicating principals spend most time working on curriculum development, paperwork, supervising the building and grounds, recruiting and hiring staff, supervising and evaluating teachers, interpreting the schools program and maintaining health and safety in school.

PRINCIPALS AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The operation of schools is an activity involving the interaction of such people as students, teachers, principals, central office administrators, support personnel and the like. Accomplishing educational goals and objectives directly corresponds with the quality of interactions among those who comprise the school's work force. For this reason, the manner in which time and energy is expended by school employees is quite important to management. Indeed, the utilization of time and energy has a substantial effect upon relations between employees and management and is fundamental to the propagation of collective bargaining.

For several years, teacher groups have derived much notoriety from gains in salary and conditions of employment through collective bargaining. An increasing trend in American education is the growth of middle management (principals and assistant principals) unions for the purpose of collective bargaining with Superintendents and Boards of Education. Once considered an anomaly, middle management unions are attempting to keep pace with teacher salary increases and fringe benefits as well as prevent further erosion of management authority.

Collective bargaining by middle managers in education departs considerably from that within the private sector. In the private sector, those employees who meet the National Labor Relations Act's definition of manager or supervisor are excluded from entering into collective bargaining "by decisional law."¹³⁹ However, middle management educators are able to engage in collective bargaining through associations with teacher groups or in separate units. Central to this issue is the nature of the rights negotiated by principals as opposed to that which would be negotiated by private sector managers and supervisors. Hayford and Sinicropi have analyzed this matter and indicated that public sector middle managers do not make salient decisions due to "highly central-

¹³⁹Margaret A. Lareau, "The Issue of Collective Bargaining for School Supervisors and Administrators," Collective Bargaining (March 1980), p. 153.

ized decision-making mechanisms. This is often emphasized in state labor board decisions which include principals..."¹⁴⁰ Further, public sector bargaining emphasizes salary and not contract negotiations where a significant potential for conflict exists. Amid this controversy, individual states have granted principals the right to enter into collective bargaining agreements with school districts.

Data collected by the ERS in a nationwide survey pointed out 74.8 percent of reporting school districts possessed collective bargaining agreements with teachers and 20.6 percent have such agreements with principals.¹⁴¹ This study also indicated in 3.7 percent of the districts, principals and teachers were part of the same bargaining unit.¹⁴² In the same study it was determined that principal bargaining units are more prevalent in larger school districts than in smaller ones.¹⁴³

¹⁴⁰ Stephen Hayford and Anthony V. Sinicropi, Collective Bargaining and the Public Sector Supervisor (Chicago: International Personnel Management Association, 1976), pp. 105.

¹⁴¹ Educational Research Service, "Spectrum," Journal of School Research and Information. (Spring 1983): 32.

¹⁴² Ibid., p. 32.

¹⁴³ Ibid., p. 32.

Table 4 will illustrate the above:¹⁴⁴

Table 4

Number of School Districts With Collective Negotiation Units and Percent of Responding Districts in ERS National Survey, by Enrollment Group, 1982-83.

| | ENROLLMENT GROUP | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|----------------|---------|------------------|---------|----------------|---------|--------------|---------|
| | TOTAL-ALL REPORTING SYSTEMS | | 25,000 OR MORE | | 10,000 TO 24,999 | | 2,500 TO 9,999 | | 300 TO 2,499 | |
| | TOTAL | PERCENT | TOTAL | PERCENT | TOTAL | PERCENT | TOTAL | PERCENT | TOTAL | PERCENT |
| TOTAL RESPONDENTS..... | 1,120 | 100.0 | 122 | 100.0 | 272 | 100.0 | 424 | 100.0 | 302 | 100.0 |
| TEACHERS | | | | | | | | | | |
| NO RESPONSE..... | 11 | 1.0 | 2 | 1.6 | 2 | .7 | 6 | 1.4 | 1 | .3 |
| YES..... | 850 | 74.8 | 78 | 63.9 | 194 | 71.3 | 325 | 76.7 | 241 | 79.8 |
| NO..... | 271 | 24.2 | 42 | 34.4 | 76 | 27.9 | 93 | 21.9 | 60 | 19.9 |
| PRINCIPALS | | | | | | | | | | |
| NO RESPONSE..... | 49 | 4.4 | 5 | 4.1 | 10 | 3.7 | 21 | 5.0 | 13 | 4.3 |
| YES..... | 231 | 20.6 | 31 | 25.4 | 57 | 21.0 | 94 | 22.2 | 49 | 16.2 |
| NO..... | 840 | 75.0 | 86 | 70.5 | 205 | 75.4 | 309 | 72.9 | 240 | 79.5 |

Collective bargaining by school principals presently occurs in more than half of the fifty states¹⁴⁵ with an even greater potential if more states passed legislation in support of the movement.¹⁴⁶ To illustrate this point, the American School Board Journal found eighty-six percent of principals polled in 1978 favored state laws which would guarantee their right to bargain with school boards.¹⁴⁷ As early as 1976, Bruce S. Cooper wrote, "there is little doubt

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 32.

¹⁴⁵ Jim Sweeney and Larry Rowedder, "What Principals Want--and Get--from Their Unions," Education Digest 46 (December 1980): 44-45.

¹⁴⁶ William P. Knoester, "Administrative Unionization: What Kind of Solution," Phi Delta Kappan (February 1978): 419.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 419.

that middle management unionism in education is growing."¹⁴⁸

Reasons for the proliferation of principals' unions are numerous. Among the more credible reasons include: improved salary and fringe benefits, restoration of authority previously negotiated to teachers by school boards, job security, clearer understanding of administrative roles, better communications with Superintendents and Boards of Education and increased involvement in decision making.¹⁴⁹ In addition, many principals feel frustrated resulting from district financial problems, lowered expectations for students and employees and reductions in force.¹⁵⁰

A California administrator has written:

My fellow workers are not supposed to bargain collectively. Unionizing, like public drunkenness, is not a moral or legal option for school managers. Still, we now face cuts in our ranks caused by the salary negotiations of teachers who are protected by law and collective bargaining, while we administrators must rely on good faith, honesty, and well-meaning school boards--not too unlike Blanche Dubois, who, in a Streetcar Named Desire, "always relied on the kindness of strangers." At the last meeting of those of us who wanted to form a union, we all agreed that the situation was a crying shame....¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁸ Bruce S. Cooper, "Collective Bargaining Comes To School Middle Management" Phi Delta Kappan (October 1976), p. 203.

¹⁴⁹ Sweeney and Rowedder, What Principals Want--and Get--from Their Unions, p. 44.

¹⁵⁰ John Marlowe. "Why I Almost Joined A Principals Union," Education Digest (September 1980), p. 24.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., p. 25.

Comments from principals about the nation provide clear evidence of discontent with Superintendent and Board of Education dispositions.

Principals are "tired of trying to hose down educational brush fires while dodging snipers from above and below" (Iowa Principals). Furthermore, principals resent their bosses "bartering away one principal's prerogative after another at the teacher bargaining table" (Illinois). Principals are cynical about "double-talking Superintendents" (Wisconsin). Principals are disillusioned with school boards and Superintendents "who rush to get in there and win the educational ballgame, then, when the chips are down, leave us out in left field without a glove" (Texas).¹⁵²

It is interesting to note a position statement by the Illinois Principals' Association regarding the frustrations encountered by the membership.

Many teachers are given the right to bargain directly with school boards over such matters as salary, due process, working conditions, etc. The General Assembly may soon grant such rights to all teachers. At the same time, the Superintendent and other district-level administrators also communicate directly with school boards on these matters. Principals--the middle managers--are usually given no direct voice to the school board. Hence, they get what is left of the financial pie.

"If the 'Administrative Team' concept ever becomes a reality in practice as well as theory and is adopted by all school districts in Illinois, principals may not need a bargaining unit. Discussions have begun with the Illinois Association of School Administrators on how acceptance of this concept could be achieved, both qualita-

¹⁵²American School Board Association, "The brewing--and, still preventable--revolt of the school principals," American School Board Journal 163 (January 1976): 25.

tively and quantitatively. Until this can be accomplished, however, we must explore all methods of escaping the position in which too many principals now find themselves; the 'neglected middle' of the decision making process."¹⁵³

In a response to the principals' position statement, the Illinois Association of School Boards noted the statement's "likeness to that of the Illinois Education Association during the halcyon days of the 1960's."¹⁵⁴ Further, the Association agreed "that principals should be treated fairly in all matters" with particular "attention to the necessary qualifications and job descriptions, delegation of authority, evaluation of performance, moral support and financial rewards."¹⁵⁵

In essence, principals feel disparaged from a lack of authoritative integrity by school boards, an unwillingness of Superintendents to assume unpopular stands, a loss of authority once reserved for middle management and an increasing clout garnered by teacher unions effecting system work rules.¹⁵⁶

Similar to other labor unions, principal unions bargain for increased salaries, fringe benefits and work conditions.

¹⁵³ Illinois Association of School Boards, "Principals Want Equal Rights," Developments in Personnel Management 1 (June 1974): 5.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 5.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 5.

¹⁵⁶ Bruce S. Cooper, Collective Bargaining Comes To School Middle Management, p. 202.

Unlike teachers, however, principals' contracts are less formalized in the areas of employee rights and negotiating procedures.¹⁵⁷ In a study conducted by the AASA, 2,138 school board members and central office administrators in Illinois and Wyoming were asked what might be negotiable when principals began bargaining. The results indicated items such as salary, length of contract, grievance procedures, leaves, travel allowances, insurance packages, negotiations procedures and consultations regarding instructional materials would be negotiable. However, evaluation procedures, hours of work, promotion procedures, payment of professional dues, transfer, reimbursement for course work, alterations to curricula and responsibility for student assignment and discipline would be non-negotiable items.¹⁵⁸

Where principals bargain collectively, as in Connecticut, for example, it is perceived that bargaining has caused increases in salary and fringe benefits, gains in decision making, improvements in communications, classifications of roles, increases in job security and a re-establishment of authority.¹⁵⁹ Principals also believe collective bargaining

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 203.

¹⁵⁸ American Association of School Administrators, "If Principals Bargain, What Is Negotiable?" The School Administrator (September 1981), p. 30.

¹⁵⁹ Sweeney and Rowedder, What Principals Want--and Get--From Their Unions, p. 45.

has favorably affected morale and relationships among principals, central office staff, Superintendents and board members.¹⁶⁰

Superintendents and school board presidents do not agree with the perceived gains principals have gleaned through collective bargaining. Indeed, they have indicated salaries are not higher nor has there been improved relations from bargaining. In their opinion, the "image of principals was hurt as a result of unions."¹⁶¹

Paul Salmon, executive director of the AASA believes principals' unions have had deleterious effects upon team management. He observes:

Collective bargaining, as a process, is adversary in essence. Being a bilateral procedure, it pits party against party. Divergence, proposals, counter-proposals, and compromise are its characteristics. In actuality, it isolates the superintendent from his team members and requires him (or his designated representative) to function as an adversary at the bargaining table.¹⁶²

While principals may believe negotiating has worked to reduce conflict with Superintendents and school boards, such was not found to be true in Michigan. Findings provide

¹⁶⁰ Terrel M. LeCesne, "Unionized Principals - Why Not?" Phi Delta Kappan 62 (December 1980): 284.

¹⁶¹ Sweeney and Rowedder, What Principals Want--and Get--from Their Unions, p. 45.

¹⁶² Knoester, Administrative Unionization: What Kind of Solution, p. 421.

evidence that non-union principals have better communications with Superintendents and school boards than union principals.¹⁶³ It would appear once an adverse relationship has been cultivated, such cannot easily be retracted.¹⁶⁴

Summary

It can be concluded that principals no longer perceive themselves as the sole manager and supervisor of their schools. When threatened, principals assume a more labor-like posture and pursue bargaining to resolve conflicts. Collective bargaining by principals is a phenomenon which is well established and threatens to become much more pervasive and integral to American public education.

¹⁶³Ibid., p. 421.

¹⁶⁴Karlitz, Unionization of Educational Administrators, p. 96.

CHAPTER III

Methods and Procedures

The purpose of this dissertation is to determine practices and procedures for establishing elementary principals' salaries. Additionally, a secondary purpose is to determine the advantages and disadvantages of principals electing to formulate unions for collective bargaining purposes.

The methods and procedures utilized to realize the purposes of this dissertation were selected because they are the most appropriate in view of the purposes of the study. In general, the research methods and procedures selected to realize the study's purposes can be described as descriptive research. This dissertation will endeavor to describe and analyze existing conditions, trends and developments in relation to practices and procedures for determining elementary principals' salaries.

Review of the Literature

To fulfill the goals of this study, a comprehensive review of related literature was completed in three sections: (1) factors considered when determining salaries; (2) appraisal systems utilized to determine salaries; and, (3) principals and collective bargaining. Among the various sources perused when collecting research included books, periodicals, docu-

ments, dissertation abstracts, unpublished corporate manuals, newspapers and articles. Upon a review of these sources, it became apparent only a modicum of substantive material relative to compensation management in school systems existed. It then became necessary to rely heavily upon literature written specifically for corporate middle management compensation administration to accomplish the study's purposes.

Selection of the Population

The population selected for this study included Superintendents and principals serving elementary school districts in Lake County, Illinois. This county was selected after an examination of its inherent diversity of urban and rural as well as wealthy and impoverished areas. Within its geographic boundaries, Lake County possesses 36 elementary school districts, each representing as many diverse characteristics as the communities they serve. The school district enrollments range in size from 11,811 to 83 (1982-83 statistics) and in wealth with 1981 assessed valuations per pupil from \$312,005 to \$21,490.

Inasmuch as practices and procedures for determining principals' salaries have particular significance for Superintendents and, quite obviously, principals, members of these groups were selected for participation in this study. Since a comparison of information received from Superintendents and principals within school districts was made, it was imperative that "pairs" of these groups be a part of the study's population.

The Survey Instrument

A questionnaire was developed and provided Superintendents to (1) establish methods utilized to determine principals' salaries; (2) establish systems utilized to evaluate principals; (3) identify the prevalence of principals' job descriptions and; (4) ascertain whether or not the Superintendent and a principal would consent to an interview.

Upon the creation of the questionnaire, the instrument was validated through field testing. To accomplish this, a jury of educational administration experts were solicited and charged to critically analyze the questionnaire regarding content and construction (Appendix A). Based upon the information gleaned from the jury of educational administration experts, minor alterations to the questionnaire were made to place the instrument in final form (Appendix B).

The questionnaire was mailed to elementary school district Superintendents in Lake County. Enclosed within the mailing were two letters: (1) a letter from the author's Superintendent endorsing the purposes for which the dissertation was being conducted (Appendix C) and, (2) a letter from the author explaining the purpose for the questionnaire, how information would be utilized and a solicitation for cooperation (Appendix D).

The Interview

After twenty-four questionnaires were returned, ten Superintendents and ten principals were selected to comprise

a sample for further study. The sample population was selected after a systematic examination of the twenty-four respondents. Since Lake County, Illinois possesses diverse school districts, it was necessary to select districts which collectively represented the characteristics of the county's school districts. The population was selected on the basis of average daily attendance, assessed valuation per pupil, cost per pupil, and willingness to participate in the study. Upon an examination of the respondents willing to participate in this study, districts were separated into groups to reflect the following:

TAX AND PER PUPIL COST DATA FOR
LAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
FOR YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1982

Table 5
Lake County Enrollment Data

| Enrollment | Number of Districts in County |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| 85 - 200 | 6 |
| 200 - 500 | 5 |
| 500 - 1,200 | 13 |
| 1,200 - 2,000 | 8 |
| 2,000 - | 3 |

Table 6
Lake County Assessed
Valuation Data

| Assessed Valuation | Number of Districts in County |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|
| \$ 40,000 - 39,999 | 7 |
| 70,000 - 69,999 | 5 |
| 81,000 - 119,999 | 11 |
| 120,000 - 149,999 | 5 |
| 150,000 - | 7 |

Table 7
Lake County Per Pupil
Cost Data

| Cost Per Pupil | Number of Districts in County |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| \$1,800 - 2,199 | 7 |
| 2,200 - 2,499 | 7 |
| 2,500 - 2,799 | 8 |
| 2,800 - 3,199 | 7 |
| 3,200 - | 6 |

Ten school districts were found to possess the characteristics necessary to make the population representative of Lake County, Illinois, and therefore, included in the study.

The interview method was selected as the best method for obtaining further information and exploring attendant areas which transcend that which was a part of the original questionnaire.

A structured interview was developed and field tested with the jury of experts who served to validate the previously referenced questionnaire. After rhetorical alterations to the original interview were completed, Superintendents and principals were interviewed to gather information relative to: (1) principals' job descriptions; (2) practices and procedures for evaluating principals; (3) practices and procedures for determining principals' salaries; (4) roles of Superintendents and principals when evaluating and compen-

sating principals and; (5) collective bargaining for principals salaries (Appendix E).

Analysis of the Data

The information received from the questionnaire and interview was analyzed and synthesized in such a manner as to provide answers for the study's questions. A narrative analysis describing findings, commonalities, differences, trends, pitfalls and explanations for what is delineated takes place. From a procedural standpoint, each study question and concomitant subquestion is presented. Upon the delineation of said questions individually, a comprehensive analysis follows. Where possible, study data are compared and contrasted with literary data. Additionally, tables are utilized to provide graphic embellishment for narrative analysis.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study is to ascertain the practices and procedures utilized to determine elementary school principals' salaries in Lake County, Illinois. Among the questions to be answered within the body of the study include: (1) How are administrative job descriptions and evaluation systems utilized to determine elementary principals' salaries? (2) What are the most important factors considered when determining elementary principals' salaries? (3) What are the specific roles of the Superintendents and principals when determining elementary principals' salaries? and (4) How do recommended practices and procedures for determining principals' salaries in the literature compare with what is taking place in practice?

A secondary question the study addressed included advantages and disadvantages for principals electing to formulate unions for collective bargaining purposes.

This Chapter contains a comprehensive presentation and analysis of data gathered from responses to a questionnaire administered to Superintendents (Appendix B) and a structured interview conducted among Superintendents and principals (Appendix E). Responses are delineated in a narrative format

and buttressed by tables for amplification where appropriate.

The Chapter is divided into five discrete sections representing the study's four major purposes as well as the secondary purpose. Each purpose is presented separately along with attendant research data and a comprehensive analysis. Since the study endeavored to compare recommended practices and procedures in the literature with what is actually taking place, secondary purposes extended the scope of the major purposes resulting in a broader and more comprehensive scope for this study.

The full study is subject to the limitations indicated in Chapter I. Therefore, the research data and analysis should be regarded as general and less than universally acceptable.

Major Purpose One - Identify and Analyze
Suggested Practices and Criteria
for Determining Principals'
Salaries in the Literature

The first purpose of this study is to ascertain suggested practices and criteria for determining principals' salaries. Resulting from a lack of substantive material written specifically for school compensation administration, it became necessary to rely upon literature written for corporate middle management compensation to accomplish the study's purpose.

Contained within Chapter II of the study is a comprehen-

sive review of literature divided into three distinct sections: (1) Factors considered when determining salaries; (2) Appraisal systems used to determine salaries; and (3) Principals and collective bargaining.

The literature clearly suggests whether rank-and-file or management, compensation should be commensurate with contributions to the organization. Job descriptions should be constructed for all management positions and, when mutually agreed upon, can be utilized to compare positions, persons and compensable job elements. Among the various factors which influence salary determinations are market pricing for similar positions, past practices, established policies, organization's ability to pay and the economy of the community. Within the educational milieu, principals' salaries are influenced by the level of students, number of contractual days of employment, academic preparation and tenure in the position. Most often, principals' salaries are established through salary schedules, merit pay plans and job evaluation systems.

Personnel appraisals, or evaluations, are conducted to communicate performance, rank employees and determine salary increases. The literature indicates school management has been slow to recognize the correspondence between evaluations and salary determinations. However, it is recommended that principals be evaluated through management by objectives systems

which readily lend themselves to salary determinations.

Collective bargaining by school middle managers presently takes place in more than half of the nation's states.¹ Reasons for the proliferation of such unions include the diminution of principals' authority, job security, role, communications with superiors and expectations for students and staff. In addition, principals join unions for improved salaries. Where threatened, principals have elected a more labor-like approach to resolving conflicts. Collective bargaining by principals threatens to become more pervasive in public education subsequently.

Major Purpose Two - Determine How Administrative
Job Descriptions and Evaluation Systems
Are Utilized to Determine
Principals' Salaries

The second purpose of this study is to determine how administrative job descriptions and evaluation systems are utilized to determine principals' salaries. Secondary purposes which will amplify the above-referenced major purpose include:

- 2.1 Identify the various duties, tasks and functions which comprise the principals' job description.
- 2.2 Identify criteria utilized to evaluate principals.
- 2.3 Identify and analyze the procedures utilized to evaluate principals.

¹Sweeney and Rowedder, "What Principals Want," p. 44.

- 2.4 Determine the extent of principal participation in his own evaluation.
- 2.5 Identify and analyze specific criteria which are important in determining principals' salaries.

This section of Chapter IV provides a presentation and analysis of the relative importance of (1) principals' job descriptions; (2) criteria and methodologies utilized to evaluate principals; and (3) role of the principal in the formulation of his own evaluation. Further, this section purports to identify and analyze the congruency and disparateness of Superintendents' and principals' responses to the above referenced material.

The research data presented in Purpose Two were collected from a field tested questionnaire mailed to all Superintendents in Lake County, Illinois, as well as structured interviews conducted with ten Superintendents and principals from the same school districts which were selected for participation in the study. The structured interview, in particular, was placed together to elicit cogent responses for the five secondary purposes attendant to Major Purpose Two. The secondary purposes should be considered sub-sectional headings for Major Purpose Two to facilitate the presentation and analysis of research in an orderly and meaningful manner.

- 2.1 Identify the Various Duties, Tasks and Functions Which Comprise Principals' Job Description

It is the purpose of this section of the study to establish the actual tasks, duties and functions of principals which would collectively comprise principals' job descriptions. Question number thirteen of the structured interview endeavored to elicit appropriate responses from both Superintendents and principals regarding principals' tasks, duties and functions. The question proposed to Superintendents and principals was: "What are the major tasks, duties and functions of principals in this school district?"

Presentation of the Data

The responses of Superintendents and principals from the same school districts were carefully analyzed to ascertain the most commonly accepted tasks, duties and functions of principals. Of the various responses, four were commonly stated by both groups of administrators. In addition, two responses were commonly stated by Superintendents only and two responses were commonly referenced by principals only. Table 8 provides a graphic illustration of this phenomenon.

TABLE 8

FREQUENCY OF SUPERINTENDENTS' AND PRINCIPALS'
RESPONSES REGARDING PRINCIPALS' TASKS,
DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS

| Responses | <u>Number of Responses</u> | | |
|---|----------------------------|------------|--------|
| | Superintendents | Principals | Pairs* |
| Proving Leadership for the Instructional Program | 10 | 7 | 7 |
| Completing School Admini- strative Activities | 6 | 5 | 5 |
| Supervising Teachers | 5 | 7 | 5 |
| Conducting Public Re- lations Activities | 5 | 8 | 5 |
| Completing Central Office Activities | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Facilitating Positive Staff Morale | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Maintaining Student Discipline | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Implementing Extra Curricular Activities | 0 | 4 | 0 |

*Pairs means the Superintendent and principal from the same school district provided a common response.

In Table 8, eight responses gleaned from interviewing Superintendents and principals are delineated. The frequency of common responses from Superintendents and principals are indicated below the titles "Superintendents" and "principals."

Further, the frequency of common responses from Superintendents and principals from within the same school district are indicated below the title "Pairs."

An examination of responses in Table 8 indicates Superintendents and principals believe elementary principals are to provide "leadership for the school's instructional program." Indeed, one hundred percent of the Superintendents and seventy percent of the principals identified "instructional leadership" as a distinct aspect of the principalship. Of ten pairs of administrators interviewed, seven affirmed the response as a task, duty or function of the elementary principal.

Interestingly, half of the administrative pairs interviewed identified "completing school administrative activities," "supervising teachers" and "conducting public relations activities" as principals' tasks, duties or functions.

It is important to note "completing central office activities" and "facilitating positive staff morale" were identified by four and three Superintendents respectively while not identified by any of the principals. The reverse was true with "maintaining student discipline" and "implementing extra-

curricular activities" identified by six and four principals respectively but not identified by any of the Superintendents.

After a review of the literature pertaining to job descriptions for management personnel, it is clear job descriptions are considered a significant precursor to appraisal and, ultimately, salary determinations. To elicit information which could be utilized for comparing what is written about job descriptions with what is actually being practiced, additional questions were proposed.

Question number three in the questionnaire sent to elementary school district Superintendents asked: "Does your school district maintain a detailed job description of principals' duties, tasks and responsibilities?" In each of the twenty-four questionnaires returned, Superintendents affirmed detailed job descriptions for principals were being maintained within their school districts. To gather further information with respect to the significance of these job descriptions, questions one through five in the structured interview were proposed to Superintendents and principals.

The literature identified a plethora of purposes for which job descriptions might be utilized within an organization. To establish how school districts utilize job descriptions, question number one was asked of Superintendents and principals: "How are job descriptions utilized?" Responses to question number one can be found in Table 9.

TABLE 9

FREQUENCY OF SUPERINTENDENTS' AND PRINCIPALS'
 RESPONSES TO: HOW ARE JOB DESCRIPTIONS
 UTILIZED?

| Responses | Number of Responses | | |
|---|---------------------|------------|-------|
| | Superintendents | Principals | Pairs |
| To Evaluate Principals | 7 | 3 | 3 |
| To Determine If The Job Is Being Completed | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Not Used At All | 2 | 6 | 2 |
| Inform Candidates Of Job Responsibilities | 0 | 2 | 0 |

While there were several responses which were rendered on only one occasion, four were stated by at least two interviewees. Three pairs of Superintendents and principals identified "to evaluate principals" as a use for job descriptions. Oddly enough, this particular response was not anticipated since the question carried a broader application beyond the principalship. However, seven Superintendents and three principals indicated principals job descriptions are utilized for evaluations.

Two pairs of administrators identified "to determine if the job is being done," as well as "not used at all" when asked for uses of job descriptions. From an accountability

standpoint, six Superintendents utilize the descriptions as a "yardstick" to ensure all aspects of given jobs are being completed. Two principals corroborated this response. It is significant to be aware that six principals and two Superintendents noted job descriptions "were not used at all." This fact is particularly interesting in view of the fact that all districts participating in this study possess job descriptions.

Question number two, "Are the elements of the principals' job description stated as tasks, duties or responsibilities," was proposed to specifically determine how frequently, "responsibilities" was identified. Unlike rank-and-file employees, the literature indicates managerial job descriptions should be comprised of responsibilities. Table 10 indicates the variation in responses as well as the frequency for which each response was mentioned by Superintendents and principals.

TABLE 10

FREQUENCY OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS
RESPONSES TO: ARE THE ELEMENTS OF
THE PRINCIPAL'S JOB DESCRIPTION STATED
AS TASKS, DUTIES OR RESPONSIBILITIES?

| Responses | Number of Responses | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|------------|--------|
| | Superintendents | Principals | Pairs* |
| Responsibilities | 5 | 6 | 4 |
| Tasks, Duties and Responsibilities | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Tasks | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Duties | 0 | 1 | 0 |

A perusal of the data illustrated in Table 10 points out approximately half of the school districts possess job descriptions for principals which are stated in terms of "responsibilities." While fifty percent of the Superintendents indicated principals job descriptions are stated as "responsibilities," sixty percent of the principals indicated the same response. However, only four pairs of administrators gave "responsibilities" as an answer to the question. As Table 10 points out, almost half of the school districts comprising this study state the elements of the principal's job description in terms of "tasks," "duties" or "tasks, duties and responsibilities."

The literature states that job descriptions should be formulated to facilitate appraisals and salary determinations. Indeed, it is from the job description that evaluation criteria are extracted. Consequently, these criteria are then converted into compensable factors for determining salary. Therefore, job descriptions, evaluation systems and, ultimately, salary determinations seem to be inter-related. Interview questions number three and four endeavor to glean information with respect to the relationship between principals' job descriptions, evaluation systems and salary determinations.

Question number three consists of two parts: "Has the principal's job description ever been utilized for evaluation purposes?" and, "If so, how?" It is the purpose of question number three to determine the actual correspondence between

the principal's job description and evaluation system. Table 11 provides a graphic display of the three responses gleaned from Superintendents and principals after having been asked the first part of question number three.

TABLE 11

FREQUENCY OF SUPERINTENDENTS' AND PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES TO: HAS THE PRINCIPAL'S JOB DESCRIPTION BEEN UTILIZED FOR EVALUATION PURPOSES?

| Responses | Number of Responses | | |
|------------|---------------------|------------|-------|
| | Superintendents | Principals | Pairs |
| Yes | 6 | 3 | 3 |
| No | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| Indirectly | 2 | 3 | 1 |

It can be concluded from an examination of Table 11 that in only three of ten school districts principals' job descriptions are utilized for evaluation purposes. In the remaining school districts, job descriptions are used "indirectly" or not at all when evaluating principals. Since only three pairs of administrators responded affirmatively to the question proposed, it can be assumed that in the majority of school districts comprising this study, job descriptions are not directly utilized when evaluating principals.

For those who stated that the principal's job description was used for evaluation purposes, the second part of question number three, "If so, how?" was asked. Three of six Superintendents indicated "principals were evaluated on how well they were meeting responsibilities specifically delineated in the job description." Other responses from Superintendents and principals were different from the above as well as from one another.

To ascertain whether or not principals' job descriptions have been utilized for salary determinations, interviewees were asked for reactions to question number four which, as question number three, had two parts: "Has the principal's job description ever been utilized to determine salaries?" and "If so, how?" Table 12 presents the responses from Superintendents and principals when asked question number four.

TABLE 12

FREQUENCY OF SUPERINTENDENTS ' AND PRINCIPALS '
RESPONSES TO: HAS THE PRINCIPAL'S JOB
DESCRIPTION EVER BEEN UTILIZED TO
DETERMINE SALARIES?

| Responses | Number of Responses | | |
|------------|---------------------|------------|-------|
| | Superintendents | Principals | Pairs |
| Yes | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| No | 4 | 6 | 4 |
| Indirectly | 2 | 1 | 2 |

From the data presented, it can be concluded only two of ten school districts participating in this study consider the principal's job description to be significant when determining principals' salaries. This conclusion is based upon the two pairs of administrators responding affirmatively to the proposed question. In six school districts, the principal's job description is either not considered or indirectly considered when determining salaries. Further, of twenty administrators interviewed, thirteen could not affirm the use of the job description when determining principal's salaries.

The second part of question number four was asked of the four Superintendents and three principals who provided affirmative answers to the first part of the question. In effect, the second part of question number four asked interviewees how the principal's job description is utilized to determine salaries? Responses from Superintendents and principals were less than definitive. Even when asked to elaborate upon responses, the administrators had obvious difficulty doing so. Apparently, Superintendents and principals did not anticipate being asked how job descriptions are utilized to determine salaries. The only response which was stated on more than one occasion was articulated by a Superintendent and principal from different school districts. When asked how the principal's job description is utilized to determine principals' pay, the administrators stated, "To pay the junior high school principal more money."

The literature points out managerial job descriptions should possess both common and unique elements for like positions. Within the school setting, while all principals have certain common responsibilities associated with building management and supervision, student needs and community demands, for example, cause principals to have unique responsibilities as well. To ensure both common and unique job responsibilities are contained within job descriptions, the literature suggests Superintendents and principals identify and agree upon job elements. Question number five was proposed to Superintendents and principals to determine if principals participate in the establishment of their job descriptions. Question number five specifically asked: "Are the elements of the principal's job description mutually agreed upon?"

In five of the ten school districts participating in the study, both the Superintendent and principal agreed the elements of the principal's job description were not mutually agreed upon. Conversely, four of the ten Superintendents and principals from the same school district indicated the elements were mutually agreed upon.

Analysis of the Data

Secondary Purpose 2.1 attempts to establish commonly accepted tasks, duties and functions which might comprise a principal's job description. From data gathered through responses Superintendents and principals provided the study's questions, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. Superintendents and principals regard "instructional leadership" as the most important aspect of the principal's job. After "instructional leadership," "completing administrative tasks," "supervising staff" and "conducting public relations activities" are deemed important. Reasons for instructional leadership being held in such high regard are many. First, during times of public scrutiny, when school patrons are questioning the importance of positions and the relative worth of one position as opposed to another, the close association with instructional leadership is a safe one for both the Superintendent, and in particular, the principal. Providing instructional leadership can be construed to mean thinking about and being among the children. In most cases Boards of Education, parents and community members think of instructional leaders as those who look after the best interests of the children. As the general public calls for greater accountability in schools, the skillful principal will be allied with children as educational leader.

Principals occasionally become educational leaders by default. Superintendents, at various times, communicate that educational leadership rightfully belongs to the "people on the front lines." Superintendents have been "on the front lines" as educational leaders and view the task as one to be assumed by a subordinate who may still be "paying dues." Additionally, teachers do not wish to be culpable when parents begin questioning the effectiveness of the educational program. While

teachers typically participate on curriculum committees, many are unwilling to assume risks and be criticized for possible failures attendant to leadership.

To a large degree, administrative preparatory institutions are responsible for principals being regarded as educational leaders. Supported by numerous textbooks and journals, professors frequently state that the principal is the educational leader in schools. As a result, when asked to identify a task, duty or function of a principal, on many occasions administrators will answer: "instructional leadership."

2. What might be most significant about the data concerning principals' tasks, duties and functions is the fact that principals who participated in this study identified "conducting public relations activities" more frequently than any other response. Eight of ten principals as compared with five of ten Superintendents stated "public relations activities" are central to the principalship. This fact is somewhat provocative in view of the fact that "public relations activities" does not impact directly upon maintaining and improving the educational program for children. If principals and Superintendents believe the principal's most important task is to provide leadership for the instructional program, one might wonder why principals as a group have a penchant for "public relations activities." Perhaps principals believe "public relations activities" are perceived to be quite important to Superintendents and essential for positive evaluations and

salary determinations. Unlike responses as "providing leadership for the educational program" and "completing school administrative activities," "conducting public relations activities" is observable, deters parents clamoring for accountability and, helps to foster public acceptance of the school district. Since Superintendents often value activities which foster public acceptance of their school districts, "conducting public relations activities" can frequently be associated with job security and above average salary increases for principals.

3. While all of the school districts in this study have established job descriptions for the principalship, more than half of the principals believe these descriptions are "not used at all." Indeed, two Superintendents corroborated this fact. However, six Superintendents utilize job descriptions for evaluation and accountability purposes. The fact that principals are not recognizing that job descriptions are not used for evaluation and accountability purposes points out that Superintendents utilize job descriptions surreptitiously. If components of the principal's job description are used as evaluation/accountability criteria, such should be clearly communicated.

4. Unlike laborers, hourly earners, clerical staff and the like, the literature suggests that management personnel be provided with job descriptions stated in terms of respon-

sibilities. Upon an examination of this study's data, less than half of the administrative pairs interviewed stated principals' job descriptions were totally comprised of responsibilities. Where responsibilities are used to formulate job descriptions, they can easily be shaped into management objectives for appraising performance. The utilization of job descriptions in this manner is readily supported by the literature. Where job descriptions reflect tasks and duties for example, appraisals are concerned with whether or not tasks and duties are being completed. In the case of school managers, appraisals should be concerned with more and broader issues than tasks and duties. Unfortunately, less than half of the principals' job descriptions are written only in terms of responsibilities. Therefore, there seems to be more interest in principals completing tasks and duties than developing responsibilities.

As alluded to previously, job descriptions within school districts have been described as static in the literature. Where job descriptions are written in terms of duties and tasks, which are changed infrequently, job descriptions are changed infrequently. On the other hand, where responsibilities comprise job descriptions they become working documents. Beyond the fact that responsibilities may be restated as management objectives, additionally, they are usually accomplished in degrees. In either case, it is necessary to reflect upon

and even change responsibilities periodically and, therefore, making job descriptions working documents.

5. The literature states job descriptions should be the foundation for which appraisals and salary determinations are made. Assuming management personnel are paid on the basis of performance, it is suggested that elements of job descriptions ultimately become compensable factors. Part of this study sought to determine the relationship which exists between job descriptions and evaluation systems and, additionally, job descriptions and salary determinations.

Research data gleaned from six Superintendents shows that job descriptions are directly used when evaluating principals. It is interesting to note only half of the principals associated with the above Superintendents are aware that their job descriptions are used in this manner. Therefore, in only three school districts can it be confirmed that job descriptions are used as criteria for evaluations. In the remaining seven school districts, it is reasonable to wonder what criteria are utilized to evaluate principals. This lack of awareness fosters much doubt about the purposes, effectiveness and credibility of principals' evaluation systems. For Boards of Education and Superintendents who wish to maintain an effective district management team, criteria utilized for principals' evaluations must be well established and effectively communicated. In the absence of this, acrimony, disenchantment and ominous perceptions of unfair treatment result. For some

principals, circumstances identified above could spawn a desire for associating with unions. At the very least, questions relative to evaluation criteria will have deleterious effects upon those who comprise the district's management team.

While conducting interviews, it was found that in some cases, the elements of job descriptions were used to formulate management goals which then become criteria for evaluations. Interestingly, Superintendents and principals who formulate management goals in this manner considered the principal's job description to be utilized "indirectly" when evaluating. This "indirect" utilization is particularly noteworthy in view of the strong support in the literature for evaluating managers through goals established from job descriptions. While principals allude to this manifestation as an "indirect" usage of job descriptions, the literature would indicate this is a "direct" usage. Perhaps principals use the term "indirect" because other forms of evaluations transcend management goals in importance as a means for evaluating principals. For example, where ten percent of a principal's evaluation is related to the accomplishment of management goals and the remaining ninety percent related to "traits and characteristics for the job," goals may be perceived as "indirectly" considered when principals are evaluated.

6. From interviews conducted, it is apparent job descriptions are insignificant when determining principals'

salaries. In eighty percent of the districts, Superintendents and principals could not affirm that job descriptions have ever been utilized to determine principals salaries. However, twenty percent of the districts indicated job descriptions are "indirectly" utilized to determine principals' salaries.

Where job descriptions were "directly" or "indirectly" utilized to determine principals' salary, administrators had much difficulty identifying just how this was being done. In most every case, the administrators noted that the accomplishment of job description elements were significant when pay increases were determined. Of all responses, the most substantive was that the junior high school principal's job description was utilized to award him with a higher salary. Other than utilizing job descriptions as a rationale for awarding higher salaries to junior high school principals, they are not utilized when determining principals' salaries.

7. The literature indicates that prior to utilizing job descriptions for evaluations or salary determinations, a mutual understanding of the elements of the job is essential. To effectively complete expectations Superintendents and Boards of Education possess for principals, there must be an agreement of the major tasks, functions and responsibilities to be fulfilled. Additionally, while all positions share common job elements, each possesses uniqueness. To ensure that both common and unique elements of the principal's position receive equitable treatment when evaluating and paying princi-

pals, a mutual agreement of job elements must be shared among Boards of Education, Superintendents and principals.

Data gathered from interviewing Superintendents and principals indicate that half of the school districts do not possess job descriptions for principals which are mutually agreed upon. In these school districts, the Superintendents formulated the principal's job description without consulting anyone. Such a practice can be criticized for being presumptuous. The propriety of formulating job descriptions without, at the very least, consulting those who have the job is highly questionable. Further, it presumes job elements delineated in descriptions are clearly understood by the person who is charged with the responsibility for the completion of the job. Unfortunately, where principals are not consulted and agreement of job elements are not pursued, vital elements may be misunderstood or absent from the established description.

In four of ten school districts incorporated within this study, principals' job descriptions were "mutually agreed upon." However in two of these districts, principals were asked to formulate a job description and, by the Superintendents' admission, the descriptions were accepted with only a cursory review. In such cases, the mutuality of agreement might better be considered agreement by default.

The data gathered regarding the mutual acceptance of principals' job descriptions illustrate that, for the most

part, the elements of the description are not mutually agreed upon.

2.2 Identify Criteria Utilized to Evaluate Principals

Performance evaluations are fundamental to meaningful decisions regarding salary determinations. Indeed, performance evaluations are most often found to precede salary determinations and shape the amount of the increase awarded. The literature states that the general welfare of the organization requires salary increases correspond with the results of fair and impartial performance evaluations. Therefore, among the most important aspects of evaluations is the determination of what is worthy of evaluating. It is the purpose of this section of the study to ascertain the criteria utilized when evaluating elementary school principals. Question number nine and the first part of question number eleven of the interview were proposed to Superintendents and principals to gather information relative to evaluation criteria. Question number nine asked: "What are the major purposes for evaluating principals?" This question was specifically proposed prior to the first part of question number eleven: "What are the specific criteria utilized to evaluate principals?" Question nine is proposed first to determine if the purposes for evaluating principals are reflected in the criteria. Namely, if principals are evaluated to determine salaries, does the criteria assist with salary determinations?

Presentation of the Data

The responses gathered from Superintendents and principals from within the study's ten school districts were analyzed to determine the purposes for which principals are evaluated. Table 13 illustrates the responses referenced on more than one occasion by either Superintendents or principals.

TABLE 13

FREQUENCY OF SUPERINTENDENTS' AND PRINCIPALS'
RESPONSES TO: WHAT ARE THE MAJOR PURPOSES FOR EVALUATING PRINCIPALS?

| Responses | Number of Responses | | |
|--|---------------------|------------|-------|
| | Superintendents | Principals | Pairs |
| To determine salaries | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| To determine continued employment | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| To improve the principal's instructional leadership skills | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| To assess the principal's relations with his staff | 0 | 2 | 0 |

From the responses indicated in Table 13, it is apparent the greatest amount of agreement regarding the purpose for evaluating principals is "to improve the principal's instructional leadership skills." In four school districts, this response was articulated by both the Superintendent and principal. It is worth noting that

Superintendents stated "to determine salaries" more frequently than any other response to this question. Oddly enough, only one principals corroborated this response. The response, "to determine continued employment" was mentioned by Superintendents on four occasions but stated by principals on only two. It may be assumed that in two school districts evaluations are utilized "to determine continued employment" since both the Superintendents and principals provided this response.

Table 14 attempts to display the various responses Superintendents and principals indicated when asked: "What are the specific criteria utilized to evaluate principals?"

TABLE 14

FREQUENCY OF SUPERINTENDENTS' AND PRINCIPALS'
RESPONSES TO: WHAT ARE THE SPECIFIC CRITERIA
UTILIZED TO EVALUATE PRINCIPALS?

| Responses | Number of Responses | | |
|---|---------------------|------------|-------|
| | Superintendents | Principals | Pairs |
| Mutually developed goals and objectives | 8 | 6 | 6 |
| Management of Staff | 6 | 5 | 4 |
| Educational environment for students | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Management of plant | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Loyalty | 1 | 7 | 1 |
| Public relations | 2 | 6 | 1 |
| Willingness to assume additional responsibilities | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Staff supervision | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| Comments from school board members | 0 | 3 | 0 |

Of the various questions comprising the structured interview, the greatest number of responses resulted from this question. It is interesting that only nine of twenty-five responses were identified by more than one interviewee. An examination of the responses shows "mutually developed goals and objectives" was mentioned by Superintendents and principals more frequently than any other response. Indeed, eight Superintendents, six principals and six pairs of administrators identified "goals and objectives" as criteria for evaluating principals.

Of the remaining responses, only "management of staff," which was articulated by six Superintendents, five principals and four pairs of administrators was corroborated on more than one occasion.

It is particularly interesting that "loyalty," "public relations" and "willingness to assume additional responsibilities" were responses frequently mentioned by principals but rarely mentioned by Superintendents. Specifically, these three responses were mentioned eighteen times by principals as compared to three times by Superintendents.

Analysis of the Data:

Secondary Purpose 2.2 endeavors to ascertain the purposes for and criteria utilized when evaluating principals. After a review of data as presented, the following can be established:

1. Of the responses given when asked about purposes for evaluating principals, "to improve the principal's instructional

leadership skills" was most frequently stated. This response was predictable in view of the fact in Purpose 2.1, Superintendents and principals regarded "instructional leadership" as the most important aspect of the principalship. As alluded to previously, school administrators have a penchant for the response "instructional leader" which is thought to be akin to looking after the best interests of the children. In so doing, the administrator is vicariously acting as master-teacher, parent and the like. School patrons expect principals to direct the educational program and where job descriptions and evaluation systems are explored, automatically the terms "principal" and "educational leader" become synonymous. When Superintendents and principals identify "to improve the principal's instructional leadership skills" as a purpose for evaluating principals, implicit is the message children's social and intellectual growth are highly regarded. Whether this fact is true or not makes little difference. In terms of maintaining and enhancing good public relations, this response is most appropriate.

2. Fifty percent of the Superintendents in this study stated that a purpose for evaluating principals is "to determine salaries." It is interesting, however, that only one principal realized he was being evaluated, in part, to determine his salary. Upon interviewing the principals in this study, there is little question they possess more than a modicum of interest in salaries. Therefore, the fact that only one of

ten principals identified "to determine salaries" as a purpose for evaluating principals indicates little recognized correspondence between evaluations and salary determinations.

3. In two school districts, principals have either been released as a result of evaluations or there is an understanding that evaluations are used "to determine continued employment." The research data point out four Superintendents, two principals and two pairs of Superintendents and principals believe evaluations are used to decide whether or not principals are maintained or replaced.

4. Performance objectives, especially when mutually developed and accepted, can lead to increased commitments to the job. This fact is clearly born out in the literature. From the results of the structured interview, it is apparent more than half of the school districts in this study utilize "mutually developed goals and objectives" as criteria for evaluating principals. Management objectives, which are comprised of "mutually developed goals and objectives," can be quite useful to both the organization and individual. The literature provides a litany of positive outcomes which result from management objectives. For Superintendents and principals, it is worthwhile being aware that "mutually developed goals and objectives" may, in effect, alter the focus of evaluations from strictly on people to processes and outcomes where people are actively involved. The residual effect of such an alteration is increased personal commitment from principals.

Where "mutually developed goals and objectives" are in existence, school districts may focus attention away from subjective ratings of job characteristics and traits and, instead, center attention on what principals and school districts would like to accomplish. The literature presents evidence that employees accomplish more when they find meaning in what they are doing as well as what the organization is doing. Where principals' evaluation systems have failed, such has been attributed to an emphasis on personalities rather than results.

5. Six Superintendents, five principals and four administrative pairs indicated "management of staff" was a criterion for evaluating principals. Since "management of staff" is rather broad and less than precise in meaning, administrators were asked to define the phrase. It is interesting that in all instances, "management of staff" was defined as a euphemism for maintaining peace and tranquility with and among the teachers. For those who are responsible for administering school districts, maintaining harmonious feelings among staff and, in particular, between the staff and administration is vitally important. Therefore, next to "mutually developed goals and objectives," administrators recognize maintaining peace and tranquility is an important criterion for principals' evaluations. Only "mutually accepted goals and objectives" was confirmed as a criterion for evaluations in more than half of the school districts. With twenty-four of twenty-five responses

confirmed in less than fifty percent of the school districts, it can be concluded there is little agreement on criteria to evaluate principals. What Superintendents have identified as evaluation criteria, principals have not. Conversely, what principals have recognized as evaluation criteria, Superintendents have not. The literature points out that one of the shortcomings within the realm of performance evaluations is a lack of understanding of assessment criteria. Particularly, when salary determinations are established from evaluations, a misunderstanding of criteria can result in principals feeling frustrated, uncommitted to the school district and contemptuous toward the Superintendent and Board of Education.

7. Seventy percent of the principals and ten percent of the Superintendents perceived "loyalty" as a criterion for evaluating principals. Without question, "loyalty" to the Superintendent is "a given." To a large degree, this is why only one of the ten Superintendents interviewed identified "loyalty" as a criterion. However, where Superintendents find principals are not loyal, such is reflected, in one way or another, in the principal's evaluation. Principals are quite sensitive to this point and, therefore, endeavor to appear loyal to their Superintendents.

8. Only three principals of the ten interviewed did not identify "public relations" as a criterion for their evaluation. Of all the responses stated, principals indicated

"public relations" more than any other. From associated conversations, it was apparent that principals perceive Superintendents to be particularly interested in whatever measures principals can take to maintain and enhance the public's image of the school system. Where principals are concerned, an eye to public relations is imperative.

9. An examination of the data shows that principals are quite unaware of criteria used for their evaluations. This lack of awareness is demonstrated by half of the principals identifying "willingness to assume additional responsibilities" as a criterion while not one Superintendent corroborated this response. Since the principals interviewed have been evaluated by the Superintendents participating in this study, it is astonishing that half of the principals believe a particular criterion is used for evaluation purposes while not one of the Superintendents indicated this was true.

10. For those who believe the improvement of classroom instruction is an important aspect of the principalship, such is not indicated when considering criteria for evaluating principals. Normally, employees are evaluated on major job elements. If "staff supervision," which incorporates the improvement of teaching performance, is an important aspect of the principalship, one might find it unusual that in only one of ten school districts is "staff supervision" a criterion

for evaluating principals. The fact that only one Superintendent and four principals indicated "staff supervision" is a criterion for evaluations indicates improving staff performance is not regarded as an important aspect of the principalship when evaluating performance. By comparison, maintaining positive relations with staff is far more important than improving staff skills.

11. Three principals interviewed were convinced Superintendents were particularly influenced by "comments from School Board Members." When interviewing Superintendents, not one corroborated this response. Indeed, the Superintendents wished to leave an impression that several groups provided indirect contributions for the principal's evaluation but, in the final analysis, it was the Superintendent's impressions which were of the greatest importance. It is significant, however, that three principals believe their Superintendents suppress their impressions in favor of those of School Board Members in many instances.

2.3 Identify and Analyze the Procedures Utilized to Evaluate Principals

The following passages endeavor to establish the procedures utilized to evaluate elementary school principals in Lake County, Illinois. To gather relevant information for a comprehensive investigation of this topic, questions number

four and five were included in the Superintendent's Questionnaire. Additionally, the structured interview included two questions, numbers seven and eleven, which were intended to embellish the information gathered from the Superintendents' Questionnaire.

Presentation of the Data

Question number four on the Superintendents' Questionnaire asked: "Are principals formally evaluated at least annually?" In each of the questionnaires returned, Superintendents indicated principals were formally evaluated annually.

Question number five on the Questionnaire asked: "If principals are formally evaluated, how would you describe the system utilized: Management by Objectives; Checklist; Rating Scale; Essay or Narrative; Other (please explain)." Responses to question number five appear in Table 15.

TABLE 15

FREQUENCY OF SUPERINTENDENTS' RESPONSES TO:
HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE THE PRINCIPALS'
EVALUATION SYSTEM?

| Responses | Number of Responses |
|--------------------------|---------------------|
| Management by Objectives | 5 |
| Checklist | 2 |
| Rating Scale | 2 |
| Essay or Narrative | 4 |
| Other | 0 |

Three Superintendents participating in the study indicated their principals were evaluated through a combination of systems. It is apparent, "management by objectives" and "essay or narrative" forms of evaluations are among the most widely used. "Checklists" and "rating scales" are not particularly popular with Superintendents. It is interesting the Superintendents' did not indicate a preference for conducting principals' evaluations beyond the four systems delineated in the questionnaire.

Interview question number seven asked Superintendents and principals, "How frequently are principals formally evaluated? Informally evaluated?" As other questions which comprise the interview, question number seven had two distinct parts. The first part of the question was proposed to find out if principals were appraised more frequently than one time each year. The second part of the question sought to ascertain the frequency of informal evaluations.

A review of the responses to the first part of question number seven shows eight pairs of Superintendents and principals responded that principals' are formally evaluated "annually." In addition, two pairs of administrators stated principals were evaluated "twice yearly." Responses to the second part of question number seven can be found in Table 16.

TABLE 16

FREQUENCY OF SUPERINTENDENTS' AND PRINCIPALS'
 RESPONSES TO: HOW OFTEN ARE PRINCIPALS
 INFORMALLY EVALUATED?

| Responses | Number of Responses | | |
|-----------|---------------------|------------|-------|
| | Superintendents | Principals | Pairs |
| Daily | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| Weekly | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Never | 1 | 2 | 0 |

Upon a perusal of Table 16, it is clear that principals are evaluated on an informal basis regularly. In seventy per cent of the school districts participating in this study, administrators agree that principals are informally evaluated either daily or weekly.

Interview question number eleven probes further into procedures utilized to evaluate principals and asked: "Are principals evaluated on their performance in accomplishing goals established by the Board of Education? By the Superintendent? By themselves?"

Interestingly, while only three Superintendents stated principals are evaluated on their performance in accomplishing goals established by the Board of Education, seven principals felt they were. A greater amount of agreement was found with respect to accomplishing goals established by Super-

intendents and by principals themselves. In terms of Superintendents goals, all but one Superintendent indicated principals were evaluated on goals established by the Superintendent. This fact was confirmed by each of the principals interviewed. Where principals' goals are concerned, five Superintendents and five principals stated that principals were evaluated on self-developed goals.

Analysis of the Data

1. The data indicates that principals are most often evaluated annually through management by objective systems. It is significant, however, that annual evaluations and management by objectives systems may be counter productive. Annual evaluations are most often a precursor to considerations of continued employment. Typically conducted prior to the end of the school year, annual evaluations are frequently summative in nature. On the other hand, management by objectives, where used as a means for evaluations, are usually formative in nature and reviewed periodically. The system dictates that as objectives are accomplished, new ones are established. Management by objectives systems which end at the conclusion of the school year do so by coincidence. Therefore, one might have serious questions about management by objectives systems utilized to evaluate principals in this study.

2. The fact that Superintendents use checklists and rating scales for evaluating principals is most disconcerting. Indeed, the literature points out these evaluative tools are typically used to assess traits and characteristics of the principalship. Most often of a highly subjective nature, assessing traits and characteristics is considered less effective than many other evaluated tools in improving administrative effectiveness.

3. The literature indicates that goal setting systems, or more precisely, management by objectives systems are most effective when evaluating management personnel. Particularly when evaluations impact directly upon salary determinations, management by objectives have definite advantages. Prior to establishing management goals, the literature suggests that organizational goals be formulated. Upon such a formulation, management goals should be created to contribute, at least in part, to the realization of the organization's goals. While individual goals are important, they must not conflict with organizational goals.

When asked if principals are evaluated on Board of Education established goals, only three Superintendents answered in the affirmative. If management by objectives systems were truly the manner in which principals were being evaluated as many Superintendents indicated, then Board of Education goals should become much more important. Where principals'

goals do not contribute to the accomplishment of Board goals, at the very least, School Board Members may be quite critical of the Superintendent's organizational priorities.

The vast majority of principals believe they are being evaluated on goals established by the Board of Education. Obviously, they are misinformed as the research data points out that this perception is unfounded.

4. Administrative responses to the creation of management goals and objects points out that both Superintendents and principals formulate goals which ultimately have a bearing upon the principals' evaluation. Fifty percent of the Superintendents and principals indicated principals' goals have an impact upon evaluations. This practice is well supported in the literature. At least to the extent that principals are formulating goals, they are participating in their evaluation system. Most often, heightened commitments and higher morale are found when managers feel they are involved in their own appraisals. In terms of appraisals, a delicate balance exists between involvement and credibility.

2.4 Determine the Extent of Principal Participation in His Own Evaluation

Among the purposes of this study is to establish the extent of principal participation in the formulation of his own evaluation. As a part of purpose 2.3, it was found

that principals do, in fact, play a role in their evaluations. The following will explore the significance of this role as well as the actual extent of involvement principals have in the evaluation process. To fulfill the purpose noted above, the second and third parts of question eight and question number nine of the structured interview were asked of the administrators in this study.

Presentation of the Data

The second and third parts of question number eight asked Superintendents and principals to "identify how evaluation criteria are measured and by whom." While eight of the ten Superintendents indicated evaluation criteria were subjectively measured by themselves, each of the principals corroborated this response. Other responses stated by Superintendents included "objectively measured goals and objectives" and "point scales" as other means for measuring principals' evaluation criteria. However, the data illustrate that principals are clearly unaware of "objectively measured goals and objectives" or "point scales" as a means for measuring criteria.

Interview question number nine asked Superintendents and principals: "What are the specific procedures utilized to evaluate principals" Table 17 illustrates the responses provided question number nine.

TABLE 17

FREQUENCY OF SUPERINTENDENTS' AND PRINCIPALS'
RESPONSES TO: WHAT ARE THE SPECIFIC PROCEDURES
UTILIZED TO EVALUATE PRINCIPALS?

| Responses | Number of Responses | | |
|--|---------------------|------------|-------|
| | Superintendents | Principals | Pairs |
| Goals Written by the Principal and Evaluated by the Superintendent | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| Goals Written by the Principal and Evaluated by the Superintendent and Principal | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Superintendent Writes a Narrative With Principal's Input | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Superintendent Writes a Narrative | 0 | 3 | 0 |

After a review of the responses administrators provided to the question, "what are the specific procedures utilized to evaluate principals?" it is evident that the administrators agree that principals write goals which are either evaluated by Superintendents unilaterally or with principals participating. Further, three Superintendents indicated they "write narratives with principals' input," while three principals stated their input is never sought.

Analysis of the Data

1. From the data presented, it is apparent that principals are evaluated by Superintendents in a subjective manner.

While some Superintendents endeavor to "smokescreen" this fact, principals readily admit their evaluations are products of Superintendents' subjectivity. Indeed, while the thoughts and opinions of others may have an impact on a principal's evaluation, there is no mistaking that the Superintendent's views are of maximum importance.

When speaking with principals about the subjective nature of their evaluations it was interesting to note they had few misgivings about this. Almost all of the principals perceived their evaluations to be fair and were supportive of their Superintendents. Perhaps the lesson to be learned is that subjective evaluations will be supported by subordinates if such evaluations are regarded as fair.

Additionally, principals recognize that the manner in which they have been evaluated has undergone little change and therefore, they have to come to accept the system as "the way it is."

2. The principal's role in the formulation of his own evaluation ranges from writing goals and providing input into the assessment process to no role at all. Without question, the Superintendent has the major role in evaluating principals. As long as the Board of Education and community are reasonably satisfied with the educational product, Superintendents may find it easy to continue evaluating principals subjectively. However, if this satisfaction wanes, Superintendents will

ultimately be held responsible for perceived problems with the educational program and building principal. Perhaps more objective forms of evaluations which focus upon the improvement of the principal's performance will diminish the Superintendent's culpability in this regard.

2.5 Identify and Analyze Specific Criteria Which Are Most Important in Determining Principals' Salaries

This section of the study endeavors to identify and analyze the specific criteria utilized to determine elementary principals' salaries. The first part of question number eight asked Superintendents and principals: "What are the most important criteria considered when determining principals' salaries?" In addition, question number two on the Superintendents' Questionnaire was proposed to ascertain if the criteria for determining salaries interfaces with the methods utilized to determine salaries. Question number two asked Superintendents: "Select from the list the method or methods utilized to determine principals salaries." The list included: (a) Principals' Salary Schedule; (b) Merit; (c) Individually Negotiated; (d) Other (please specify).

Presentation of the Data

After interviewing Superintendents and principals to ascertain criteria which are most important to principals' salary determinations it was significant that a great number

of different responses were rendered. Beyond those which were stated by Superintendents and principals on only one occasion, the remaining responses are presented in Table 18.

TABLE 18

FREQUENCY OF SUPERINTENDENTS' AND PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES TO: WHAT ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT CRITERIA CONSIDERED WHEN DETERMINING PRINCIPALS' SALARIES?

| Responses | Number of Responses | | |
|---|---------------------|------------|-------|
| | Superintendents | Principals | Pairs |
| Salaries paid principals in other districts with comparable school enrollments and responsibilities | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| Results of Evaluations | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Achievement of Goals | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Public Relations | 3 | 7 | 3 |
| Staff Relations | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| Instructional Leadership | 3 | 6 | 3 |
| Daily operation of the building | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Amount of money available for principals' salary increases | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Don't know | 0 | 2 | 0 |

Data presented in Table 18 shows seven Superintendents consider "salaries paid principals in other districts with comparable school enrollments and responsibilities" when determining pay. Only one principal corroborated what his superior stated in this regard. Other responses by Superintendents were stated by less than half of those who were interviewed. Principals regarded "public relations," "instructional leadership" and "amount of money available for

principals' salary increases" as the most important factors considered when determining principal salaries. In each of the above responses, less than half of the Superintendents shared the principals' perceptions. It is significant twenty percent of the principals interviewed stated they "don't know" the most important criteria considered when their salaries are established.

Question number two in the Superintendents' Questionnaire was proposed to establish whether or not the criteria considered corresponds with the methods used to determine principals' salaries. Question number two asked Superintendents to "select the method or methods utilized to determine principals salaries." Responses are reflected in Table 19.

TABLE 19

FREQUENCY OF SUPERINTENDENTS'
RESPONSES TO METHOD UTILIZED TO
DETERMINE PRINCIPALS' SALARIES

| Responses | Number of Responses |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| Merit | 6 |
| Individually Negotiated | 1 |
| Principals' Salary Schedule | 0 |
| Others: | |
| Going Rate | 7 |
| Board Established | 1 |

The responses gleaned from Superintendents regarding question number two shows in most school districts, the method used to determine principals' salaries is through a determination of the "going rate." Stated in other terms, school districts endeavor to find what other districts are paying principals and then determine how much they wish to pay their principals. The second most frequently identified response to question number two was "merit."

Analysis of the Data

1. Superintendents are quite conscious of "going rates" when paying principals. Comparisons of pay provided those who occupy similar positions are supported throughout the literature. From interviewing Superintendents, it is apparent that each wishes to pay his principals a "fair" salary. A "fair" salary is one which would fall within the middle of the salary range for principals. The only exception to this concept was detected in an affluent school district where the Superintendent wanted administrative salaries to be among the highest paid within Lake County, Illinois. This particular Superintendent indicated his community was composed of "high rollers" and, therefore, used to seeing "big numbers" in terms of salaries. It is apparent, at least in this school district, that salaries paid principals are positively affected by the socio-economic level of the community.

2. It is particularly significant that only four Superintendents of ten stated the "results of evaluations" were con-

sidered when determining salaries. The mere fact that sixty percent of the Superintendents did not provide this response points out the lack of correspondence between evaluations and salaries. What is even more telling is not one principal indicated "results of evaluations" impacted upon salaries. It is worth noting that the literature presents substantial evidence that there is a direct relationship between evaluations and salaries in the corporate sector and, further, there should be such a relationship. In this case, salary practices in education do not coincide with suggested salary practices in the literature.

3. While some Superintendents concede "public relations" is considered when determining principals' salaries, the majority of principals believe it is considered to a great degree. Principals understand that the public's image of their schools and of themselves is most important to Superintendents. If the school is held in high regard and the Superintendent does not receive negative phone calls about the principal, higher salary increases may be awarded. For principals, "public relations" is considered the most important criterion considered when establishing their salaries.

4. While "instructional leadership" and "staff relations" are important criteria when determining salaries, so is "amount of money available for principals' salary increases." Half the principals felt that their salaries were directly influenced by how much money the school district

could afford to pay after the teachers and Superintendents received their salary increases. The propriety of paying principals what is "left over" is highly questionable and can be predicted to spawn, over a period of time, unhappy principals.

Major Purpose Three - Determine The Most
Important Factors Considered
When Determining Principals' Salaries

The third purpose of this study is to determine the most important factors considered when determining principals' salaries. Secondary purposes which will serve to address the major purpose include:

- 3.1 Identify and analyze factors Superintendents consider most important when determining principals' salaries.
- 3.2 Identify and analyze factors principals consider most important when determining principals' salaries.
- 3.3 Compare and contrast Superintendents' and principals' responses.

The following section of Chapter IV attempts to establish the most important factors considered when determining elementary principals' salaries as indicated by Superintendents and principals. Further, this section will compare and contrast responses from Superintendents and principals relative to this topic.

Research data presented in Major Purpose Three were taken from responses to the structured interview which was administered to Superintendents and principals. Secondary purposes for Major Purpose Three will appear as subsections to facilitate the orderly presentation of research data in a systematic manner.

3.1 Identify and Analyze Factors Superintendents Consider Most Important When Determining Principals' Salaries.

This section of the study endeavors to identify and analyze the most important considerations when determining principals salaries. To identify factors considered by Superintendents when determining principals' salaries, eight questions from the interview were proposed. The following is a presentation of the research data:

Presentation of the Data

Question number twelve probes the relationship between the results of evaluations and salary determinations. The literature states that prior to meaningful salary determinations, a comprehensive assessment of one's performance should take place. Where managers, in particular, are found to be effective in accomplishing job responsibilities, salary determinations should reflect the manager's effectiveness. The higher the quality of managerial performance, the higher the salary. Question number twelve has two parts and attempts to determine the relationship between the results of evalua-

tions and salary determinations: "What percentage of a principal's salary is determined by the results of evaluations?" and "Specifically how are the results of a principal's evaluation converted into salary?"

The responses that Superintendents provided for the first part of question number twelve were quite varied. While six Superintendents stated "one-hundred percent" of principals' salaries are determined by the results of evaluation, the following responses were stated on only one occasion: "ninety percent," "eighty percent," "fifty percent," and "zero."

When asked "how are the results of evaluations converted into salary determinations?" Superintendents provided the responses shown in Table 20.

TABLE 20

SUPERINTENDENTS' RESPONSES TO:
HOW ARE THE RESULTS OF PRINCIPALS'
EVALUATIONS CONVERTED INTO SALARY DETERMINATIONS?

| Responses | Frequency of Responses |
|--|------------------------|
| How much other like districts are paying principals. | 5 |
| Subjectively by the Superintendent. | 2 |
| The ability of the district to pay. | 1 |
| By a point system. | 1 |
| By tenure and degree earned. | 1 |

An examination of responses shows half of the Superintendents compare evaluation results with "how much other like districts are paying principals." Beyond this response, two Superintendents stated evaluation results were converted "subjectively by the Superintendent," while the remaining responses were mentioned on only one occasion.

Question number fourteen asked Superintendents to specifically identify "which of the principals tasks, duties and functions (identified in the preceding question, number thirteen) are considered when evaluating principals?" and "when determining principals' salaries?" This question was proposed to determine the correspondence between assessed effectiveness in tasks, duties and functions and pay for principals.

The results of proposing question number fourteen are graphically illustrated in Table 21.

TABLE 21
SUPERINTENDENT RESPONSES TO:
TASKS, DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS
CONSIDERED WHEN EVALUATING
AND PAYING PRINCIPALS

| Responses | Frequency of Responses | |
|--|------------------------|--------|
| | Evaluating | Paying |
| Providing Leadership for the Instructional Program | 7 | 7 |
| Completing School Administrative Activities | 4 | 4 |
| Conducting Public Relations Activities | 4 | 5 |
| Supervising Teachers | 3 | 5 |
| Facilitating Positive Staff Morale | 2 | 0 |

Table 21 illustrates that Superintendents consider "providing leadership for the educational program" the most important of all tasks, duties or functions when evaluating and paying elementary principals. While "completing school administrative activities" and "conducting public relations activities" were significant for both evaluation and pay considerations, it is interesting that "supervising teachers" is relatively unimportant to the evaluation process but moderately important when determining salary increases.

The literature provides evidence that an effective manner of recognizing and rewarding superior performances is through cash bonuses. Frequently provided for private sector employees, bonuses represent an award given on one occasion and not reflected in a salary commitment paid throughout an employee's tenure on the job. Interview question number fifteen attempted to ascertain if school districts have rewarded superior performances in a similar manner as corporations and asked: "Have principals in your school district been granted bonuses in the past five years? If so, how frequently has this occurred? For what purposes have bonuses been awarded?"

When asked the first part of question number fifteen each of the Superintendents indicated, "NO." Since school districts were not in the practice of granting bonuses, the remaining parts of question number eighteen were not asked.

As indicated previously, the literature supports paying for performance. Upon an examination of books, period-

icals and the like, within the realm of compensation, it is suggested that pay for anything other than performance be avoided. Question number sixteen attempts to find out whether or not school districts pay principals an amount thought to be commensurate with their performance. Question number sixteen asks: "Should principals be paid solely on the basis of performance? If not, what other factors should be considered when determining principals' salaries? From the factors (you) identified, which are the most important when determining principals salaries?" While half of the Superintendents interviewed indicated principals should be paid solely on the basis of performance, half indicated they should be paid on performance as well as "other factors." These "other factors" which are considered most important when determining principals' salaries are presented in Table 22.

TABLE 22

SUPERINTENDENTS' RESPONSES TO:
OTHER FACTORS WHICH ARE MOST IMPORTANT
WHEN DETERMINING PRINCIPALS' SALARIES

| Responses | Frequency of Responses |
|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Tenure in position | 3 |
| Educational preparation | 1 |
| Going rate for principals | 4 |
| Loyalty | 2 |

To five Superintendents who indicated that factors beyond performance were important when determining principals' salaries, three stated "tenure in the position" and "going rate for principals" were also factors. Additionally, "loyalty" was stated twice and "educational preparation" once as important factors for principals' pay.

In an effort to establish additional information relative to important factors which are considered when determining principals' salaries, question number seventeen was asked of Superintendents: "In this school district, are principals' salaries related or connected to teachers' salaries in any way, shape or form? Related to the Superintendent's salary? Other Superintendent's salaries? Central Office Administrators' salaries? Other professionals' salaries? If so, to what degree are salaries related to the individual or group identified?"

Responses to question number seventeen were the same in every instance. Superintendents stated that there was no direct relationship between salaries paid teachers, Superintendents, central office administrators and other professionals and salaries paid principals. However, on various occasions, Superintendents confirmed that salaries paid to some of these professionals had an indirect influence upon how much principals were paid. Specifically, eight of ten Superintendents stated that the percent of the overall increase provided teachers is most often used as a gauge for the percent of the overall increase provided principals. Also, four Superintendents indicated that the principals, as a group, always receive a higher per-

centage salary increase than they do. Therefore, salaries paid teachers and Superintendents have an indirect influence upon what is paid to principals.

Private sector organizations often establish salary ranges for all positions. These ranges are tantamount to a range of importance to the organization. Positions which are of lesser importance have lesser pay ranges than positions of greater importance. The literature suggests that pay ranges are determined after a comprehensive job evaluation and analysis have been conducted. The establishment of pay ranges through job evaluations and analysis is presented as important within the literature. Even in public sector organizations, such as schools, the literature supports the establishment of pay ranges for salary determinations. Question number nineteen asked administrators: "Does the school district possess an established pay range for the position of principal? If so, how was this pay range placed together? How are principals' salaries determined from within the pay range?"

When presented with this question, each of the ten Superintendents interviewed in this study indicated that their school districts did not possess an established pay range for the principalship.

Analysis of the Data

1. From an analysis of the responses regarding the percentage of principals' salaries determined from the results of evaluations, Superintendents indicate that a high

percent of salary determinations are made from evaluation results. Only one Superintendent of ten indicated less than fifty percent of salary determinations are determined from the results of evaluations. However, Superintendents found considerable difficulty answering how evaluation results are converted into salaries. Of six responses, only "by a point system" can be considered an objective method for converting evaluation results into salaries. Interestingly, only one Superintendent provided this response. Thus, ninety percent of Superintendents converted evaluation results into salary determinations subjectively. It is worth noting that two responses are not even relevant: "the ability of the district to pay" and "by tenure and degree earned." In both cases, the responses show no relationship between evaluation results and salary determinations.

Of the various questions proposed, Superintendents had the greatest difficulty answering how evaluation results are converted into pay. Without question, this topic was a sensitive one. Superintendents were reluctant to state that the results of evaluations were being converted into salary determinations subjectively after stating quite adamantly that evaluations significantly impacted upon principals' pay. In effect, Superintendents had difficulty making a strong case for "paying for performance" on one hand and yet, being unable to establish pay objectively from performance evaluations.

Ideally, organizations should have sufficient funds to provide substantial increases for exemplary employees. However, in four school districts, no matter how extraordinarily well a principal performs, his salary will be influenced by what principals are being paid in other school districts.

2. When comparing responses to tasks, duties and functions considered when evaluating and paying principals, it is interesting to note "providing leadership for the instructional program," "completing school administrative activities" and "conducting public relations activities" are significant when evaluating and paying principals. Principals wishing to receive positive evaluations and better than average salary increases should remain particularly sensitive to their performance when conducting instructional activities, completing administrative tasks and facilitating positive public relations. Beyond other considerations, these three are most significant when Superintendents consider evaluations and salary.

3. It is clear Superintendents believe principals should be paid for performance. While bonuses have not been utilized as a means for stimulating extraordinary performances, salaries have been awarded on this basis. Each of the Superintendents interviewed favored paying principals more money on the basis of performance. While half of the Superintendents stated that principals should be paid solely on per-

formance, half thought that "tenure," "educational preparation," "going rates for principals" and "loyalty" should be considered. While the literature supports the paying of "going rates" for given positions, it does not support paying for tenure, educational preparation or loyalty. Indeed, the literature indicates that Superintendents endeavor to avoid paying on the basis of performance because they do not wish to be held responsible for defending it. From the responses gleaned from Superintendents in this study, at least half do not wish to be culpable for "merit," or, "pay for performance" systems.

4. While principals' salaries are not directly related to salaries paid teachers, Superintendents, Central Office Administrators or other professionals, Superintendents provided evidence that there exists an indirect relationship between teachers and principals' salaries.

In almost every case, Superintendents confirmed that the total percentage of the salary increase granted teachers impacted upon the total percentage increase granted principals. To Superintendents, overall percentage increases paid teachers and principals must be similar. While in given years, one group may receive a higher percentage than the other, over a period of time, these percentages must be comparable. The cause for this view may be political. The Superintendent realizes that increases which are not regarded as comparable may cause an invidious state of affairs. Where principals are paid considerably more than teachers, union negotiators

may hold out longer to satisfy the membership that they have negotiated for "all they can get." Conversely, where teachers are paid a substantially higher percentage increase, principals may lose respect for the Superintendent and Board of Education perceiving an acquiescence to union demands. Such a circumstance could arouse principals and perhaps stimulate the formulation of administrative unions to bargain for principals' salaries. In either case, the Superintendent is faced with potential unrest from either teachers or principals. Clearly, the easiest way to avoid such problems is to pay both groups similar overall percentage increases in salary.

3.2 Identify and Analyze Factors Principals Consider Most Important When Determining Principals' Salaries.

This section of the study attempts to identify and analyze the most important considerations when determining principals salaries. Section 3.2 attempts to elicit principal responses to the same interview questions proposed to Superintendents in Section 3.1. The following is a presentation of the research data.

Presentation of the Data:

As indicated previously, the literature presents compelling evidence that there should be a positive relationship between the results of evaluations and salary determinations.

Question number twelve asks principals: "What percentage of a principal's salary is determined by the results of evaluations?" and "Specifically, how are the results of the principal's evaluation converted into salary?"

The responses that principals provided for the first part of question number twelve varied from two principals stating "one-hundred percent" of their salaries were determined by the results of evaluations to five principals stating that there is "no relationship" between their salaries and evaluations. Additionally, two principals indicated that they had "no idea" if there was a relationship between evaluations and pay while one principal stated that "twenty percent" of his salary was determined by his evaluation.

Principal responses to "how are the results of evaluations converted into salaries," are graphically presented in Table 23.

TABLE 23

PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES TO: HOW ARE
THE RESULTS OF PRINCIPALS' EVALUATIONS
CONVERTED INTO SALARY DETERMINATIONS?

| Responses | Frequency of Responses |
|---|------------------------|
| Subjectively by the Superintendent | 2 |
| How much other like districts are paying principals | 2 |
| Don't know | 1 |

Upon a review of Table 23, it can be observed that only five principals responded to the second part of question number twelve. Where principals stated that there was "no relationship" between evaluations and salary, the second part of question number twelve was not proposed.

When asked how evaluation results are converted into salaries, two principals indicated that "subjectively by the Superintendent," two indicated they "don't know" and one indicated that it depended upon "how much other like districts are paying principals."

To establish the correspondence between the accomplishment of tasks, duties and functions and principals' evaluations and salaries, question number fourteen was asked of principals: "Which of the principals' tasks, duties and functions are considered when evaluating principals?" and "When determining principals' salaries?"

The responses principals provided question number fourteen are illustrated in Table 24.

TABLE 24

PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES TO: TASKS, DUTIES
AND FUNCTIONS CONSIDERED WHEN EVALUATING AND
PAYING PRINCIPALS

| Responses | Frequency of Responses | |
|--|------------------------|--------|
| | Evaluating | Paying |
| Conducting Public Relations Activities | 4 | 6 |
| Completing school Administrative Activities | 4 | 3 |
| Providing Leadership for the Instructional Program | 3 | 5 |
| Supervising Teachers | 2 | 0 |
| Completing Central Office Responsibilities | 0 | 3 |

Table 24 points out "conducting public relations activities" is considered by principals to be the most important task, duty or function when evaluating and paying principals. Other important tasks, duties or functions principals identified were "completing school administrative activities" and "providing leadership for the instructional program."

To establish if school districts have emulated the corporate practice of awarding superior achievements with bonuses, question number fifteen asked principals: "Have principals in your school district been granted bonuses in the past five years? If so, how frequently has this occurred? For what purposes have bonuses been awarded?"

When asked the first part of question number eighteen, each of the ten principals interviewed indicated that bonuses have never been awarded in their school districts. The remaining parts of the question were, therefore, not asked.

Question number sixteen was asked of principals to determine the relationship between pay and performance. Question number sixteen asked: "Should principals be paid solely on the basis of performance? If not, what other factors should be considered when determining principals' salaries? From the factors (you) identified, which are the most important when determining principals' salaries?"

While eight of the ten principals indicated they should be paid on the basis of performance, two stated, in addition to performance, other factors to consider included "building size" and "responsibilities associated with difficult students, staffs or communities." It is significant, that neither of the principals who identified considerations beyond performance felt that his considerations were important when determining his salaries.

To determine whether principals salaries are related to those of others, principals were asked to respond to question number seventeen: "In this school district, are principals' salaries related or connected to teachers' salaries in any way, shape or form? Related to the Superintendent's

salary? Other Superintendents' salaries? Central Office? Administrators' salaries? Other professionals' salaries?"

While principals were evenly divided regarding the relationship, or connection, between principals' and teachers' salaries, they indicated there was no relationship, or connection, between their salaries and those of Superintendents, Central Office Administrators or other professionals.

As alluded to previously, the literature supports the establishment of pay ranges for all positions within organizations. Question number nineteen asked principals: "Does the school district possess an established pay range for the position of principal? If so, how was this pay range placed together? How are principals' salaries determined from within the pay range?"

The principals unanimously indicated that their school districts did not possess a pay range for the principalship.

Analysis of the Data:

1. From responses gleaned during interview sessions, it is clear that the majority of principals in this study see little or no relationship between the results of their evaluations and salaries they are awarded. With only two principals indicating that "one-hundred percent" of the results of their evaluations were used for salary determinations, it is clear that in most of the school districts comprising this study, evaluations may be used for purposes other than paying principals.

It is interesting, that in three school districts where evaluation results are used for salary determinations, principals were unaware of the process used to convert evaluations to salary. However, these principals were aware that those who received more positive evaluations also received higher salaries. Additionally, two principals knew that their Superintendents subjectively established salaries from what was delineated in their evaluations. Upon further probing, it was found that these principals felt that their Superintendents has decided on their pay prior to actually writing evaluations. Therefore, in these cases, salaries were used as a justification or rationale for evaluations. Most often, evaluations serve as a justification or rationale for salaries.

2. The most important task, duty or function considered when evaluating and paying principals is "conducting public relations activities." What is particularly significant is the fact that "public relations" activities are considered more important to evaluations and pay than "leadership for the instructional program" and "supervising teachers." Placing "public relations activities" above the latter two responses is curious because "leadership for the instructional program" and "supervising teachers" are more closely related to the purposes for which schools exist. However, it is readily accepted among principals that "public relations activities" are more important to evaluations and pay than other activities which are more directly related to the educational program. This is not to

say the "educational program" is insignificant, but, on balance, it is considered less important than developing good "public relations."

3. When asked if they had received bonuses, each of the principals replied by saying "no." While none of the principals interviewed had ever received a bonus for a superior performance, most perceived the notion as comical and indicated they would not be anticipating a bonus either.

4. While each of the principals felt they should be paid on the basis of performance, two added that "building size" and "additional responsibilities" should be regarded as significant when paying principals. Without question, principals wish to be paid for the contributions they make to their respective buildings and school districts. Unlike teachers, for example, principals do not wish for tenure on the job, degrees or graduate credits earned to be significant factors when establishing salaries.

5. While principals did not perceive any relationship between salaries they were paid and those of Superintendents, Central Office Administrators or other professionals, five of the ten principals indicated there was a relationship with teachers' salaries. In each of the five cases, principals felt Superintendents and Boards of Education kept principals' salaries and teachers' salaries approximately equal to avoid problems with the teachers' union. In these five

school districts the union had been in existence for several years and Superintendents and Boards of Education recognized the union's potential for causing problems among the teachers and administrators. To maintain workable relations with the teachers, five principals felt that they have received and will continue to receive overall percentage increases which are comparable to that which has been granted to teachers.

3.3 Compare and Contrast Superintendents' and Principals' Responses

Section 3.3 of this study compares and contrasts responses elicited from Superintendents and principals to question regarding the most important factors when determining principals' salaries. Unlike previous sections of this study, section 3.3 does not include a presentation of data. Since such presentations have been delineated in detail in sections 3.1 and 3.2, a recapitulation of the same data would be redundant. Instead, an analysis of the data for each of the interview questions relevant to the topic is presented. To realize the specific purposes for section 3.3, each analysis compares and contrasts Superintendents' and principals' responses to the same questions. Additionally, where appropriate, each analysis amplifies implications, pitfalls and problems attendant to the responses.

Analysis of the Data

1. To determine the importance of evaluations to salary determinations, administrators were asked the per-

centage of principals' salaries which are determined by the results of evaluations. While six Superintendents stated that "one-hundred percent" of the principal's salary is determined by evaluations, only two principals gave the same response. It is interesting that only one of the Superintendents and one of the principals who rendered this response were working together in the same school district.

Other responses from Superintendents were "ninety percent," "eighty percent," "fifty percent" and "zero." By comparison, other responses from principals were "twenty percent" (stated once), "no relationship" (stated five times) and "no idea" (stated twice).

Clearly, three times as many Superintendents than principals believe that principals' salaries are solely determined by the results of evaluations. Additionally, where Superintendents stated a portion of principals' salary are determined by evaluations, such is unrecognized in seven of ten instances by principals. From an analysis of the responses, it is determined that much confusion exists where evaluation results are used as a basis of paying principals. If Superintendents are basing salary determinations, either wholly or in part, on the results of evaluations, principals do not recognize this to be true. Superintendents should communicate the purposes for evaluating principals and follow through with specificity to ensure these purposes are both recognized and realized. In terms of pay for principals, Superintendents must provide a greater emphasis, beyond

"lipservice," on evaluations to ensure a heightened degree of appreciation for the correspondence between evaluation results and salary determinations.

2. When asked "how are the results of principals' evaluations converted into salary determinations," four Superintendents, two principals and one pair of administrators stated that this conversion was accomplished by the Superintendent in a subjective manner. Beyond this response, only one other response rendered by Superintendents and principals was relevant to the question.

Indeed, it would appear that the majority of school districts participating in this study do not possess an objective manner for converting evaluation results into monetary awards for principals. While references to point systems, as an example, for the purpose of converting evaluation results into salary determinations are readily found in the literature, such is not being practiced on a wholesale basis. Presently, the vast majority of conversions are recognized as subjective in nature. If Superintendents are ever challenged on such conversions, they will have great difficulty justifying their actions.

3. When considering pay, Superintendents and principals regard "conducting public relations activities" as significant. Indeed, "conducting public relations activities" was the second most frequently stated response from both Superintendents and principals. This priority is questionable when

one considers that "public relations" activities are marginally related to children and the purposes for which schools exist. However, it is clear that "public relations" is considered more important when paying principals than "supervising teachers" or "facilitating positive staff morale," for example.

4. From a review of the data pertaining to whether or not principals should be paid solely on the basis of performance, it can be concluded that more principals than Superintendents favor pay for performance. Indeed, eighty percent of the principals as compared to fifty percent of the Superintendents believe elementary principals should be paid solely on the basis of performance. Interestingly, half of the Superintendents interviewed favored paying principals for performance but additionally, considering non-performance criteria as "tenure," "educational preparation" and "loyalty."

Unlike Superintendents, principals wish for "additional responsibilities" attendant to greater building sizes and difficulties with students and community members to be considered when they are paid. Without question, principals believe the most important factors to consider when determining salaries are those which are related to how well they complete the various aspects of their jobs. While half of the Superintendents believe non-performance factors should be considered when compensating principals, principals believe only performance related factors should be considered. It is

important that Superintendents are aware that individual principals may become chagrined when marginally effective colleagues receive commensurate pay for lesser job performances as a result of "tenure" or "loyalty." Further, members of the community may well demand a rationale for pay increases provided substandard principals. The general public believes that principals are paid for their performance. Anything less may become a catalyst for increased pressures placed on Superintendents from principals and community members alike.

5. Upon a review of the data, it is apparent that Superintendents are sensitive to the perception of teachers' unions when establishing principals' salaries. Superintendents' responses indicate a strong disposition to awarding principals overall percentage increases which are approximately equal to what the unions have successfully negotiated for teachers. Indeed, among the prime factors considered when establishing principals' salaries is the overall percentage increase granted teachers. Several principals (6) interviewed expressed the belief that Superintendents attempt to maintain credibility with teachers' unions by awarding principals a lower percentage increase than that awarded to teachers.

Therefore, "pay for performance" and "merit pay" for principals are constrained by collective bargaining agreements with teachers. In reality, no matter how well principals perform, pay increases are directly influenced by

what teachers are paid. When principals determine that their salaries are positively correlated to teachers' salaries they may begin "pulling" for unions when negotiating money issues.

6. Ninety percent of the Superintendents indicated principals are paid, entirely or in part, on the basis of merit. However, it is significant that merit pay is determined "subjectively by the Superintendent" or "by the ability of the district to pay." In view of what was previously presented relative to the impact of teachers' salaries on principals' salaries, merit pay is not awarded to principals solely on the basis of performance. Upon a perusal of the literature it is found that merit pay is a salary objectively awarded for performance with sufficient funds available to make it truly meaningful. Where salaries are subjectively awarded with residual funds after teacher negotiations are completed, merit pay for principals is not handled as defined in the professional literature.

Major Purpose Four - Determine The Roles
Played By Superintendents and Principals
In Determining Principals' Salaries

The fourth purpose of this study is to determine the roles played by Superintendents and principals when deter-

mining elementary principals' salaries. Secondary purposes which will serve to address the major purposes include:

- 4.1 Identify and analyze the roles played by Superintendents and principals as determined by Superintendents.
- 4.2 Identify and analyze the roles played by Superintendents and principals as determined by principals.
- 4.3 Compare and contrast Superintendents' and principals' responses.

This section of the study establishes the specific roles played by Superintendents and principals when determining elementary principals' salaries as indicated by responses from Superintendents and principals. Additionally, this section compares and contracts significant elements of the research data gleaned from responses to the structured interview as well as the Superintendents' Questionnaire.

- 4.1 Identify and Analyze the Roles Played by Superintendents and Principals as Determined by Superintendents.

This subsection of the study purports to identify roles played by various groups which impact upon Superintendents and principals when determining elementary principals' salaries. To facilitate the gathering of data, five interview questions were proposed to Superintendents. The following is a presentation of the research data:

Presentation of the Data

Question number ten attempts to ascertain the role which various groups of individuals play in the evaluation of principals. Frequently in this study, reference to the positive relationship between managerial evaluations and salary determinations have been made. In brief, the literature supports the notion of pay as a manifestation of performance evaluations. Where managers, in particular, are appraised as effective, salary determinations should reflect this effectiveness. Question number ten contains eight different parts: "What role do the following people play in evaluating principals; members of the Board of Education? the Superintendent? Central Office Administrators? fellow principals? teachers? students? parents? community members?"

Responses to question number ten are illustrated in Table 25.

TABLE 25
SUPERINTENDENTS' RESPONSES TO: ROLES
PLAYED IN EVALUATING PRINCIPALS

| Individuals Playing A Role in Evaluating Principals | Responses | Frequency of Responses |
|---|-----------|------------------------|
| Board Member | Minimal | 2 |
| | None | 8 |
| Superintendent | Total | 10 |
| Central Office Administrators | Input | |
| | None | 7 |
| Fellow Principals | None | 10 |
| Teachers | Input | 4 |
| | None | 6 |
| Students, Parents and Community Members | Input | 3 |
| | None | 7 |

After a perusal of the data, it is clear that Superintendents perceive themselves as having the "total" role in the evaluation of principals. It is significant that among all other individuals who might play a role in evaluating principals, Superintendents indicate that Board Members play the least important role. While two Superintendents identified the Board's role as "minimal," three, four and three Superintendents identified Central Office administrators, teachers and students, parents and community members respectively as providing "input" for principals' evaluations.

Question number eighteen probed the topic of merit increases. Merit pay for performance is a subject which has gained much notoriety in the recent past. In the report, A Nation At Risk, by the National Commission on Excellence, merit pay is presented as a means for attracting quality candidates to the teaching profession as well as a stimulus for veteran teachers to strive for heightened performance levels. Interview question number eighteen was proposed to Superintendents to determine the extent of merit pay increases awarded to principals. Additionally, question number eighteen endeavors to find if merit pay is, in fact, awarded to principals, what is the role of select persons in determining merit increases. Question number eighteen asked: "What percentage of principals' salaries are determined by merit? How are merit increases determined? What role does the Board of Education play in determining

merit pay for principals? The Superintendent? The principal? Who was involved in the planning of your merit pay system?"

When asked, "what percentage of principals' salaries are determined by merit," four Superintendents stated one-hundred percent, three stated fifty percent, two stated zero and one stated eighty percent.

Responses to the question, "how are merit increases determined," were as follows: Eight Superintendents stated, "subjectively by the Superintendent" and two Superintendents stated, "by the ability of the district to pay."

Within the school districts participating in this study, Superintendents identified the role of the Board of Education in determining merit increases as follows: Five Superintendents indicated the Board only "ratified" the Superintendent's recommendation, three indicated the Board "establishes an amount of money to be divided on the basis of merit" and two indicated the Board "plays no role" in awarding merit increases.

Each of the ten Superintendents stated the "major" role in establishing merit pay for principals was held by the Superintendent.

When asked of the role principals play in determining merit pay, nine Superintendents stated they play "no" role while one stated "principals recommended base salaries for which merit increases are added."

From the responses provided the question, "who was involved in the planning of your merit pay system," Superintendents indicated, "the Superintendent" on six occasions and, "the Superintendent and Board of Education" on four occasions.

Analysis of the Data

1. In view of Superintendents' responses to those who play a role in evaluating principals, it can be concluded that Superintendents play a major role and Board Members play a subordinate role. Where Superintendents are regarded as strong leaders, their role is one of chief executive officer and the Board's role is purely legislative in nature. In effect, the Board legislates and the Superintendent administers. In some school districts, principals are considered the "footsoldiers" who extend the superintendency into the schools. In a sense, the Superintendent operates each school vicariously through his principal. To ensure that principals are sensitive to their relationship to the superintendency, Superintendents maintain tight controls on principals' evaluations. Through such controls, principals are overtly amenable to their Superintendent's word and deed. While the Superintendent may, in fact, consider the thoughts of various other groups when evaluating principals, Board Members are maintained at a distance from the process. Indeed, Superintendents often endeavor to guard against Board Members administering the district by evaluating principals.

2. Merit pay increases are awarded to principals in eight of the ten districts comprising the research of this study. The manner in which awards are typically granted is subjectively by the Superintendent. In most cases, the Board of Education merely ratifies the Superintendent's recommendation in this regard. Where the Board of Education plays a role, Superintendents describe the role as establishing a total amount of money for the Superintendent to divide among the principals. Clearly, Superintendents have never allowed principals to play a role in the establishment of merit pay increases.

4.2 Identify and Analyze the Roles Played by Superintendents and Principals as Determined by Principals.

This subsection endeavors to establish the roles played by Superintendents and principals when evaluating as indicated by principals. As was the case in the previous subsection of the study, five interview questions were asked of administrators to gather relevant data to fulfill the purpose of the section. The following paragraphs will present the research data:

Presentation of the Data

Inasmuch as the literature provides strong support for paying managers from performance evaluations, interview question number ten was incorporated into the study. Question number ten asked principals to identify the roles played by

various individuals in the development of their evaluations. Principals' responses to this question appear in Table 26.

TABLE 26

PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES TO: ROLES
PLAYED IN EVALUATING PRINCIPALS

| Individuals Playing A Role in Evaluating Principals | Responses | Frequency of Responses |
|---|-----------|------------------------|
| Board Members | Minimal | 5 |
| | None | 5 |
| Superintendent | Total | 10 |
| Central Office | Input | 4 |
| | None | 6 |
| Fellow Principals | Input | 4 |
| | None | 6 |
| Teachers | Input | 7 |
| | None | 3 |
| Students, Parents and Community Members | Input | 7 |
| | None | 3 |

A cursory perusal of the data is all that is necessary to establish that principals believe that their Superintendents play the major role in formulating their evaluations. None the less, principals are aware that teachers, students, parents, community members and school board officials have an impact on their evaluations.

Question number eighteen was incorporated into the structured interview to determine the extent to which principals were receiving merit pay as well as the roles various persons play in the awarding of merit pay. Specifically, the question asked principals: "What percentage of principals' salaries are determined by merit? How are merit increases determined? What role does the Board of Education play in determining merit pay for principals? The Superintendent? The principal? Who was involved in the planning of your merit pay system?"

Principals' responses to the first part of the question indicated that very few school districts award merit pay. Only two of ten principals stated "one-hundred percent" of their salaries were determined by merit while one principal stated "ten percent" and seven stated "none."

Since seven principals indicated no portion of their salaries were determined by merit, only three principals were asked the remaining parts of question number eighteen. When asked how merit increases are determined, the three principals stated "subjectively by the Superintendent." Additionally, the three principals also indicated "the Superintendent" was responsible for the planning and implementation of the merit system and other than the Board of Education "ratifying the Superintendent's recommendation," no one other than the Superintendent plays a role in merit pay determinations.

Analysis of the Data

1. There is no question that principals are well aware of the major role Superintendents play in the formulation of their evaluations. What is particularly interesting is the principals' belief that other individuals beyond the Superintendent play a role in their evaluations. While seventy percent of the principals identified "Teachers, Students, Parents and Community Members" as playing a role, fifty percent identified "Board Members," also. Whether soliciting responses from the above noted individuals or not, principals believe Superintendents are sensitive to responses from a variety of sources as they formulate principals' evaluations.

2. In only three of ten school districts was merit pay perceived to be awarded to principals. However, where merit pay is thought to exist, such is awarded through the subjective judgments of Superintendents. Beyond a shadow of a doubt, where merit pay exists, principals have never played a role in its determination.

4.3 Compare and Contrast Superintendents' and Principals' Responses

Subsection 4.3 compares and contrasts Superintendents' and principals' responses to questions pertaining to roles played when determining elementary principals' salaries. Unlike other subsections of this study, 4.3 does not include a

presentation of the data as this has been delineated in previous subsections. To realize the purposes of subsection 4.3, each analysis compares and contrasts Superintendents' and principals' responses to the same questions. Where appropriate, each analysis is embellished through a presentation of implications, pitfalls and problems associated with the responses.

Analysis of the Data

1. Both Superintendents and principals are aware that the Superintendent plays the major role in the formulation of principals' evaluations. While principals believe others provide the Superintendents with substantive input into their evaluations, Superintendents' indicate that this belief is not the case. Particularly where teachers, students, parents and community members are concerned, principals believe these individuals have more than a modicum of influence upon Superintendents when evaluations are being formulated. Superintendents indicated they are only somewhat influenced by these individuals.

When evaluating managers who have contact with a broad base of individuals, prudence would dictate that evaluators endeavor to consult with this base to determine the effectiveness of the manager. Where principals are concerned, they have a substantial impact upon children, parents and staff members. Where Superintendents do not make a conscientious

effort to gain significant knowledge about principals by contacting some of these individuals, they are less than judicious in completing one of their most important tasks. Moreover, where salaries are paid on the basis of inaccurate, subjective assumptions about ineffective principals, Superintendents may well be castigated by Boards of Education, parents and community members who perceive these principals being paid in excess of what they deserve.

2. It is significant that while eighty percent of the Superintendents in this study claim principals receive merit pay increases, seventy percent of the principals state they do not. Indeed, it is incomprehensible that administrators cannot agree on whether or not merit pay is awarded. It is obvious that communication problems among the administrators in this study exists. When principals are paid merit increases they should be informed of the extent to which such pay will comprise their salaries. Further, principals should be informed of the criteria Superintendents will utilize when merit awards are granted. From the data which appear in this section of the study, in the majority of cases, Superintendents play the major role in determining merit salary increases. Therefore, it should be relatively easy to communicate necessary information regarding merit pay since only two people need to enter into the communications, namely, the Superintendent and principal. At the present time, Superintendents are often awarding merit increases and principals are unaware that this decision is taking place.

Determine the Advantages and Disadvantages
Of Collective Bargaining
By Principals

A secondary purpose of this study is to ascertain the advantages and disadvantages of collective bargaining by principals. Resulting from principals feeling disparaged from a diminution of authority, lack of support from Superintendents, weak School Boards and increasing clout of teachers unions, middle managers are assuming a more labor-like posture and persuing bargaining for, among other things, salaries. Collective bargaining by principals can be found in more than half of the fifty states and threatens to become much more pervasive subsequently.

The following paragraphs will present and analyze Superintendents' and principals' responses regarding advantages and disadvantages to principals bargaining for salaries. Additionally, the following endeavors to determine whether or not principals would agree to engage in collective bargaining. Questions number twenty, twenty-one and twenty-two of the structured interview elicited responses to fulfill the purpose of this section of the study.

To determine advantages and disadvantages of collectively bargaining principals' salaries, question number twenty was proposed to Superintendents and principals: "What

factors would motivate your principals (you) to enter into collective bargaining?" Table 27 presents Superintendents' and principals' responses:

TABLE 27

SUPERINTENDENTS' AND PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES TO:
FACTORS FOR ENTERING INTO
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

| Responses | Frequency of Responses | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|------------|-------|
| | Superintendents | Principals | Pairs |
| Poor Salaries | 8 | 9 | 8 |
| Unfair Treatment | 7 | 5 | 5 |
| No Ownership in Policy Formulation | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Poor Communications | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| Success of Teachers' Union | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Job Security | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Weak Superintendent | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| No Recognition | 0 | 3 | 0 |

While there were several responses uttered on one occasion, the responses delineated in Table 27 were stated by either Superintendents or principals at least twice. It is evident that a large number of Superintendents and principals agreed "poor salaries" is one cause for principals to enter into collective bargaining. The only other response which was shared by both administrative groups was "unfair

treatment." While half the Superintendents felt "no ownership in policy formulation" would foster collective bargaining, principals did not corroborate the response. It is significant that while six principals indicated that "job security" would foster collective bargaining, not one Superintendent provided a similar response.

Question number twenty-one had two parts and asked administrators: "What advantages would principals realize from collective bargaining? What disadvantages?" Responses to this question are found in Table 28 and Table 29.

TABLE 28

SUPERINTENDENTS' AND PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES
TO: ADVANTAGES OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

| Responses | Frequency of Responses | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|------------|-------|
| | Superintendents | Principals | Pairs |
| None | 6 | 3 | 1 |
| Sense of Togetherness | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| More Money and Fringe Benefits | 2 | 6 | 2 |
| Job Security | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Political Influence | 0 | 3 | 0 |

TABLE 29

SUPERINTENDENTS' AND PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES
TO: DISADVANTAGES OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

| Responses | Frequency of Responses | | |
|---|------------------------|------------|-------|
| | Superintendents | Principals | Pairs |
| Loss of Prestige | 7 | 2 | 0 |
| Loss of Supervisory Integrity | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| Principals would be fired | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Precludes effective administrative team | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Everyone will be paid the same | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| Principals will become labor and not management | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Loss of incentives | 0 | 2 | 0 |

Upon an examination of Table 28, it is clear the majority of Superintendents do not believe there are any advantages for principals to realize when entering into collective bargaining. Where a minority of the Superintendents were able to determine an advantage, two indicated that principals could derive a "sense of togetherness" while two other Superintendents indicated "more money and fringe benefits." Principals were unable to establish many advantages to collective bargaining either. Beyond "more money and fringe benefits" and "job security," which were stated on six and five occasions,

respectively, principals did not provide other responses on more than three occasions.

Table 29 shows that Superintendents believe principals will lose "prestige" and "supervisory integrity" if they entered into collective bargaining. Principals agreed more frequently than Superintendents when identifying disadvantages to collective bargaining. In particular, principals stated that bargaining "precludes effective administrative teams" and promotes "everyone being paid the same." Other responses from Superintendents and principals were stated by less than half of the respective administrative groups and, therefore, are less significant than those responses reference above.

To establish whether or not principals would enter into collective bargaining for salaries, question number twenty-three was included in the structured interview: "Would principals in your school district enter into collective bargaining for salaries? Why or why not?"

It is interesting to note that the greatest amount of agreement from responding administrators was fostered by the first part of question number twenty-three. Each Superintendent and principal stated "no" when asked if principals would enter into collective bargaining for salaries. When asked why principals would not bargain for salaries, a great number of responses were gleaned. However, those which were stated on more than five occasions by either Superintendents or

principals were "Principals are fairly treated" (stated by five Superintendents and nine principals), "principals are opposed to unions in general" (stated by three Superintendents and seven principals), "principals are happy in the district" (stated by five Superintendents and five principals) and "Superintendents would frown upon principals who negotiated" (stated by two Superintendents and five principals).

Analysis of the Data

1. Where principals would consider entering into collective bargaining, such would be motivated by poor salaries and unfair treatment. Without question, money is extremely important to principals. Ninety percent of the principals and eighty percent of the Superintendents recognize this fact by stating that "poor salaries" motivate principals to enter into bargaining. Principals' salaries are considered poor when they do not keep up with cost of living increases, teachers overall increases or Superintendent overall increases. Additionally, principals' salaries are poor when they are paid substantially lower than what other principals with like training, skills and responsibilities are paid. For these reasons and others, Superintendents take great care to compare what other school districts are paying principals. To avoid the acrimonious tenor often associated with teacher

negotiations, Superintendents frequently consider paying principals competitive salaries.

Another catalyst for bargaining is "unfair treatment." When Superintendents do not listen and respond to principals' when they question district practices, Board aspirations, accountability measures, and the like, principals may feel slighted. Further, principals consider themselves as middle managers and not "order-takers." They must be provided the opportunity to take risks, attempt innovations to meet building needs and generally be allowed freedom of choice when conducting activities of the position. Where Superintendents do not allow for such to take place, principals may feel demeaned as professionals. Thus, Superintendents should allow principals to operate their schools as managers within parameters established to ensure that the Superintendent maintains some semblance of centralized control throughout the school district.

2. An aspect of "unfair treatment" is "no ownership in policy formulation." While half of the Superintendents indicated "no ownership...." will cause disenchantment among principals, not one of the principals provided this response to question number twenty. It is assumed then that the response is much more significant to Superintendents than principals. Resulting from strong demands for heightened standards and accountability, principals may wish to avoid

being held responsible for policy formulation. This wish is particularly true when district-wide policies are formulated which may cause repercussions from teachers and parents. Unlike principals, Superintendents feel the "heat" and, therefore, seek assistance where repercussions result. While Superintendents believe that principals become distraught when provided "no ownership in policy formulation," in reality, the opposite is true. The research data collected on this issue provide evidence that principals are not interested in formulating policy.

3. There were many more disadvantages than advantages identified for principals entering into collective bargaining. Superintendents view principals as professionals who are quite unlike the rank-and-file. As professionals, principals enjoy a prestige attendant to school leadership. Where Superintendents are concerned, principals who enter into collective bargaining would lose prestige and be viewed as labor and not management.

4. Whether determined subjectively or not, principals are paid differentiated salaries which are influenced, to a degree, by job performance. The thought of being paid equal amounts of money for job tenure, degrees earned and the like is not popular among principals. As managers, principals wish to be paid for their management skills. Being paid

equal amounts of money resulting from negotiated agreements is considered a disadvantage to collective bargaining by principals in this study.

5. Principals in this study would not enter into collective bargaining for salaries. While there are several reasons which could be cited to explicate this fact, two reasons transcend all others in importance. First, principals recognize that they are treated fairly. While they could be granted greater authority, recognition and salaries, what they presently receive is considered more than adequate. Secondly, principals are opposed to collective bargaining and unions. No doubt a manifestation of their negative associations with teachers' unions, principals perceive more to be lost than gained when entering into collective bargaining.

TABLE 30

INTEGRATIVE TABLE

It is the purpose of the following table to integrate the major findings of this study through a synthesis of appropriate tables which have been presented in Chapter IV of this study.

Determine How Administrative Job Descriptions
And Evaluation Systems Are
Utilized To Determine
Principals' Salaries

FREQUENCY OF SUPERINTENDENT AND PRINCIPALS'
RESPONSES REGARDING PRINCIPALS' TASKS,
DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS

| Responses | Number of Responses | | |
|--|---------------------|------------|--------|
| | Superintendents | Principals | Pairs* |
| Proving Leadership for the Instructional Program | 10 | 7 | 7 |

Major Finding: Superintendents and principals regard instructional leadership as the most important element of the elementary principalship.

FREQUENCY OF SUPERINTENDENTS' AND PRINCIPALS'
RESPONSES TO: HOW ARE JOB DESCRIPTIONS
UTILIZED?

| Responses | Number of Responses | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|------------|-------|
| | Superintendents | Principals | Pairs |
| To Evaluate Principals | 7 | 3 | 3 |

Major Finding: Although Superintendents utilize job descriptions for evaluation purposes, principals are not aware that this is being done.

FREQUENCY OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS'
 RESPONSES TO: WHAT ARE THE MAJOR PURPOSES FOR EVALUATING PRINCIPALS?

| Responses | Number of Responses | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|------------|-------|
| | Superintendents | Principals | Pairs |
| To determine salaries | 5 | 1 | 1 |

Major Finding: While fifty percent of the Study's Superintendents evaluate principals to determine salaries, only ten percent of the principals perceive this to be true.

FREQUENCY OF SUPERINTENDENTS' AND PRINCIPALS'
 RESPONSES TO: WHAT ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT
 CRITERIA CONSIDERED WHEN DETERMINING PRINCIPALS' SALARIES?

| Responses | Number of Responses | | |
|---|---------------------|------------|-------|
| | Superintendents | Principals | Pairs |
| Salaries paid principals in other districts with comparable school enrollments and responsibilities | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| Results of Evaluations | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Achievement of Goals | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Public Relations | 3 | 7 | 3 |
| Staff Relations | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| Instructional Leadership | 3 | 6 | 3 |
| Daily operation of the building | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Amount of money available for principals' salary increases | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Don't know | 0 | 2 | 0 |

Major Finding: There is little agreement among Superintendents and principals on criteria utilized to evaluate principals.

Determine The Most Important Factors
Considered When Determining
Principals Salaries

SUPERINTENDENTS RESPONSES TO:
OTHER FACTORS WHICH ARE MOST IMPORTANT
WHEN DETERMINING PRINCIPALS' SALARIES

| Responses | Frequency of Responses |
|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Tenure in position | 3 |
| Educational preparation | 1 |
| Going rate for principals | 4 |
| Loyalty | 2 |

Major Finding: All Superintendents believe principals should be paid on the basis of performance. In addition, Superintendents consider tenure, educational preparation, going rates and loyalty along with performance when determining principals' salaries.

Determine The Roles Played By The
Superintendents and Principals
In Determining Principals' Salaries

SUPERINTENDENTS' RESPONSES TO: ROLES
PLAYED IN EVALUATING PRINCIPALS

| Individuals Playing A Role in Evaluating Principals | Responses | Frequency of Responses |
|---|-----------|------------------------|
| Board Member | Minimal | 2 |
| | None | 8 |
| Superintendent | Total | 10 |

PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES TO: ROLES
PLAYED IN EVALUATING PRINCIPALS

| Individuals Playing A Role in Evaluating Principals | Responses | Frequency of Responses |
|---|-----------|------------------------|
| Board Members | Minimal | 5 |
| | None | 5 |
| Superintendent | Total | 10 |

Major Finding: Administrators comprising this study readily recognize that Superintendents play the major role in evaluating principals.

Determine The Advantages and Disadvantages
Of Collective Bargaining By
Principals

SUPERINTENDENTS' AND PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES TO:
FACTORS FOR ENTERING INTO
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

| Responses | Frequency of Responses | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|------------|-------|
| | Superintendents | Principals | Pairs |
| Poor Salaries | 8 | 9 | 8 |
| Unfair Treatment | 7 | 5 | 5 |
| No Ownership in Policy Formulation | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Poor Communications | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| Success of Teachers' Union | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Job Security | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Weak Superintendent | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| No Recognition | 0 | 3 | 0 |

- Major Findings:
1. Superintendents and principals agree that poor salaries and unfair treatment are catalysts for principals entering into collective bargaining.
 2. Superintendents believe principals may be motivated to enter into bargaining if they have no ownership in policy formulations.
 3. As a result of declining school enrollments, principals perceive job security as a cause for persuing collective bargaining.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has endeavored to establish practices and procedures for determining elementary principals' salaries in Lake County, Illinois. The four primary purposes of the study were: (1) Identify and analyze suggested practices and procedures for determining principals' salaries as identified in the literature; (2) Determine how job descriptions and evaluation systems are utilized to determine principals' salaries; (3) Determine the most important factors considered when determining principals' salaries; and (4) Determine the roles of Superintendents and principals in determining principals' salaries. A secondary purpose is to establish the advantages and disadvantages of collective bargaining by principals.

Conclusions

To fulfill the goals of the study, a comprehensive review of the literature was completed in three sections: (1) Factors considered when determining salaries; (2) Appraisal systems utilized to determine salaries; (3) Principals and collective bargaining. Upon a review of various sources, it

became apparent that very little had been written about principals' compensation management. Therefore, it became necessary to rely upon literature written specifically for corporate compensation management to accomplish the study's purposes.

The research data presented and analyzed in this study were gleaned from a Superintendents' Questionnaire and Structured Interview conducted among ten Superintendents and ten principals. The research data from the questionnaire and interview were analyzed in such a manner as to provide answers to the study's questions. A narrative analysis describing findings, commonalities, differences, trends, pitfalls and explanations took place. Where possible, study data were compared and contrasted with literary data.

All of the above provided a basis for the following conclusions:

Identify and Analyze Suggested Practices and Criteria For Determining Principals' Salaries in the Literature

The first purpose of this study was to ascertain suggested practices and criteria for determining principals' salaries. Conclusions to be drawn from a review of pertinent literature indicates the following:

1. Compensation should be commensurate with assessed contributions to the organization.
2. Job descriptions should be formulated for all management positions. Elements of the manager's job description should

be stated in terms of measureable responsibilities which are to become comparable factors.

3. Factors which influence salary determinations for principals include:
 - a. market pricing for similar positions
 - b. past practices
 - c. ability of the school district to pay
 - d. socio-economics level of the community
 - e. level of students within the school
 - f. number of contractual days of employment
 - g. academic preparation
 - h. tenure in the position
4. Principals' salaries are most often established through salary schedules, merit pay plans and job evaluation systems.
5. Appraisals are conducted to communicate performance, rank employees and determine salary increases.
6. Principals should be evaluated through management by objectives systems which lend themselves to salary determinations.
7. Reasons for the proliferation of principals' unions include:
 - a. diminution of principals' authority, job security, role, communications with superiors and expectations for students and staff.
 - b. poor salaries.

Determine How Administrative Job Descriptions and
Evaluation Systems Are Utilized to Determine
Principals' Salaries

The second purpose of this study presented and analyzed research relating to how administrative job descriptions and evaluation systems are utilized to determine principals' salaries. Upon an examination of salient points comprising this section of the study, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. Superintendents and principals regard instructional leadership as the most important element of the elementary principalship.
2. Although Superintendents utilize job descriptions for evaluation purposes, principals are not aware that this is being done.
3. In sixty percent of the school districts comprising this study, principals' job descriptions are written in terms of tasks and duties rather than just responsibilities.
4. In seventy percent of the study's school districts, job descriptions are not utilized for evaluation purposes.
5. Beyond the utilization of the principal's job description to pay junior high school principals higher salaries, they are not considered when determining principals' salaries.
6. Principals' job descriptions are mutually agreed upon in forty percent of the study's school districts. In half

of the school districts, the Superintendents formulated the principal's job description unilaterally.

7. The major purpose for evaluating principals is to improve instructional leadership skills.
8. While fifty percent of the study's Superintendents evaluate principals to determine salaries, only ten percent of the principals perceive this to be true.
9. The most frequently used criterion for evaluating principals is "mutually accepted goals and objectives."
10. There is little agreement among Superintendents and principals on criteria utilized to evaluate principals.
11. The Superintendent's impressions transcends the impressions of all others when evaluating principals.
12. Principals' evaluations are subjectively written by Superintendents. The principal's role in the formulation of his own evaluation ranges from the writing of goals and objectives and providing input to no role at all.

Determine The Most Important Factors Considered When

Determining Principals' Salaries

The third purpose of this study is to determine the most important factors considered when determining principals' salaries. Upon a review of the data presented in this study, the following conclusions are made:

1. While Superintendents consider the "going rate" for the principalship the most important criterion when determining

- principals' salaries, principals consider public relations activities as the most important criterion.
2. While Superintendents utilize the results of evaluations to determine a high percentage of principals' salaries, principals find little relationship between the results of evaluations and salary determinations.
 3. All Superintendents believe principals should be paid on the basis of performance. In addition, half of the Superintendents consider tenure, educational preparation, going rates and loyalty along with performance when determining principals' salaries.
 4. All principals believe they should be paid on the basis of performance. In addition, twenty percent of the principals believe that building size and additional responsibilities should be considered along with performance when determining principals' salaries.
 5. The total percentage increase paid teachers positively influences the total percentage increase paid to principals.

Determine The Roles Played By The Superintendents
and Principals In Determining Principals' Salaries

The fourth purpose of this study is to determine the actual roles played by Superintendents and principals when determining elementary principals' salaries. Upon an examination of the research data, the following can be concluded:

1. Administrators comprising this study readily recognize that Superintendents play the major role in evaluating principals.

2. Principals perceive teachers, students, parents and community members having a greater impact upon their evaluations than members of the Boards of Education.
3. In seventy percent of the participating school districts, Superintendents award merit pay which is not recognized by principals.

Determine The Advantages and Disadvantages
Of Collective Bargaining By Principals

It is the purpose of this secondary study purpose to ascertain the advantages and disadvantages of collective bargaining by principals. Additionally, this secondary purpose endeavored to find out whether or not principals would enter into collective bargaining for salaries.

From a review of the research data as presented and analyzed, the following conclusions can be made:

1. Superintendents and principals agree that poor salaries and unfair treatment are catalysts for principals entering into collective bargaining.
2. Superintendents believe principals may be motivated to enter into bargaining if they have no ownership in policy formulations.
3. As a result of declining school enrollments, principals perceive job security as a cause for persuing collective bargaining.
4. Superintendents find few advantages for principals entering into collective bargaining. Indeed, they find that

principals have far more to lose than gain in bargaining. Among the disadvantages Superintendents identified are loss of prestige and job incentives. Additionally, a minority of Superintendents indicated they would endeavor to replace principals electing to take part in collective bargaining.

6. Pay for performance is an ideal held in high regard by principals. A disadvantage of collective bargaining is the establishment of equal pay for unequal performance.

7. Principals in this study would not enter into collective bargaining for salaries primarily because they are treated fairly and are vehemently opposed to collective bargaining and unions.

Recommendations For Further Study

As a result of this study, the following recommendations are provided students of compensation administration:

1. A comprehensive study should be made to explore the rationale of school districts for not having policies and procedures for determining elementary principals' salaries.
2. A study should be conducted to compare salaries paid to elementary principals in school districts which conduct

job evaluations and school districts which do not conduct job evaluations.

3. A follow-up study to this study should be made which would include Superintendents and principals from a county other than Lake County, Illinois.
4. A study should be made to compare responsibilities and salaries paid principals and middle managers in the corporate sector.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Albrecht, Karl. Successful Management by Objectives. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1978.
- American Association of School Administrators. How to Evaluate Administrative and Supervisory Personnel. Arlington, Va.: American Association of School Administrators. 1977.
- American Association of School Administrators and National School Board Association. Evaluating the Superintendent. Arlington, Va.: American Association of School Administrators. 1980.
- American Association of School Administrators. Staff Relations in School Administration, Thirty-third yearbook. Arlington, Va.: The Association. 1955.
- Bailey, Max A.; and Booth, Ronald R. Collective Bargaining and the School Board Member. Springfield, Il.: Illinois Association of School Boards, 1978.
- Barnard, Charles I. The Functions of the Executive. 20th ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1938-1971.
- Beach, Dale S. Personnel: The Management of People at Work. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc. 1975.
- Berg, Gary J. Managing Compensation. New York: AMACOM. 1976.
- Bolton, Dale L. Evaluating Administrative Personnel in School Systems. New York: Teachers College Press. 1980.
- Booth, Ronald R.; and Gerald R. Glaub. Planned Appraisal of the Superintendent. Springfield, IL.: Illinois Association of School Boards. 1978.
- Cheeks, John E. How To Compensate Executives. Homewood, Illinois: Dow Jones-Irwin, Inc. 1974.
- Chruden, Herbert J.; and Sherman, Arthur W., Jr. Personnel Management. Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing. 1976.
- Cohen, Theodore; and Lindberg, Roy A. Compensating Key Executives In The Small Company. New York: AMACOM. 1979.

- DeRoche, Edward F. An Administrator's Guide for Evaluating Programs and Personnel. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1981.
- Drucker, Peter F. Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.
- Dunn, J. D.; and Rachel, Frank M. Wage and Salary Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.
- Fayol, Henri. "The Administrative Theory In The State." trans. Sarah Greer. In Papers on the Science of Administration, pp. 101-114. Edited by Luther Gulick and L. Urwick. New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937.
- Goodale, James G. The Fine Art of Interviewing. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1982.
- Gregg, Russell T. Administrative Behavior in Education, pp. 269-317. Edited by Ronald Campbell and Russell T. Gregg. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers. 1957.
- Gulick, Luther. "Notes on the Theory of Organization." In Papers on the Science of Administration, pp. 1-45. Edited by Luther Gulick and L. Urwick. New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937.
- Hayford, Stephen; and Sinicropi, Anthony V. Collective Bargaining and the Public Sector Supervisor. Chicago: International Personnel Management Association, 1976.
- Henderson, Richard I. Compensation Management: Rewarding Performance in the Modern Organization. Reston, Va.: Reston Publishing, 1976.
- Henrici, Stanley B. Salary Management for the Nonspecialist. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1978.
- Jucius, Michael J., Ph.D. Personnel Management. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1979.
- Lucio, William H.; and McNeil, John D. Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action. 2nd. ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.
- McCormick, Ernest J. Job Analysis: Methods and Applications. New York: AMACOM, 1979.
- McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Patten, Thomas H., Jr. Pay: Employee Compensation and Incentive Plans. New York: The Free Press, 1977.

Sergiovanni, Thomas; and Elliott, David L. Educational and Organizational Leadership in Elementary Schools. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Smith, Howard P.; and Bouwer, Paul J. Performance Appraisal and Human Development: A Practical Guide to Effective Management. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1977.

Stoma, Richard S. How to Measure Managerial Performance. New York: MacMillian Publishing Co., Inc. 1980.

Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary, 2nd ed., 1970.

Wiles, Kimbald; and Lovell, John R. Supervision for Better Schools. 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

B. JOURNALS

American Association of School Administrators. "Theme Six: Accountability, an Enduring Expectation." The American School Superintendency (1982): 67-68.

American Association of School Administrators. "If Principals Bargain, What is Negotiable?" The School Administrator (September 1981): 30.

American School Board Association. "The brewing-and, still preventable--revolt of the school principals." American School Board Journal 163 (January 1976): 25.

Belcher, David W. "Pay and Performance." Compensation Review Quarterly 12 (Third Quarter, 1980): 47.

Berenson, Conrad; and Ruhnke, Henry O. "Job Descriptions: How To Write and Use Them." Personnel Journal (1976): 13-22.

Cameron, Kim. "Measuring Organizational Effectiveness in Institutions of Higher Education." Administrative Science Quarterly 23 (December 1978): 604.

Cooper, Bruce S. "Collective Bargaining Comes To School Management." Phi Delta Kappan (October 1976): 203.

Cooper, Bruce S.; and Murrman, Kent F. "Efforts of Unionization on School Administrators." Education Digest 48 (January 1983): 40-41.

- Deal, Terrance E., Dornbusch, Sanford M.; and Crawford, Robert, A. "Villians As Victims." Phi Delta Kappan (December 1977): 274.
- Educational Research Service. "Spectrum." Journal of School Research and Information (Spring 1983): 32.
- Gager, Philip E.; and Tascano, Gerald. "If you follow these proven guidelines, merit pay for administrators can succeed." American School Board Journal 167 (January 1980): 31.
- Hayes, James L. "Experts Probe Factors That Determine Salaries." American School and University (June 1978): 18c.
- Humphries, Kenneth W. "This Evaluation System Lets You Know What Your Administrators' Jobs Are Worth." American School Board Journal (1977): 67.
- Illinois Association of School Boards. "Evaluating Administrators." Illinois School Board Journal (March-April 1975): 19.
- Illinois Association of School Boards. "Principals Want Equal Rights." Developments in Personnel Management 1 (June 1974): 5.
- Karlitz, Howard. "Unionization of Educational Administrators in the USA." International Review of Education 25 (1979): 95-96.
- Knoester, William P. "Administrative Unionization: What Kind of Solution?" Phi Delta Kappan (February 1978): 419.
- Larean, Margaret A. "The Issue of Collective Bargaining for School Supervisors and Administrators." Collective Bargaining (March 1980): 153.
- LeCesne, Terrel M. "Unionized Principals-Why Not?" Phi Delta Kappan 62 (December 1980): 284.
- Levinson, Harry. "Appraisal of What Performance?" Harvard Business Review 54 (July-August 1976): 32.
- Manning, Renfro C. "Improving Principals' Performance Through Motivation and Evaluation." Journal of School Research and Information (Spring 1983): 34.
- Marlowe, John. "Why I Almost Joined a Principals Union." Education Digest (September 1980): 24.
- McPherson, R. Bruce. "Grass Roots on the Ceiling: The Principal and the Locus of Power." Principal (March 1982): 24-27.

- Meitler, Neal. "Merit Pay For Administrators." Illinois School Board Journal (November-December 1974): 31.
- National Association of Elementary School Principals and Educational Research Service. "School Salaries, 1981: An NAESP/ERS Research Report." Principal 61 (March 1982): 27.
- National Association of School Boards. "The Ways (not all good) Principals Are Paid." American School Board Journal 163 (July 1976): 21.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. "Study Confirms Principal's Role." Capital Comments (July 16, 1982): 6.
- Redfern, George. "Accountability: Echos From The Field." Principal 4 (March/April 1976): 44.
- Rultan, Larry G. "Administrator Merit Pay-Theory Into Practice." Thrust 8 (May 1979): 29.
- Schaefer, William; and Read, Bruce. "A Merit System for Evaluating School Administrators." Education Digest 48 (January 1983): 42-43.
- Stow, Shirley B.; and Manatt, Richard P. "Administrator Evaluation Tailored To Your School District." Educational Leadership (February 1982): 355.
- Sweeney, Jim; and Rowdder, Larry. "What Principals Want--and Get--from Their Unions." Education Digest 46 (February 1978): 419.
- VanAdelsberg, Henri. "Relating Performance Evaluation to Compensation of Public Sector Employees." Public Personnel Management 2 (March-April 1978): 76.
- Vanderpool, Maurice. "School Administrators Under Stress." Principal 4 (March 1981): 39.

C. REPORTS

- Association of School Business Officials. A Wage and Salary Program Based on Position Evaluations for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel. Park Ridge, Illinois: Association of School Business Officials of the United States and Canada, 1980.
- Cunningham, Luvern; and Hentges, Joseph T. The American School Superintendency. Arlington, Va.: The American Association of School Administrators, 1982.

- Educational Research Service. ERS Composite Indicator of Changes in Average Salaries and Wages Paid in Public Schools. Arlington, Va.: Educational Research Service, 1983.
- Educational Research Service. Evaluating Administrative Performance. Arlington, Va.: Educational Research Service, 1974.
- Educational Research Service. Fringe Benefits for Administrators in Public Schools, 1981-82. Arlington, Va.: Educational Research Service, 1982.
- Educational Research Service. Methods of Scheduling Salaries for Principals. Arlington, Va.: Educational Research Service, 1975.
- Educational Research Service. The Role of Elementary School Principals: A Summary of Research. Arlington, Va.: Educational Research Service, 1982.
- Leadership Liason Task Force. Administrative Evaluation: A Process For Discussion. Harrisburg, Pa.: Pennsylvania Board of Education, May 1982.

D. GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

- (Illinois) State Board of Education, Illinois Office of Education. The School Code of Illinois (St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1983).

E. NEWSPAPERS

- Business. Chicago Tribune. (Chicago), May 23, 1983, p. 11-13.

F. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- Wells, Richard Frances. "A Study of the Major Job Responsibilities of the Elementary Principal." Ed.D. dissertation, University of North Colorado, 1978. Dissertation Abstracts International 39 (October 1978), p. 1987-A.
- XYZ Corporation. "Guide To Preparing Job Descriptions." XYZ Corporation Compensation Administration Policy Manual, (1979), p. 1.

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO MEMBERS OF JURY

LAWRENCE M. BASKIN
310 W. Rockland Road
Libertyville, IL 60048
(312) 362-9023

August 12, 1983

Dear

I wish to thank you for agreeing to assist with my doctoral dissertation as a member of a jury of educators to critically analyze a questionnaire intended to generate needed information. My dissertation will endeavor to establish practices and procedures for determining elementary principals' salaries. Questions to be addressed include:

- a. How are administrative job descriptions and evaluation systems utilized to determine principals' salaries?
- b. What are the most important factors considered when determining principals' salaries?
- c. What are the roles of Boards of Education, Superintendents and Principals in determining principals' salaries?

I solicit your assistance to obtain comments regarding my questionnaire before it is distributed to elementary district superintendents. Please note, it is not expected that you answer the questions. Instead, I am asking you to comment on the quality of the questionnaire with respect to:

- a. Content: In your opinion, do the questions seek information which would appear useful in light of my dissertation topic and questions to be addressed as referenced above? If not, what alterations would you suggest?
- b. Construction: In your opinion, is the format of the questionnaire and individual questions easily understood? Do any of the questions appear ambiguous? If so, how would you suggest the questions be modified?

Please write your suggestions and comments directly on the questionnaire.

A limited number of superintendents and principals from the same district will participate in follow-up interviews to collect additional information. Upon the construction of an instrument to be utilized for interviewing, a copy will be sent to you for review prior to it being utilized.

I would be most appreciative for your prompt review. Please note, I have enclosed a self-addressed, stamped envelope for your convenience. Thank you very much for the interest and assistance.

Most Appreciatively,

Lawrence M. Baskin

LB/f

Enclosures: Questionnaire
Self-addressed envelope

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE COMPLETED BY SUPERINTENDENTS

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS' SALARY QUESTIONNAIRE

Superintendent's Name: _____

School District Name: _____

School District Number: _____

1. How many years have you served this school district as Superintendent? _____
2. Select from the list below the method or methods utilized to determine principals' salaries for the past three years. Please place the appropriate letter beside the corresponding school year.
 - a. Principals' Salary Schedule
 - b. Merit
 - c. Individually Negotiated
 - d. Other (please specify) _____

1980-81 _____ 1981-82 _____ 1982-83 _____
3. Does your school district maintain a detailed job description of principals' duties, tasks and responsibilities?

yes _____ no _____
4. Are principals formally evaluated at least annually?

yes _____ no _____
5. If principals are formally evaluated, how would you describe the system utilized? Please check the line beside the appropriate response.

| | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Management by Objectives _____ | Essay or Narrative _____ |
| Checklist _____ | Other (please explain) _____ |
| Rating Scale _____ | _____ |
6. Select from the listing below those who provide direct contributions for a principals' performance evaluation. Please check the line beside the appropriate response.

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Students _____ | Central Office _____ |
| Parents _____ | Administrators _____ |
| Teachers _____ | Superintendent _____ |
| Other Principals _____ | Board Members _____ |
| | Other (please specify) _____ |
7. If selected for further participation in this study, would you and a principal be available for a short interview?

yes _____ no _____

Thank you for the assistance. I am deeply appreciative of the time and effort provided this questionnaire. Please mail the completed questionnaire to the address below by August 29, 1983. A stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed.

Lawrence M. Baskin
310 W. Rockland Road
Libertyville, IL 60048

APPENDIX C

LETTER FROM EMPLOYING SUPERINTENDENT

Libertyville Public Schools

District No. 70
310 West Rockland Road • Libertyville, Illinois 60048
(312) 362-9023

August 10, 1983

Dear

I am writing to seek your assistance and cooperation on behalf of Larry Baskin, my Assistant Superintendent.

Mr. Baskin is completing work leading to the Doctorate of Education at Loyola University of Chicago and is now preparing his dissertation which will focus on practices and procedures for determining elementary school principals' salaries. Mr. Baskin has worked in District No. 70 in areas related to compensation administration, and I feel that the study he has undertaken can be of benefit to districts in Lake County.

Mr. Baskin has assured me that the results of his study can be shared with all Lake County districts should they desire.

I, therefore, endorse Mr. Baskin's study and seek your cooperation in completing the questionnaire and returning it to Mr. Baskin.

Sincerely yours,



Robert W. Boos
Superintendent

RWB/f

APPENDIX D

LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS EXPLAINING
THE QUESTIONNAIRE'S PURPOSES

LAWRENCE M. BASKIN
310 W. Rockland Road
Libertyville, IL 60048
(312) 362-9023

August 12, 1983

Dear

Enclosed please find a questionnaire which is a significant part of the research which I am conducting for a doctoral dissertation at Loyola University of Chicago. The dissertation is focused on an analysis of the practices and procedures for determining elementary school principals' salaries in Lake County, Illinois.

Since the research data will be collected from Lake County school districts, your completion and return of the enclosed questionnaire is important to accomplishing the purposes of the study. A limited number of superintendents and a principal from the same district will be randomly selected to participate in a short follow-up interview.

Anonymity of individual responses will be strictly maintained. To accomplish this, responses gleaned will be coded. Additionally, personal references to individuals electing to be part of the study will not appear within the dissertation.

If you desire additional information, feel free to telephone me at 362-9023, or I will meet with you at your convenience. I would appreciate being advised of your disposition by receiving a completed questionnaire by August 29, 1983.

Thank you for the assistance.

Sincerely,

Lawrence M. Baskin

LMB:f

Enclosures: Self-addressed envelope
Questionnaire

APPENDIX E

STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

1. How are job descriptions utilized?
2. Are the elements of the principal's job description stated as tasks, duties or responsibilities?
3. Has the principal's job description ever been utilized for evaluation purposes? If so, how?
4. Has the principal's job description ever been utilized to determine salaries? If so, how?
5. Are the elements of the principal's job description mutually agreed upon?
6. What are the major purposes for evaluating principals?
7. How frequently are principals formally evaluated? Informally evaluated?
8. What are the specific criteria utilized to evaluate principals? How are these criteria measured? By whom? What are the most important criteria considered when determining principals' salaries?
9. What are the specific procedures utilized to evaluate principals?
10. What role do the following people play in evaluating principals: members of the board of education, the superintendent, central office administrators, fellow principals, teachers, students, parents, community members?
11. Are principals evaluated on their performance in accomplishing goals established by the board of education?, superintendent?, themselves?
12. What percentage of a principal's salary is determined by the results of evaluations? Specifically, how are the results of a principal's evaluation converted into salary?
13. What are the major tasks, duties and functions of principals in this school district?
14. Which of these tasks, duties and functions are considered when evaluating principals? When determining principals' salaries.
15. Have principals in your school district been granted bonuses in the past five years? If so, how frequently has this occurred? For what purposes have bonuses been awarded?

16. Should principals be paid solely on the basis of performance? If not, what other factors should be considered when determining principals salaries? From the factors you identified, which are the most important when determining principals salaries?
17. In this school district, are principals' salaries related or connected to teachers' salaries in any way, shape or form? Related to the Superintendent's salary? Other superintendent's salaries?, Central Office administrators' salaries?, Other professionals' salaries? If so, to what degree are salaries related to the individual or group identified?
18. What percentage of principals' salaries are determined by merit? How are merit increases determined? What role does the Board of Education play in determining merit pay for principals? The Superintendent? The Principal? Who was involved in the planning of your merit pay system?
19. Does the school district possess an established pay range for the position of principal? If so, how was this pay range placed together? How are principals' salaries determined from within the pay range?
20. What factors would motivate your principals (you) to enter into collective bargaining?
21. What advantages would your principals (you) realize from collective bargaining? What disadvantages?
22. Would principals in your school district enter into collective bargaining for salaries? Who or why not?

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Lawrence M. Baskin has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Melvin P. Heller, Director
Professor,
Administration and Supervision, Loyola

Dr. Philip M. Carlin
Chairman, Department of
Administration and Supervision, Loyola

Dr. Fred Lunenburg
Associate Professor,
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.

January 10, 1984
Date

M.P. Heller
Director's Signature