



1989

An Analysis of the Evaluation Process for Public High School Principals in Cook, Dupage, Lake, Mchenry and Will Counties, Illinois

Laura F. Murray
Loyola University Chicago

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



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Murray, Laura F., "An Analysis of the Evaluation Process for Public High School Principals in Cook, Dupage, Lake, Mchenry and Will Counties, Illinois" (1989). *Dissertations*. 3140.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/3140

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 © 1989 Laura F. Murray

AN ANALYSIS OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS
FOR PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
IN COOK, DUPAGE, LAKE, MCHENRY
AND WILL COUNTIES, ILLINOIS

by

Laura Lee F. Murray

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

January

1989

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is sincerely grateful to Dr. Max A. Bailey for his assistance, support and guidance throughout the pursuit of her doctorate and writing of the dissertation. She is also sincerely appreciative of the advice, encouragement and support received from Dr. Melvin P. Heller and Dr. Philip M. Carlin.

A heartfelt thank you is reserved for the author's family to whom this study is dedicated. Without the love, support, and understanding of the author's mother, father, husband and son, this dissertation could not have been done. A special thank you goes to Dr. Pepper for his warmth and companionship.

Finally, a special recognition is in order for Cheryl Engel who helped make my handwritten scribbles legible.

VITA

The author, Laura Lee Fosdick Murray, is the daughter of Leland Beach Fosdick and Florence Urmston Fosdick. She was born September 19, 1950, in Columbus, Ohio.

Her high school education was completed at Glenbard West High School, Glen Ellyn, Illinois, in 1968. In June 1972 she graduated with a Bachelor of Science in mathematics from Purdue University and in August 1978 she received a Masters of Science in Education from Northern Illinois University.

In January 1989 the author was awarded a Doctor of Philosophy from Loyola University of Chicago.

In 1987 the author was elected to Phi Delta Kappa at Loyola University. Also in 1987 she was selected for Who's Who In American Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
VITA.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
CONTENTS OF APPENDICES.....	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	11
Components of a Good Process.....	11
Studies of Principal Evaluation Processes	32
Processes of Principal Evaluation.....	54
III. METHODS.....	79
Written Survey.....	80
Interviews.....	83
IV. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS.....	92
Results.....	93
Analysis.....	133
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	157
Summary.....	157
Conclusions.....	159
Recommendations.....	162
Recommendations for Future Study.....	163
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	164
APPENDIX A.....	171
APPENDIX B.....	175
APPENDIX C.....	178
APPENDIX D.....	180
APPENDIX E.....	182

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number of School Districts By County.....	82
2. Comparison of District Processes.....	85
3. Districts' Use of Criteria.....	86
4. Percent of Districts Using Criteria.....	90
5. Number of Years In Current Superintendency As Compared to Number of Years As A Superintendent.....	95
6. Degrees Earned By Superintendents.....	97
7. Number of High Schools In The District.....	98
8. Size of the District By Number of People.....	99
9. Money Spent Per Pupil As Per The 1986-87 School Report Card.....	100
10. Written Principal Evaluation Process.....	102
11. Written Forms.....	104
12. Participation In The Principal Evaluation Process.....	105

CONTENTS OF APPENDICES

	Page
Appendix A Principal Evaluation Process Survey.....	172
Appendix B List of Schools In The Original Sample....	176
Appendix C List of Schools Who Returned The Survey...	179
Appendix D School Districts Selected For Interviews..	181
Appendix E Questions For Superintendents Interview...	183

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Since A Nation At Risk was published in 1983, the American Public School System has been under close scrutiny. The current research on effective schools espouses that the more effective schools have effective leaders. Former Secretary of Education, William J. Bennett, reported to President Reagan in a speech in May 1988 that "Good schools have good principals—leaders who articulate clear goals, leaders who show the ability and authority necessary to get teachers and students working toward those goals."¹ He continued by stating that, "Someone needs to be responsible for the performance of our schools, and principals - as their chief executive officers are the logical choice. Real educational responsibility demands the authority to make decisions about school budgets and personnel. Good principals want that authority."² The role of the principal has

¹Miller, Julie A., "Bennett Despite Reform, 'We are still At Risk'", Education Week, May 4, 1988 (Secondary Source)

²The Chronicle of Higher Education, May 4, 1988 p.A40 Text of Bennett's Report (Secondary Source)

been repeatedly expressed as crucial to the ethos of the school and paramount to having an outstanding school. In 1983 Barth stated, "The world seems to have rediscovered the school principal. Central office administrators, state department officials and university researchers have come to recognize what most teachers, parents and students have known right along, the quality of a school is related to the quality of it's leadership."³ Barth was supported in 1988 by Chester E. Finn Jr., Assistant Secretary for Research and Improvement in the U.S. Department of Education, who stated, "A decade of education reform has taught most of us that real improvements occur not at the state or school system level but school by school. The course and pace of important reforms - from school climate and teacher professionalism to student assessment and accountability - depend to a large degree on the principal."⁴ Thus if the principal's performance is one of the leading indicators of an outstanding school, it follows that adequate attention

³Barth, Roland. "The Principalship" Educational Leadership, October 1984 p.93

⁴Finn, Chester E. Jr. "Expand Your Vision And Pick Principals With Promise" The Executive Educator, June 1988 p21.

must be given to evaluating and improving a principal's level of performance. If as a nation, we are committed to excellent schools, we must in turn examine the leaders of the schools and analyze how we can assist them to be the best principals possible.

Purpose

Although much has been written concerning the qualities of effective leaders in the business world and how to evaluate them, very little of this has been directed specifically towards techniques used to evaluate or improve a principal's performance. During the last ten years teacher evaluation has progressed from evaluation to the improvement of instruction. Principal evaluation has seemingly remained as "evaluative". In 1979 Zakrajsek stated that principal evaluations tended to emphasize weaknesses of the principal as opposed to strengths and areas for development. "In the past, evaluation was used as a vehicle to hire, fire or retain principals."⁴ George Redfern concurred with Zakrajsek when he stated, "Evaluation techniques of principals and

⁴Zakrajsek, Barbara, "Evaluation Systems: A Critical Look" NAASP Bulletin January 1979, p.100-111

assistant principals haven't changed much during the last decade; conventional procedures are still widely used, then evaluations are expressed in the form of checklists, scales and descriptive assessments."⁵ In a publication in Spring 1986 the Northwest Educational Cooperative stated that the evaluation of the principal has progressed little beyond "the recognition of its potential usefulness."⁶ Therefore, the purpose of this dissertation was to describe, compare and analyze what was currently being done in the area of principal evaluation. Specifically, this study sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the current status of public high school principal evaluation?
2. What is the purpose of principal evaluation?
3. Who conducts the evaluation?
4. What is the process and/or instrument employed?

Procedure

First, there was an extensive review of the last 10 years of the literature concerning evaluation of prin-

⁵Redfern, George, "Evaluation of Principals", The Practitioner, June 1981 p.66

⁶Northwest Educational Cooperative, The Evaluation of Principals As Instructional Leaders, p.13

cipals. The purpose of the review of literature was first to ascertain the components a good principal evaluation process should contain and second to review principal evaluation processes currently in use and advocated. Then data was collected in two phases. The first stage of data gathering consisted of designing, administering and analyzing a questionnaire given to superintendents. The questionnaire (Appendex A) sought to determine what process and written instruments each district used, who conducted the evaluation, who participated in the process, whether or not the process was influenced by Illinois Senate Bill 730 and whether or not the superintendent's attendance at the Illinois Administrator's Academy influenced the district's process. The survey was field tested by three elementary school superintendents and one high school superintendent. District principal evaluation processes as detailed in the returned surveys were compared to what the review of literature found to be characteristics of good processes. The characteristics are specifically detailed in the Review of Literature but a few are listed subsequently.

1. The presence of a written evaluation and the type of form used (ie checklist, rating, work goals, job description).

2. The number of required meetings between the principal and evaluator. (cyclical versus once a year)
3. The presence of a job description of common objectives and/or unique yearly objectives.
4. The use of multiple data sources or client centered evaluation.
5. The number of years the system has been utilized.
6. The evaluation purpose is both formative and summative.
7. The evaluation process is responsive to state mandated policy.

The superintendents of those districts whose processes employed the highest number of the aforementioned characteristics were selected to be interviewed. The second phase of data gathering was to interview the superintendents of the chosen districts. The three fold purpose of the second data gathering phase was to validate and clarify responses to the survey, to gather more in-depth information, and to determine the extent to which the superintendent believed the process helped or hindered a principal's performance. A sample of questions asked during the interview process is listed below. (A complete list is included in Appendix E)

1. What is the purpose(s) of the evaluation?
(Formative versus Summative)

2. How was your process of principal evaluation determined?
3. Who was involved in the development of the process?
4. In your district's evaluation process, there appears to be (number) required meetings between the principal and evaluator. What is the purpose of each meeting?
5. Explain how input from other groups is utilized in the process.
6. Clarify/expand on the response to Senate Bill 730 and Illinois Administrator's Academy influence or lack of influence on your process.
7. To what extent do you believe the process either helps or hinders a principal's performance?
8. Is your district's principal evaluation process periodically reviewed or evaluated?

Sample

The sample consisted of the superintendents of high school districts in the five Illinois counties of DuPage, Cook (not including the Chicago Public School System), McHenry, Will and Lake. Superintendents in Kane County were eliminated from the sample as the school districts in Kane were all unit districts. In order to make valid comparisons only superintendents of public high school districts were included, and superintendents of unit districts, elementary districts and

private or parochial schools were eliminated. The rationale for excluding the aforementioned superintendents was:

- elementary school principals had a different role than secondary school principals and therefore the procedures to evaluate may be different
- private schools and parochial schools were not required to follow the state mandates of Illinois State Senate Bill 730
- unit districts tended to classify all principals (elementary, middle and high school) the same

The total sample size was fifty-two superintendents with the breakdown by county as follows: DuPage seven, Cook twenty-seven, Lake eleven, Will three and McHenry four.

The criteria for selecting the specific sample for this dissertation were several. First, these counties had a diversity in population, geography and socio-economic levels. Second, many of the school districts in the metropolitan area had been extensively involved in instructional improvement programs whether with Madeline Hunter, Jerry Bellon, Tom McGreal, the Illinois Administrators Academy or others. Since the principal was viewed as a role model, and teachers were involved in improvement of instruction and evaluation

program, it followed that principals should be included in a comprehensive evaluation program also. Finally, this sample included several "lighthouse" districts that have received national attention for current programs. As the review of literature portrays, not much has occurred during the last ten years in the area of principal evaluation. If the schools in this five county area have been trend setters in the area of teacher evaluation, this study sought to determine if they were advanced in the principal evaluation process also.

Limitations of the Study

One limitation of the study was that superintendents were surveyed and interviewed but principals were not. The purpose of this study was to ascertain what was currently in use, not to set-up an adversarial relationship between superintendent and principal. The scope of this study didn't lend itself to including principals, but rather had implications for further research. Future studies might determine if the principal believes the process is working, if the principal believes it is aimed towards improvement of performance and not just evaluative, and if the principal's and

superintendent's views about the process differ.

A second limitation might be the original sample size; however, this was partially overridden by the fact that eighty-five percent of the questionnaires were returned.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature that relates to evaluation of principals over the past several years. Specifically, there are three areas that will be covered. The first section contains a discussion of the recommended components that a good principal evaluation process should contain. Second, there is a review of studies that have been conducted concerning principal evaluation processes and recommendations relating from the studies. Third, the last section is an examination of specific processes or systems of principal evaluation that are either currently in use or presently advocated.

Section One: Components Of A Good Process

As early as 1976 Buser and Stuck wrote a pamphlet published by the Illinois Principal Association entitled, Evaluation And The Principal. The introductory portion stressed the importance of both principals being actively involved in designing and implementing the system of

principal evaluation and the system taking into consideration local factors and idiosyncrasies.

Buser and Stuck believed that "guidelines should direct the intent and conditions of the evaluation system; they become significant as a norm in the design and implementation of the evaluation process."¹ They continued by listing eighteen components that should guide and direct an effective principal evaluation process. The items were:

1. The primary objective of the evaluation is to improve the quality of the educational leadership of the school.
2. Those to be evaluated must be knowledgeable of performance expectations and measures thereof.
3. Evaluation policies, criteria, procedures and means should be designed for a particular school setting.
4. All personnel involved should be informed about the evaluation system. The purposes, the criteria, and the respective roles of those to be involved must be communicated to all concerned.
5. Evaluation procedures are most effective when the personnel to be evaluated are actively involved in the process.
6. Evaluations should be made on numerous occasions over an extended period of time.
7. Judgments, ratings and recommendations should be made in a manner to minimize strong feelings of

¹Buser and Stuck, Evaluation And The Principal p.10

insecurity by both the evaluators and those being evaluated. Evaluatees should be afforded the opportunity to communicate their rationale for their positions, actions and behaviors.

8. Evaluation procedures should be designed to minimize and control evaluator bias.
9. If those being evaluated are to improve their professional competencies and performances, they should be assured the opportunity to receive and react to observations, judgments, and recommendations. Therefore, a conference to communicate the evaluator's recommendations should be an integral part of the evaluation process.
10. Evaluations should be made in good faith, i.e., as a means to bring about improved performance within a school and not to collect information to support preconceived judgments.
11. Evaluation observations should be conducted openly with the full knowledge of those being evaluated.
12. Mechanical observation devices should be used only with the consent of the person observed.
13. Evaluations should be comprehensive, with the real criteria included in the evaluation instrument.
14. Those being evaluated should be encouraged to use self-assessments as well as the ratings of appropriate referent groups--peers, teachers, students, parents--to complement the ratings of supervisors.
15. Evaluations, observations and recommendations should be effectively communicated to those legitimately concerned--principals, administrators and the school board.
16. The evaluatee is entitled to receive the candid professional judgments and recommendations of the evaluator(s), with sufficient lead time to implement the recommendations.
17. Evaluation results should be held in strict confidence by the evaluators as well as by those to whom their judgments are submitted.

18. The evaluation should be referenced to established job expectations mutually developed by the evaluator(s) and the evaluatee(s).²

In addition to delineating the components of an effective principal evaluation process, Buser and Stuck in 1976 designed a model written instrument to be used. To them the model instrument encompassed four areas. First, the general information section asked for specific names of the principal and evaluator, and dates of the evaluation but in addition, it contained a crucial section in which the evaluator had to check the reason for the evaluation. Buser and Stuck believed that purposes for evaluation ranged from professional growth and development, to improving leadership of the school, to salary determination and employment status. The key element was that the purpose be clearly stated on the instrument at the beginning. The second section contained three general areas with twenty-six competencies which were rated commendable (extreme, high or moderate) or concern (extreme, high or moderate). The headings of the three areas were personal/professional characteristics, administrative processes and job performance. These twenty-six skills were further delineated by a listing of four hun-

²Ibid p.10-12

dred five behaviors that comprised each skill. The third and fourth sections gave the evaluator and the principal the opportunity to write comments and/or reactions in a narrative form.

It was important to note that as early as 1976 when teacher instructional improvement programs were in the infancy stage, Buser and Stuck emphasized the need to re-examine the principal evaluation process. Even at that time they stated that it should be a cooperative process, that if a principal received less than the highest rating, there must be job targets and that the superintendent must ask staff, students, parents and the Board of Education for input.

The evaluation of the principal was an important topic to Buser, as in 1977 he and Hunt published an article in National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin. They stated that the public's cry for accountability forced the principal to be more visible and demanded the principal be evaluated. Although Buser and Hunt listed salary, tenure, transfer, retention and dismissal as reasons for evaluation, they also included professional development and job targets as recent reasons for evaluation. Buser and Hunt specified thirteen criteria that were essential for a system that would assist the principal in the professional development

aspect of evaluation. The components were similar to the ones which had been espoused by Buser and Stuck in 1976. Specifically they included:

1. The purposes of evaluation are well defined and understood.
2. The principal understands performance expectations and measures of them.
3. The evaluation is related to job expectations understood by the Principal and evaluator.
4. The principal and the evaluator both assist in the design of the system.
5. The principal has the opportunity to explain rationale for behavior and action.
6. The evaluation focus is diagnostic more than judgmental.
7. The process is designed for a specific school setting.
8. Evaluations are not based on preconceived ideas, but are made in good faith.
9. The principal receives the evaluator's comments in a constructive way and has time to implement.
10. The evaluation is not a one time meeting but rather based on numerous meetings over a specific time period.
11. The principal may supplement the evaluators ratings by self-evaluation or client evaluations.
12. The principal is aware when he is evaluated.
13. The evaluation is confidential.³

³Hunt, John and Buser, Robert, "Evaluating the Principal" NASSP Bulletin, December 1977 p.13

Hunt and Buser concluded by mentioning that, regardless of the final evaluation process selected, it should incorporate both civil due process and professional due process. In summary, they believed the evaluation system must delineate the purposes, the evaluator, the criteria for the evaluation, the procedures for the process and the designer of the process.

These components were similar to ones that Herman specified in 1977. He developed a rating system to be completed by a committee who was charged with developing a system for principal evaluation. The six main areas identified were: why evaluate, what is to be evaluated, who evaluates, when should the evaluation be conducted, where should it take place and how shall the evaluation be conducted?⁴ Under each category there were numerous items to be weighted on a one to five scale. The committee determining the system arrived at a consensus based on the weightings assigned to the items under each major heading. For example, there were twelve items under the "Why Evaluate" category. These included tenure, salary, demotion, but they also included increasing productivity

⁴Herman, Jerry "Guidelines for Evaluating And Compensating Administrators", NASSP Bulletin, December 1977, p.2-4

of the person, motivation, development of inservice and improvement of instruction. So again there was the professional/personal development category in addition to the old stand-bys of salary, promotion and tenure. Each member of the committee rated the twelve items on the one to five scale, and mathematically the top reasons for evaluation were calculated. Herman believed that this allowed each school committee to "personalize" the evaluation process for their specific needs.

The idea that was espoused by Herman of allowing a local constituency to determine the why, what, who, when, where and how of the principal evaluation process was seconded by Culbertson in a speech given to the American Association of School Administrators Convention in 1977. He stated that "more specifically, since the learning objectives will differ from school to school and at different times in the same school, sets of criteria for evaluating principals in different schools and at different times will necessarily differ. Thus, evaluation systems will need to help individual schools, which have differing objectives, be accountable to their immediate clientele and the specific neighborhoods served."⁵

⁵Culbertson, Jack, Evaluation of Middle Administrative Personnel, AASA 1977 p.4

In 1979 Zakrajsek summarized what Hunt, Buser, Stuck and Herman had embraced, "In the past, evaluation was used as a vehicle to hire, fire or retain principals. The trend now appears to be toward using evaluation as a method of improving principal activity and providing feedback as to the results of planned activity."⁶ Zakrajsek viewed fifteen specific models and categorized the evaluation models as to types for their strengths and weaknesses. First, there was the checklist which as an instrument was efficient but could be invalid because of a halo or horn effect. (A tendency to rate a person overall too high or too low, respectively because of a recent event or past record). Second, there was a ranking scale, but humanists questioned how human performance equated to numbers. Third, the critical incident model relied upon evaluating the principal's behavior and effectiveness in solving a specific critical incident. This model was criticized as it ignored much of the administrator's performance and evaluated only a few actions. The fourth model that emerged was a criteria based model which emphasized "on the job", real life

⁶Zakrajsek, Barbara, "Evaluation Systems: A Critical Look", NASSP Bulletin, January 1979, p.101

situations with a wide variety of data gathering methods and instruments. The criteria given in this model are general enough to apply to almost every situation."⁷ The major difficulty with this model was that general criteria and behavior standards that were formulated were applied to each principal in the same way. If each principal had unique strengths, this caused a problem. Fifth, Zakrajsek identified a competency based model which listed specific competencies or skills a principal should have. The principal had little control over this model as the skills were predetermined. The next system was one developed by the now defunct Department of Health, Education and Welfare which combined a goal orientation with a rating scale. In theory this was difficult as two philosophies competed. The seventh system was a spin-off from the business management by objective system and it emphasized goals, targets and objectives. Although goals were difficult to write, this system allowed principals flexibility. This system gave principals a direction to follow and a means upon which they were evaluated. Last, Zakrajsek discussed the behavior-frequency model developed by Halpin which worked

⁷Ibid, p.110

only with the leadership aspect of the principal's job.

Zakrajsek spent considerable time reviewing the specific models in use prior to 1979 and categorizing them as to general type. Later in this chapter it becomes apparent that many systems are a combination of one or more of the systems identified by Zakrajsek in 1979. For example, several systems currently in use, utilize competencies, goal setting and job descriptions with a combination of rating scales and narratives. In conclusion, Zakrajsek summarized what she and her colleagues felt were the direction and components of effective principal evaluation for the 1980's.

Evaluation should provide more direction than the mere reliance on accountability. Evaluation should provide for growth of the principal. It should give him a profile of where he stands in the eyes of others and suggest ways he might improve. Besides an interest in others views, evaluation should provide the principal with an opportunity to set goals for himself and to personally evaluate progress made toward the goals. By allowing a variety of people to take part in the evaluation process, a look at all the situations surrounding the principal is easily available. Finally evaluation of secondary principals should not be unique unto itself. It should be incorporated into the⁸ general organization of the entire school system.

During the early 1980's principal evaluation systems (which are discussed in the next two sections

⁸Ibid, p.111

of this chapter) were being developed; although not much more was written concerning components a good system should contain until the middle 1980's. Farrar indicated that there were several differences between effective elementary and secondary school principals so that this dictated the need for different evaluation criteria. High schools were larger; tended to be more diverse both academically and socially; were a more complex organization; were faculty subject oriented; had frequent student movement from class to class; had more faculty resistance; and contained a more complex administrative role for the principal than elementary schools. These differences necessitated the need for evaluation systems for secondary principals being different than those for elementary principals, although there were certainly some components in common. This coincided with Culbertson's concerns that needs or components for principal evaluation systems differed in different settings at different times.

This concern was reiterated and reinforced in an ERIC Action Brief by the National Institute of Education in 1980. The contention was that an effective leader was one whose style was integrated with the needs of the organization. Thus it followed "that a good evaluation

program must be sensitive to the different situations that arise in schools; standardized evaluations that treat all leaders and all schools in the same way may not provide accurate measures of leadership effectiveness."⁹ The institute reported the results of a project conducted in Georgia entitled the Results Oriented Management in Education. This project included both elementary and secondary schools in urban, suburban and rural districts and involved rating Principals on how frequently and how effectively they demonstrated competencies. Evaluators included students, teachers, central office personnel, external observers and the principal. The results pointed to several areas that needed to be considered when designing an effective system. The five key components identified for a successful process included:

1. Evaluations needed to be specific and reflect the conditions at each school.
2. Checklists of competencies used instead of essays.
3. The process utilized client centered assessment and involved as many groups as possible as evaluators of the principal (i.e. teachers, students, parents).
4. Teachers were the best evaluators of principal effectiveness, but in this study there were more elementary than secondary schools.

⁹National Institute of Education, ERIC Action Brief 12 1980, p. 3

5. The quality or effectiveness of a competency was more important than the quantity or frequency of its use.

The importance of including client centered feedback as part of the principal evaluation process was emphasized by Bailey in 1984. He contended that faculty feedback be utilized as an emphasis on administrative improvement as opposed to evaluation. Teachers now have clinical supervision, video-tapes and other methodologies to help them improve; whereas, the principal remains in an isolated position. Bailey admitted that the quantity of quality faculty feedback forms was scarce and that several factors were considered when a form was developed. Factors decided were the areas of interest for the feedback, the specific items addressed for each area, the format chosen (i.e. essay, multiple choice, continuum), the timing of data collection, risk to the faculty and preparing psychologically for feedback. Bailey contended that, "if administrators are to become the leaders the faculty and public expect them to be, they must model those practices that communicate a commitment to excellence. They must practice what they expect of their teachers and that is to become the best that they can

be."¹⁰ According to Bailey, faculty feedback is a gigantic step towards making the previous transition occur.

In 1984 Allen, Pellica and Boardman professed the importance of a conceptual framework for improving administrator performance. They espoused a Contingency Framework for Administrator Development which was based on the premise that administrative processes were contingent upon the type of organization, the environment of the organization at a particular moment and the specific tasks to be completed.¹¹ The model was based on the three dimensions of administrator tasks, processes and traits. The tasks included instruction, pupil personnel, school/community relations, staff, facilities, auxiliary services, finance and organization. The processes were the same as those developed years ago by Gulick and Fayol and they encompassed planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting. Last, the traits were comprised of the twelve factors identified by the National Association of Secondary School

¹⁰Bailey, Gerald, "Faculty Feedback For Administrators, A Means To Improve Leadership Behavior", NASSP Bulletin, January 1984, p.9

¹¹Allen, Carol, Pellicer, Leon and Boardman, Gerald, "Model For Administrator Training, Development Uses Both Theory And Practice", NASSP Bulletin, January 1984, p.14-19

principal's Assessment Centers. The authors contended that their model allowed for flexibility and individualization. For example, if the task was curriculum development, the process was directing and the trait was leadership. By reviewing, studying and applying these three dimensions, an administrator's performance improved.

Also, in 1984 Look and Manatt published a report concerning principal evaluation. They believed, "At the very least, principal performance appraisal fulfills a legal requirement; at best, it is a process to improve the administrator's performance."¹² To them there were problems inherent in principal evaluation that needed to be resolved. Look and Manatt contended the debate concerning whether a principal was an instructional leader or manager was wasted effort because both areas needed to be evaluated. Second, evaluations for elementary and secondary principals needed to be different because work situations weren't similar. As Farrar and others stated, the secondary school principal had more teachers, a larger facility, a more diversified curriculum, and more publics to address than an elementary school principal. In

¹²Look, Ellen and Manatt, Richard "Evaluating Principal Performance With Improved Criteria" NASSP Bulletin, December 1984, p.76

addition, Look and Manatt emphasized that the collective judgment of a client-centered evaluation was crucial. Clients, including teachers, must only be asked to judge what they observed. Finally, Look and Manatt said that there were four questions to be answered when designing a performance evaluation system for principals. The questions were, "What are your criteria? How high are your standards? How will you monitor and report progress? How will you improve performance after you have a benchmark of current performance?"¹³

Ernest added a sense of humor to the entire process in 1985 when he entitled principal evaluations as "can you eat, sleep and laugh?"¹⁴ His contention was that if a principal did all three, he wasn't overstressed by the job. On the serious side, Ernest believed the principal evaluation process focused on the areas of professional development, and strengths of the principal, and provided feedback. The importance of principal evaluation was that if faculty were to be evaluated, the principal modeled behavior and was involved in an evaluation process also. Specifically, Ernest identified

¹³Ibid, p.80

¹⁴Ernest, Bill "Can You Eat? Can You Sleep? Can You Laugh? The Why and How of Evaluating Principals", The Clearing House, March 1985, p.290

several key components that permeated a good process.

They were:

1. The purpose is clear and understood by all involved.
2. The atmosphere is one of respect and mutual trust.
3. The evaluation is purposeful.
4. The evaluation is objective.
5. The focus of the evaluation is growth and development not punitive.
6. The evaluation includes self-evaluation and client-centered information. In other words the rating must reflect a consensus of several people not just the superintendent.
7. The evaluation instrument is simple and easy to administer and score.
8. The process is formative and summative.
9. The process is monitored for its effectiveness.¹⁵

In summary, Ernest stated, "If principal evaluation systems are not designed so that performance is improved, we will not have profited from the years of trial and error involved with teacher evaluation."¹⁶

Also, in 1985 Bellon published a paper entitled, Developing A Comprehensive Personnel Evaluation Program

¹⁵Ibid p.290-92

¹⁶Ibid p.292

in which he advocated a three-pronged administrator evaluation process which was one part of a comprehensive program evaluating all school personnel.¹⁷ The three-part process included assessing principal performance according to a position description, yearly work plans and leadership processes. Thus, he combined the concepts of both individualizing for the school setting and general leadership competencies. In addition he encouraged the system was well planned, allowed for continuous, systematic feedback and clearly understood by all involved.

In 1986 Langlois proposed that an effective principal evaluation process included self-evaluation, evaluation by the immediate supervisor and evaluation by staff members. He stated that teachers be included because, "No one is in a better position than your teachers to determine whether you (the principal) are performing satisfactorily. Teachers see you in action everyday, and they know more about you than you realize. Pull them in on your evaluation. You'll be pleased and suprised at the results."¹⁸ By requesting input from the faculty the

¹⁷Bellon, Jerry, Developing A Comprehensive Evaluation Program, p.1

¹⁸Langlois, Donald E. "The Sky Won't Fall If Teachers Evaluate Principal's Performance", The Executive Educator March 1986, p.20

principal let them know what was expected of administrators, improved morale and allowed faculty input towards the principal's yearly goals.

Eleven years after his 1977 article on guidelines for evaluating and compensating administrators, Herman wrote again in the National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin concerning the same topic. He began by stating, "Administrators are evaluated daily by teachers, students, parents, employees and their supervisors. The challenge is to create an effective evaluation system based on the competencies that the local decision makers deem important to excellence in administrative performance."¹⁹ Herman indicated that a good competency evaluation system needed to integrate five areas. The areas were:

1. A clear statement of competency areas
2. A list of sample indicators
3. Evidence was provided for ratings
4. Competency areas were weighted
5. The weighting determined according to the level of the administrator. (i.e. department chair, assistant principal, principal)²⁰

¹⁹Herman, Jerry J. "Evaluating Administrators - Assessing the Competencies" NASSP Bulletin, May 1988, p.5

²⁰Ibid p.5

Specifically, Herman advocated fourteen competency areas with a weighting of one to five depending on the administrative level. Herman took a step beyond just suggesting components and he illustrated how the system converted to determine merit pay. Total possible points divided by the amount of money available ascertained the amount per point. Administrators received merit pay based on their point totals.

The Northwest Educational Cooperative under a contract with the Illinois State Board of Education collected information and published a manual for a handbook for the Illinois Administrators Academy from 1986-1988 entitled, The Evaluation of Principals As Instructional Leaders. This occurred as a result of mandates in Illinois Senate Bill 730 which clearly stated that fifty-one percent of a principal's time should be spent in instructional leadership and observing teachers. Superintendents who evaluated principals were required to attend a two day workshop at which time the previously mentioned manual served as a textbook. The Administrators Academy stressed the importance that principal evaluation procedures and processes were field tested, used research-based evaluation criteria, utilized multiple data sources, employed multiple evaluators and used the evaluators who best observed and evaluated the principal

in a natural setting.²¹ In addition, the workshop indicated that there were several factors to consider when developing an evaluation process. First, the process was objective with the evaluation criteria equitable and measurable. Next, the system was specific and simple. The data were easy to comprehend and the criteria with outcomes precisely listed. Last, the process both motivated the principal and coordinated with other staff development programs.²² Based on the research conducted to compile the manual, the Illinois State Board of Education through the Administrators Academy suggested that a very complex, multi-faceted process of principal evaluation be employed in school districts. This system is discussed in detail along with several other systems in the next two sections of the review of literature.

Section Two: Studies Of Principal Evaluation Processes And Recommendations Of The Studies

In 1986, Lindahl speculated that, "There seems to be constant pressure from local school boards, state legislatures and educational organizations for revision of

²¹Northwest Educational Cooperative, The Evaluation of Principals As Instructional Leaders, 1986, p.25

²²Ibid, p.10

employee evaluation practices. While these pressures have traditionally focused upon teacher evaluation, school effectiveness studies over the past decade have so valued the impact of the principal on the educational process that more and more districts are re-assessing and reformulating their evaluation systems for principals as well."²³ Prior to Lindahl's 1986 comments, much time was spent on teacher evaluation. Only in the last several years has the focus changed to include the principal evaluation process.

In 1981, a group consisting of Duhamel, Cyze, Lamacraft and Rutherford conducted an extensive study concerning the status of principal evaluation processes in Ontario, Canada. They randomly selected fifty of one hundred thirty-six boards of education and twenty-four of fifty-seven Roman Catholic Schools. The threefold purpose of the study was to ascertain if formal evaluation of principals was occurring; if it did occur, to categorize it as a process, presage, or outcome approach; and to determine the extent of use of each type of approach. First, they found the process approach was the most com-

²³Lindahl, Ronald A. "Implementing A New Evaluation System For Principals: An Experience in Planned Change", Planning and Changing, Winter 1986, p.224

mon evaluative style utilized by fifty-six percent of the respondents. The process approach involved using behavior norms as a measure to determine a principal's effectiveness. The extent to which a principal's performance was congruent with behavior norms determined effectiveness. The three types of norms were organization, comportment and presentation. The process approach allowed for checklists and observation forms to be utilized and permitted data gathering from multiple sources. The drawbacks were the amount of time involved, the length and number of observations, the training of the observer, and the observer's effect on the setting.

Second, the least used approach was presage. This included lists of norms for each component of effective principal behavior. If the principal met or exceeded the norms, the principal was effective. The components were academic and professional qualifications, physical characteristics, and extra-curricular involvement. The authors contended this approach was factual and information was easily obtained; however, there was no good evidence that there was any relation between presage criteria and a principal's effectiveness.

Third, the outcome approach assessed the extent to which a principal achieved a goal that he had written with his supervisor. The approach had merit as the prin-

principal and supervisor established goals and outcomes and it gave the principals some control; but, the authors found principals were not adequately trained in goal setting.

Based on the study, Duhamel, Cyze, Lamacraft and Rutherford had several conclusions. First, sixty percent of the respondents had a formal process, but forty percent did not. Second, if a formal process was utilized, the forms completed were complex. Third, process was the most commonly used, although several districts used the process approach together with the outcome approach. "Finally, and most importantly, very few systems seemed to have addressed three questions which appeared to be basic to evaluation. What is the function of the principal in the jurisdiction? How well is the principal fulfilling that function? What evidence is offered in support of the preceding question?"²⁴ In conclusion the authors stressed four specific important guidelines for an effective principal evaluation process.

1. The expectations were clearly defined.
2. Once the function was defined; periodic evaluations were conducted employing a variety of styles.

²⁴Duhamel, Ronald Cyze, Michael, Lamacraft, George and Rutherford, Carol. "The Evaluation of Principals", Education Canada , Summer 1981, p.26

3. The evaluation was based on predetermined clear criteria which were mutually accepted.
4. The main reason for the process was to improve the principal's performance and maintain a superior learning environment for the pupils.²⁵

In 1984 Buser wrote again about principal evaluation when he and Banks summarized the results of a study concerning principal evaluation conducted by Banks. The sample for the survey was the elected officers of the state affiliates of the American Association of School Administrators, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Association of Elementary School Principals and the National Education Association. The study sought to ascertain the views of the aforementioned groups concerning who evaluated the principal, what was the purpose for evaluation, what was the focus and what were the conditions. First, ninety-five percent of the respondents believed the superintendent must evaluate the principal and ninety-four percent agreed a self-evaluation must be included. Only forty percent believed teachers should evaluate principals; however, in the teacher subgroup eighty-seven percent stated they must be involved.

²⁵Ibid, p.27

As for the purpose, there was a ninety-eight percent agreement that the top purpose was to assist the principal in professional growth. The other three reasons, with over ninety percent acceptance, were to improve leadership, to identify job targets or competencies for improvement, and to acknowledge the quality of performance.

In the third area concerning the focus of the evaluation there again were minimal differences. One hundred percent of the respondents believed the top priority was the principal's effectiveness in the administrative processes of planning, decision making and supervising. In addition, ninety-eight percent stated the principal's effectiveness in being an administrator of curriculum was important. The third important focus cited was the principal's personal characteristics such as personality, appearance and leadership. Last, there were four conditions for principal evaluation which received over ninety percent agreement. These four included: the principal received the evaluation and had adequate time to improve, the principal had a conference with his supervisor to discuss the evaluation, the principal was aware of performance expectations and measures, and the principal had the opportunity to be involved in the design of the process. A significant area of dis-

agreement was that the process be tailored to the individual principal.

In reviewing the results, Buser and Banks alluded to three surprising results. First, there was significant agreement amongst the groups as to the purpose, conditions and focus of principal evaluation. Second, there was limited support for the idea of designing the evaluation with the individual principal in mind. This was perplexing given the popularity of management by objective in the business sector. Third, it was noted by all groups that personal characteristics were an important criteria. Buser and Banks stated the study reiterated and reinforced the notions that the evaluator was the superintendent, that the purposes were improved job performance and professional growth, and that the primary focus of the evaluation was the administrative processes. Finally, Buser and Banks questioned the lack of support the respondents gave for client involvement (i.e. parent, student, community) in the principal evaluation process given the public's current cry for accountability.

In 1985 and 1986 Murphy, Hallinger and Peterson reported the results of a study they conducted in 1984. The study reviewed in depth the supervising and evaluating of principals in school districts the authors deemed effective. There were two reasons they directed the

study. First they stated teachers received evaluation even if it were symbolic; whereas, principals were generally not supervised or evaluated. Second, teachers' classrooms were visited but many principals were never visited by the superintendent in the principal's building because of geographic circumstances.²⁶ The threefold purpose of the study encompassed searching for characteristics or factors related to school effectiveness; examining leadership activities of the superintendent; and determining the district office's and Superintendents' roles in supervising, evaluating and controlling the principal. The remarks here have been limited to the third purpose. Twelve districts from one thousand in California were selected including four unified, three high school and five elementary. Selection was determined by the student achievement scores on the California Assessment Program aggregated to the district level. Those districts whose scores consistently exceeded the scores of other districts over the three year time span of 1982-1984 were the twelve selected. Data collection consisted of interviewing superintendents in July of

²⁶Murphy, Joseph, Hallenger, Phillip and Peterson, Kent D. "Supervising and Evaluating Principals: Lessons From Effective Districts", Educational Leadership, October 1985, p.79

1984, and reviewing documents (i.e. district goals, forms) to check for validity. In ten of the twelve districts the superintendent directly evaluated and supervised the principal. In the other two districts, (which were the largest of the twelve) the assistant superintendent was the direct line supervisor.

A significant finding was that all twelve superintendents were very active in visiting the schools in their districts. Superintendents of large districts visited schools as often as those in smaller districts, but the superintendents in large ones tended to not visit each school as often. The average time spent visiting schools was twenty-one eight hour days or eight to ten percent of the superintendent's time. The authors noted that both the number of visits and amount of time spent were substantially greater than those found in a random sample. The superintendents visited the schools for three reasons including checking and reviewing perceptions and information; building the culture of the district and increasing his knowledge base; and supervising the principal and role modeling.

A second significant finding was that the evaluation process of principals utilized by these districts was characterized by a high degree of rationality. The key factor for the process in seven of twelve districts

was yearly school and/or principal objectives. All twelve districts required principals to write yearly work agendas to achieve the school goals or school board's objectives for the year. Procedures on a yearly basis included a beginning of the year conference with the principal to set performance indicators or write goals, monitoring throughout the year, and a final formal written evaluation. A very important portion of determining the principal's objectives for the year involved student test scores. Eight superintendents, six formally and two informally, used student test scores to evaluate the principal. In other words, during the initial conference at the beginning of the year, the superintendent set targets for student achievement test scores. It was important that in all the review of literature, this was the only study which utilized student test scores in such a manner. Other data employed by superintendents in their evaluation of principals was quantifiable data from their own observations and feedback from staff, community and district office personnel. However, the superintendents always "checked out" data they did not personally observe. Twenty principals or fifteen percent of the principals in these districts were removed from the principalship. The authors contended that this high percentage was due to the accountability inherent in the

processes used in these districts.

Thus, the authors concluded that the overall supervision and evaluation of principals in these districts were epitomized by clear procedures and evaluation criteria, active superintendent involvement, and a high degree of rationality. The supervision and evaluation processes linked the individual schools with the district office and tended to focus on curriculum and instruction. Finally, the principal evaluation relied quite heavily on outcome controls such as student achievement.

At approximately the same time the previous study was being directed, Duke and Stiggins conducted a descriptive study on principal evaluation in the state of Oregon. Although this study had some serious flaws such as a biased sample, poor statistical choice, and a few misleading findings, it was worthy of mention. The questions which generated the study were as follows. Is principal evaluation based on clear, specific performance standards? Do procedures exist to allow for the collection of valid and reliable data? Are the consequences of the evaluation rational and understood?²⁷ The strati-

²⁷Duke, Daniel and Stiggers, Richard, "Evaluating the Performance of Principals", Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 21, No. 4, Fall 1985

fied random sample consisted of thirty school districts in Oregon. One third of the school districts had less than 1,000 students, one third had more than 4,000 students and one third had between 1,000 and 4,000. Superintendents were requested to complete a questionnaire and then identify two principals to complete the same survey. This obviously biased the sample. After field testing a questionnaire the authors settled on eleven topics to be explored. The topics were:

1. Purpose of principal evaluation
2. Procedures used to acquaint the principal with the process
3. Components of the process
4. Performance standards for the principal
5. Procedures for determining the principal's goals
6. Procedures for determining the school's goals
7. Sources of information/evidence used in the principal's evaluation
8. Frequency of evaluation
9. Relationship between professional development and principal evaluation
10. Satisfaction with the process
11. Consequences of a negative or positive evaluation.²⁸

²⁸Ibid, p.73

Even though the results were categorized in five areas (total sample, supervisors, principals, high school principals and elementary principals) only the total sample results were addressed in this review because it was unclear how determinations of category were made. (i.e. What is a supervisor?)

For the first topic, which asked the purpose of evaluation, respondents were asked to respond both according to their belief and to the district's values. The two highest in both categories were professional development and improving students' performance. The belief category had percentages of sixty-four and twenty-six respectively for the two purposes; whereas, the district value category's percentages were much lower with both at twenty-five percent. As for the way in which the principal was informed about the process for evaluation, respondents indicated that sixty-one percent were told verbally, while only thirty-six percent stated the process was given to them in a written form in a district handbook. Next, there was ninety percent agreement that the evaluation components were a supervisor's review of the principal's performance and eighty percent identified the principal's attainment of goals as important also. It was significant to note that the least liked

components were peer review at three percent and community evaluation at ten percent. Over half of the districts had performance standards and seventy-five percent of the districts utilized personal and professional goal setting. In determining school goals, sixty-four of the districts set district goals which schools used, and a little less than half considered program evaluation and student performance data.

The area in which the least agreement occurred involved the evidence that was used to formulate principal evaluation. Forty-two percent of the districts used the supervisor's perception of the principal and the individual school's performance to do the evaluation. Fewer than nine percent gathered data from teachers, parents or other school personnel. A formative evaluation was only conducted by thirty-nine percent of the districts; whereas, a summative evaluation was held once a year by eighty-five percent of the districts.

Another significant finding, according to Duke and Stiggers, was that eighty percent of the respondents stated evaluation and performance should be linked; however, only forty-nine percent declared it was actually linked in their district. Furthermore those forty-nine percent continued by stating that the linkage was done to

correct deficiencies through principal's attendance at workshops. Last, the respondents listed three shortcomings of principal evaluation as it was currently being done. There was lack of reward for excellent performance, inadequate time for supervisors to observe and evaluate, and a lack of specific performance criteria. As a final note, the authors indicated that district size was a determining factor as to the amount of time the supervisor observed the principal, the presence or absence of performance standards, and the requirement of inclusion of a self evaluation in the process. As was expected, in larger districts less than one-half of the respondents directly observed the principal, but in the small districts the percentage was eighty-two. Sixty percent of the large districts had performance standards and used self assessment; whereas, this occurred in approximately only one-third of the smaller districts.

In summary, Duke and Stiggers declared that the data indicated that principal evaluation was most effective when there was agreement about the purpose, and when the perceived purposes corresponded to the actual ones. Also, the most desirable purpose was to promote professional development. They continued by stating that the reality of school management was a dichotomy between

accountability (i.e. personnel decisions) and improvement (i.e. professional growth). Finally, the authors questioned whether principal evaluation was a priority at all. They believed the districts placed far more importance on the supervision and evaluation of teachers compared to that placed on principal evaluation.

One year later, Lindahl wrote a case study concerning how a new principal evaluation process was determined and implemented in his district. The process was introduced over two full years in a large urban district consisting of thirty elementary schools and fifteen high schools. The backbone of the process was as Lindahl stated, "The primary benefit of a system lies much more in its potential to guide the professional growth and development of the administration than in its summative evaluation function."²⁹

First, there was a nine step development process which was the superintendent's primary goal for the 1984-85 school year. The steps were:

1. Determine a development committee
2. Secure a consultant

²⁹Lindahl, Ronald, "Implementing A New Evaluation System For Principals: An Experience in Planned Change", Planning and Changing, Winter 1986, p.224

3. Investigate plans currently in use in other systems
4. Review the literature
5. Develop a pilot plan
6. Obtain approval of the plan by those involved in its implementation and evaluation
7. Develop inservice to teach people the plan
8. Provide for formative evaluation of the plan
9. Write board₃₀ policy and secure board approval of the system.

The development committee consisted of teachers, principals, district level administrators and an outside consultant. The cornerstone of the administrative evaluation process encompassed the seven principles espoused by Bolton in 1980. This included a self evaluation; monitoring for effectiveness; input, process and output; common and unique objectives; formative and summative evaluation; and interrelating the system to other school systems.³¹

The new system developed in Lindahl's district had a broad input base. Three members were determined to evaluate each principal so as to lower the possibility of

³⁰ Ibid, p.225

³¹ Bolton, Dale L., Evaluating Administrative Personnel in School Systems, New York: Columbia University, 1980

bias and increase the perception base. The committee was composed of the principal's direct supervisor, the respective director of elementary or secondary education and a peer of the principal's own choosing. Information regarding the principal's performance was solicited from teachers and a few students and parents. The data were collected in a variety of ways including a survey, campus visitations, site observations, interviews and document analysis.³² Principals were given three year contracts so the observation cycle was formative for years one and two and summative for year three. Each principal had a job description with common objectives and unique objectives detailed in a school improvement plan and personal/professional development plan.

Lindah1 remarked that as the new system was implemented, several principals felt threatened, but many principals appreciated the faculty and community input. The drawback to the system was the time involved; however, Lindahl declared there was now a state mandate and their system was more rigid and comprehensive than the mandate.

In 1986 Harrison and Peterson expounded on the pitfalls involved in the evaluation of principals. They

³²Op Cit, Lindahl p.226

explained that even if a system for evaluation was in operation, inconsistencies developed because of the nature of the principal's work. "The evaluation mechanisms in school districts face a much more complex set of problems than the simple house thermostat. In school districts the thermostat must assess a complex set of conditions, try to determine what is the acceptable standard and then attempt to activate resources to correct the deviation resources that are often not available or difficult to activate."³³ The authors claimed that many studies of evaluation processes failed because a conceptual framework was not used to guide the investigation. Therefore, when Harrison and Peterson studied the principal evaluation processes used in a southern state, they used the theoretical model espoused by Natriello and Dornbush in 1981. This model had four areas which were allocating tasks, setting criteria, sampling performance and appraising.³⁴

For their study, Harrison and Peterson selected a southern state where a standard process had been imple-

³²Harrison, William C. and Peterson, Kent D., "Pitfalls In the Evaluation of Principals", The Urban Review, Vol. 18, No. 4, p.222

³³Ibid, p.223

mented with some discretion left to the local school districts. The sample included a random selection of two hundred principals and all one hundred forty-two superintendents in the state. One concern of the researchers was that superintendents might report inaccurately what they did so as not to be vulnerable to sanctions in case they were digressing too much from the state mandate.³⁵ The questionnaire sent to principals and superintendents requested information about the criteria used in the evaluation process; the focus and purpose of the evaluation; sources of information used; and if the results were perceived as important. Harrison and Peterson reviewed the results in the framework of the Dornbush and Natriello model.

First, in the allocating of tasks and setting criteria areas, there was a discrepancy. Even though there was a state job description for the principal and the principals and superintendents agreed it was accurate, there was considerable question and uncertainty with the superintendents' interpretation of criteria for a principal's performance. Eighty percent of the superintendents stated they made it clear to principals what

³⁵Ibid, p.225

the expectations for performance were; however, only fifty-eight percent of the principals said the criteria were clear to them. Thus, superintendents were not as good as they believed they were in communicating expectations to the principals.

In the third area of sampling performance outcome there were differences in the principals' and superintendents' views. The principals indicated they believed the reaction of the public was the most important factor for performance; whereas, the superintendents ranked it fifth and ranked the quality of instruction as number one. Furthermore, the superintendents stated their number one source for information concerning the principals performance was the principal, but the principals believed it was the parents and community. The two groups' views digressed further when the question arose as to the frequency of times the superintendents visited schools. Eighty-one percent of the superintendents claimed they visited schools frequently but only thirty-seven percent of the principals agreed.

Studying the processes in light of the fourth stage in the model, there appeared again to be a lack of communication regarding the performance criteria. Both superintendents and principals agreed that superinten-

dents communicated satisfaction, but they disagreed on how frequently the superintendents conveyed dissatisfaction.

In summary, the authors stated, "Criteria are often not communicated to principals clearly, sampling is sometimes infrequent or dependent on biased sampling procedures or potentially unreliable providers of data, and appraisal uses standards devised more from reference group assessments than from quantitative appraisals of behavior and performance."³⁶ Further, they contended that discrepancies occurred in the first three stages of setting criteria, sampling performance and communicating feedback.

Again in 1988 Harrison and Peterson wrote about the same study and reiterated the key points. "Superintendents must make their expectations for principals performance clear, ensuring that the principals understand the tasks they are to accomplish, the criteria used to assess performance, the type of data used, and the ways performance outcomes are appraised."³⁷

³⁶Ibid, p.233

³⁷Harrison, William C. and Peterson, Kent D., "Evaluation of Principals: The Process Can Be Improved" NASSP Bulletin, May 1988, Vol. 72, p.4

Section Three: Processes Or Systems For Principal Evaluation

In 1981 Black spoke to the National Association of School Boards annual meeting in Dallas. He detailed a process of principal evaluation used at that time in the Keystone Oaks School District. The system was based on key result areas that were espoused by the Dale Carnegie Seminars. Each administrator had a job description that was developed by the principal and Assistant Superintendent and approved by the Superintendent and the School Board. The principal and assistant superintendent wrote ten key result areas that delineated what the principal must do to complete the job satisfactorily. There was a meeting three times a year (September, January and May) between the principal and superintendent to assess the principal's performance toward the key result areas. Each key result area was rated on a zero to six scale with zero as unacceptable to six as outstanding. The key factor in this entire process was that the degree to which a principal achieved his key result areas determined his merit pay. The school board, each year, appropriated a monetary value to each point. Thus, a perfect rating was sixty which was achieved by scoring six in all ten areas. A principal's merit pay was his score multi-

plied by the monetary allotment per point. There was no evidence in this report as to principals' satisfaction with the system or if they viewed the process as encouraging professional development or totally salary related.

In 1975, the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) introduced education to a concept that was widely and successfully used in the business world. The concept was an assessment center which had the two-fold purpose of promoting improved training programs for principals and improving the quality of leadership at the building level. It was developed with help from the American Psychological Association. By February of 1985, there were thirty centers in twenty-two states and approximately two thousand four hundred seventy educators had attended. The centers operated as follows. There were twelve participants and a team of six assessors. During a two-day period the participants completed a series of simulations, interviews and tests. Specifically, there were twelve skill dimensions that were being assessed. They were: problem analysis, judgment, organizational ability, decisiveness, leadership, sensitivity, stress tolerance, oral communication, written communication, range of interests, personal motivation and education values. The team of assessors gathered

data and spent three days describing and discussing the behavior and skills of each participant before arriving at a consensus. The validity of the centers was assessed and completed in 1979. As a result of these centers, a principal evaluation system called LEAP was developed.

In 1981 Redfern advocated a system for evaluating administrators entitled Leadership Excellence Achievement Plan (LEAP). This process was based on a position description, administrative skills, and work goals and was both formative and summative. First, both the principal and superior agreed on the technical competencies which comprised the job description. Second, the principal's performance was reviewed in terms of twelve administrator skills identified by the National Association of Secondary School Principals Assessment Centers. These skills included: problem analysis, judgment, organizational ability, decisiveness, leadership, sensitivity, range of interests, personal motivation, educational values, stress tolerance, oral communication skills and written skills. Third, the principal was evaluated in terms of yearly performance goals that had specific outcomes which were measured.

The process consisted of four official meetings during the year between the principal and his supervisor.

At the first meeting the principal and supervisor reviewed past evaluations, the job description and administrative skills, and then jointly determined the performance goals or work plan for the year. If the principal was performing satisfactorily, the work goals were entitled a development plan; however, if the principal was unsatisfactory, the work goals were an improvement plan.

The development plan consisted of a few competencies on which the principal worked in depth; whereas, an improvement plan was a much more explicit statement of deficiencies and the specific corrective actions that needed to be done. The second and third meetings were held to review the principal's progress in the three areas of the job description, administrative skills and work goals. Redfern stated, "Classroom observation is the primary monitoring tool for teachers. The progress review is the most effective method for administrators."³⁸ The progress reviews were formative and allowed for modification of work goals based on specific situations.

³⁸Redfern, George, "Evaluation of Principals", The Practitioner, June 1981 Vol. VIII, No. 4, p.6

Finally, there was a summative or appraisal conference held between the principal and his evaluator at the end of the year. Prior to the conference the principal had completed a self evaluation. Redfern suggested that there were scaled categories with a three to five point rating scale and a narrative assessment. Thus, this system encompassed both common objectives (job description and administrative skills) and unique objectives (work goals), and it included both summative and formative evaluation. In addition, the uniqueness of each principal's individual school setting was taken into account through the work plan phase.

In 1982, Hartley described a specific process of evaluation utilized by her superintendent. The superintendent appeared in Hartley's office one day and observed her the entire day. The two had a conference at the end of the day and Hartley was instructed to write the superintendent's comments down so that the superintendent could review them to make certain Hartley understood what was discussed.

Specifically, the process consisted of a pre-observation conference, observation, pre-conference planning, post observation conference, summary and final report. This was similar to clinical supervision of a

classroom teacher although this observation was a surprise, lasted an entire day, and had the principal writing the final report with the superintendent checking it for accuracy. Hartley advocated this system because the superintendent was visible, he learned about the school, he observed other staff in the process, it helped the principal analyze behavior and the process adapted to the person.

Manning, who in 1983 was Superintendent of Orange County Public Schools in Virginia, wrote then about the process of principal evaluation. He recommended that a process combine motivation with evaluation. He employed six strategies to motivate. They included: allowing the principal to select teachers; giving the principal the freedom to distribute the money allocated for his school in anyway he desired; ensuring the principal made the final decisions; allocating the money for leadership staff development; equalizing central office and the principal; and recognizing performance.³⁹ In addition, Manning stated that the process was simple since it had a job description, specific objectives and coordinated with staff

³⁹Manning, Renfro C. "Improving Performance Through Motivation And Evaluation", ERS Spectrum, Spring 1983, p.34

development. Thus, Manning believed a principal must be a top level rather than middle manager and that the motivation was a key factor.

A system that in Kansas in 1984 employed client centered assessment was described by Anderson and Bartlett. The system encompassed a position guide with the two divisions of position requirements and position holder qualifications. There were forty three behaviors for principals listed under the six divisions of administrative skills, instructional leadership skills, supervisory skills, interpersonal/communication skills, professional activities and special assignments. Computer forms were distributed to teachers and students who, throughout the school year, marked the occasion and the date on which a specific behavior was observed. The behavior was rated as disappointing, acceptable, commended and outstanding. The data from the forms was compiled in the superintendent's office in one of five columns: no data, needs to improve (data shows negative display), satisfactory (data shows meets expectations), above average (data shows exceeds standards), or outstanding (data shows really exceeds standards). The principal and the superintendent met to review and analyze the data. This process was continuous and cyclical,

it was objective and the evaluation criteria were specifically stated. It did not use individually set performance objectives and goals.

Another system which utilized client centered assessment was the Profile for Assessment of Leadership (PAL) which was employed in DeKalb County, Georgia. It was an excellent system for principal evaluation that incorporated many of the characteristics that were mentioned as important in Section One.

The process developed when a committee of ten members consisting of teachers, administrators, college professors and district level personnel narrowed a list of ten thousand behaviors to one hundred twenty. A list of the one hundred twenty behaviors was mailed to five hundred educators in the state of Georgia who were asked to rate each behavior as a yes or no for effective leadership. This list was finally narrowed to eighty-two behaviors with indicators and descriptors. The overall evaluation system operated with a pre-assessment conference, client centered assessment, and formative and summative conferences. It has been validated and the principals that used it truly expressed positive feeling about subordinate evaluation.

Specifically, the principal was evaluated in two

areas; his performance of seven "generic" competencies which were the basis of a job description and his attainment of individual performance goals. First, the seven competencies were listed with indicators and then descriptors. For example, one competency was relating to other people. The four indicators for this competency were: promotes positive relationships, respects opinions of others, manages conflicts and maintains integrity. The first indicator (promotes positive relationships) was then further described by: will give recognition and praise to staff, colleagues and community, demonstrates courtesy, demonstrates relevant personal knowledge and interest in staff, and demonstrates impartiality. Second, the principal and his immediate supervisor determined and developed specific performance objectives for the year.

Thus, the overall process for PAL began with a pre-assessment conference at which time the principal and supervisor established goals for the principal and listed performance objectives which indicated goal achievement. Throughout the year the principal was evaluated on both the competencies and his individual goals by his supervisor, staff members and himself. Each assessor responded to the behaviors by making an observed and non-observed mark on a computer scantron card. The data was compiled

by a central computer. At the summative conference the principal reviewed with his superior the percentages of teachers who observed certain behaviors and if the supervisor observed them also. This data was analyzed and compared to other principals and administrators in the system. It was the basis for a staff development plan for the following year. In December 1985 the system had been operating for two years and the participants felt quite positive. Again, PAL was noteworthy because of its pre-assessment conference, its dependence on common (seven generic) and unique (performance objective) goals, and its client centered assessment technique.

A third system which used client centered assessment was the one espoused by the Illinois Administrators Academy and this process was very similar to PAL which was previously discussed. There were nine competencies with indicators and specific descriptors. The competencies included:

1. The Building Administrator possesses and communicates a vision for the school mission.
2. The Building Administrator demonstrates knowledge of the school curriculum and the instructional program.
3. The Building Administrator supervises the teaching process and monitors student progress.

4. The Building Administrator promotes a positive school climate and interpersonal relationships among students, community and staff members.
5. The Building Administrator demonstrates planning and organizational skills.
6. The Building Administrator demonstrates effective communication skills.
7. The Building Administrator demonstrates skill in making decisions.
8. The Building Administrator sets high expectations for staff.
9. The Building Administrator improves professionally and provides the staff with opportunities for professional improvement.⁴⁰

The assessment of the principal was completed by his superordinate, subordinates, students and parents. The superordinate rated all the descriptors as "S" satisfactory, "N" not satisfactory or "NA" not applicable. If the superordinate marked any "N", he made comments with specific suggestions for improvement. There was a section for comments and the superordinate met mid-year with the principal for a formative review and year end for a summative one. The subordinate form didn't have a space for comments and the teacher rated the principal on a scale of one to four (almost never to almost always).

⁴⁰ Northwest Educational Cooperative, The Evaluation of Principals As Instructional Leaders, 1985, p.152-59

The student form only addressed competencies one, two, three, four, five, and eight as a student was not in a position to observe six, seven and nine. The student's response was a simple yes or no and the descriptors were simplified. The parents form was quite similar to the students. This process was costly and very time consuming; however, it certainly synthesized all the current research espoused for effective principal evaluation.

A fourth system which included client centered assessment was entitled, Performance Review Analysis and Improvement System for Educators or PRAISE. PRAISE was funded by the Ontario Ministry of Education in Canada in 1984. After extensive field testing a client centered instrument was developed. It was administered to the principal, the supervisor, peers and subordinates. Strengths and weaknesses in performance were identified based on mean scores compared to provincial norms that had been determined. This system allowed the principal to compare his perceptions or self ratings of his performance to those perceptions of the other group. In addition, since it was computerized the principal compared his leadership style to other principals in his area.

In 1984 Anzaldua advocated a process utilized by his school district which was predicated on a performance

contract. The contract was developed yearly between the principal and the cabinet which consisted of the superintendent, deputy superintendent, personnel director and business manager. There was a formative, midyear review, between the principal and cabinet and a final summative conference between the parties. Anzaldua declared that this process improved the principals' management skills and was an ongoing effort to improve performance and allow the principal to grow. Also, the contract gave the principal a clear understanding of what was expected and how he was evaluated.

At the Far West Laboratory in San Fransisco a program had been in operation since 1983. Although it was not an evaluation process per se, its purpose was to assist principals in developing skills to use to analyze their own and other principals' management styles. The program was entitled Peer Assisted Leadership. Its four-fold purpose was:

1. To assist principals to develop skills so they can analyze their leadership style and behavior.
2. To give principals the opportunity to learn how other principals lead their schools.
3. To enable principals to receive support from other principals.

4. To assist principals in integrating instructional leadership into their schools.⁴¹

Basically, a group of principals had six meetings over a period of thirty-six weeks. Between meetings they shadowed each other, took notes, and discussed reactions the next day. The group meetings helped them learn how to shadow and assisted them in learning to think reflectively. They found effective principals felt isolated, and reflective interviews allowed principals to engage in self evaluation. This project allowed principals to shadow their peers, an idea the literature stated that superintendents needed to do with their principals.

In 1986, Redfern described four principal evaluation processes that were used in different parts of the United States. First, the Kettering City Schools in Ohio employed a comprehensive plan which included both common criteria (management process skills) and individual criteria (performance objectives). Their process was predicated on the belief that the purposes of evaluation were to improve performance, promote personal and professional development, recognize and reinforce strengths,

⁴¹Barnett, Bruce and Lang, Claudia, "Peer Assisted Leadership: Principals Learning From Each Other", Phi Delta Kappa, May 1986, p.673

and improve communication. The specific process began when the principal and superintendent met and agreed upon the principal's performance objectives and reviewed the management process skills. It included two review or formative conferences during the year and a year end summative meeting. This was a comprehensive goal oriented system.

Second, a system of evaluation that employed statewide performance objectives existed in the Pitt County Schools, Greenville, North Carolina. The purposes for evaluation were divided into two categories, individual and school. A principal conferred with his supervisor and determined the status of his current performance and established personal goals. The principal implemented a plan to achieve his goals and the results were assessed by the principal and his immediate supervisor at the middle and end of the year. The uniqueness of this system occurred because in addition to the individual goals determined by the principal and superintendent, the principal was rated by the superintendent on state performance criteria. The state performance plan had thirty-eight descriptors divided into five areas of: general planning, school/classroom objectives, personnel, clientele relationships and management and allocation of

supplies. The principal was rated on each descriptor as "E" exceeds, "M" meets, "I" needs improvement or "U" unsatisfactory. Thus, this system espoused the superintendent as the only evaluator, it incorporated formative and summative evaluation, and it included both individually set goals and state wide performance objectives.

Third, a system which was entirely goal oriented was in operation in Pocatello School District Number twenty-five in Idaho. The principal had a job description and each year met with the superintendent to establish program and personal goals. A work plan to achieve the goals was developed and goal monitoring occurred at several interviews throughout the year. Year end assessment was based entirely on goal attainment.

Last, a very simplistic system, relying on a checklist and totally on the evaluator's judgment, existed in the Birmingham, Alabama, City Schools. There were eight areas of responsibility and the supervisor rated the principal as "O" outstanding, "AA" above average, "A" average, or "BA" below average.

Another type of principal evaluation process was commonly called performance based. In the last few years several school districts integrated this type of process. Prince, in 1987, as Superintendent of the Tupelo Public

School District in Mississippi advocated this process. He stated, "We found it logical to make judgments about the principal's performance in terms of effectiveness (or productiveness) of the school he or she supervised. Each of our principals was charged to enhance learning opportunities for each child."⁴² His district developed a Professional Standards Scale for Principals (PSS:P). The job description contained six categories which were defined by one hundred two specific job performance specifications. They found it difficult to collect reliable and valid data and this was when the program became more formative to shape behavior, as opposed to summative to judge behavior. The uniqueness of this system was that there were ten different instruments to collect data as any single item of data might be flawed. Each of the ten instruments collected data on six to forty-four of the one hundred and two job performance specifications. The process was founded on the premise that no one person knew everything about a principal's performance. Every teacher in every school was

⁴²Prince, Julian D. "Performance Based Evaluation of School Principals: A Feedback Design to Support Effective Schools", ERS Spectrum, Winter 1987, p.39

sampled by at least one of these instruments.

There were three instruments that surveyed teacher opinion and each was distributed to one-third of the staff. Form A was written and had questions which related to the principal at the school during that year in the areas of leadership and school climate. Form B was completed by interviewing teachers and its purpose was to collect data on how frequently events occur. Form C also involved interviews and the topic was staff morale and the working relation with the principal. Form D consisted of telephone interviews with a random sample of twenty percent of the parents. The parents were instructed to answer the questions only as they related to their child at the school. The fifth instrument to collect data was comprised of a one hour interview with the principal conducted by a trained interviewer who surveyed the principal's perceptions of his performance in the six areas of the PSS:P.

Next, there were two data collection forms that concerned document analysis. One checked all documents, including student test scores, while the other one was specifically for a fiscal audit. Finally, the last three instruments collected data from central office staff, students and the school board.

Data from all ten forms was analyzed and the questions that related specifically to the principal's performance on the one hundred two items on the PSS:P compiled. During the 1985-86 school year, the Tupelo School Board set a minimum of seventy percent on the PSS:P for the principal to be re-employed. In addition the sixty-four percent of the principals who received a ninety percent or above rating received a \$4,000 merit award. Each unsatisfactory item became a guide for individual development and each principal received from the superintendent a written document which was a compilation of all data gathered and analyzed. Prince summarized the underlying beliefs for his system. "Evaluation of a principal is a powerful staff development tool if the evaluation is specific rather than generic. We suspect the principal's function in a school is probably so unique as the setting in which the school district is found."⁴³

Valentine argued for Performance/Outcome Based Principal Evaluation. At the National Association of Secondary School Principals' convention in 1988 he

⁴³Ibid, p.46

detailed the components of this process.

Performance/Outcome Based Principal Evaluation is a process for the professional development of principals through (a) the identification of job related expectations and desired organizational outcomes; (b) the documentation of expected skills and accomplishment of desired outcomes; (c) conferencing, coaching and feedback regarding skill level and progress toward outcome; (d) the opportunity to improve skill level and modify desired outcomes; and (e) job related decision making.⁴⁴

He reiterated it was a process whose purpose was professional development and in which principals were evaluated on criteria not descriptors. In addition, Valentine stated the process was based on the philosophy of improvement, it provided for faculty input, it necessitated on site data collection, and it encompassed inservice training for principals.

Specifically, there were two areas that comprised the process. There was the performance criteria section which included personal skills improvement and job related criteria and there was the school goals section. The later section encompassed goals associated with desired school outcomes over which the principal had an impact. Data for each area was collected in several ways. These

⁴⁴Valentine, Jerry W., Performance Outcome Based Principal Evaluation, March 1988, p.3

included scheduled and unscheduled visits in which the principal was shadowed by the superintendent; non observed items which included parental input; and artifact data such as student test scores. Twice a year the evaluator met with the principal to assess progress in both areas. This was the formative, growth development phase and a crucial component of the system. The last phase was summative. In 1986, Valentine surveyed one hundred and eighty-six school districts which employed some form of performance/outcome based principal evaluation. He found principals were very positive about the system.

As a result of the 1985 Excellence in Education Act in Missouri, it was mandated that every board of education in the state have a comprehensive performance based evaluation program for administrators and that the state department of education provided suggested procedures. The guidelines produced by the department of education encompassed a formative phase and a summative phase. It was suggested the Superintendent was the evaluator of the principal and that if multiple evaluators were used, they were required to be trained in the process of performance based principal evaluation.

The formative phase consisted of three meetings a year between the principal and superintendent. At the

first conference the principal's annual goals were agreed upon and the twenty-three criteria which comprised the job targets were reviewed. During the summative conference a final report was completed concerning the principal's performance on the twenty-three criteria and the principal's attainment of his goals. He was rated on a four point scale. Overall, the guidelines were quite detailed.

Three school districts in Missouri have utilized Valentine as a consultant and the Missouri Department of Education guidelines to develop and implement their own systems. These districts were Blue Springs, Ritenour and Liberty. The Blue Springs process was developed by a committee and again emphasized the formative phase. Included in this phase were a pre-observation conference, scheduled and unscheduled observation, and a post observation conference to be held within three days of the observation. There was a mandated minimum of a one-half day unscheduled observation and a one day scheduled observation. The system included job targets and annual goal setting. The first three years on the job there was a yearly summative conference; however, after three years there was a summative conference once every three years. The Ritenour and Liberty school districts were almost

identical to the state guidelines and Blue Springs. The minimal difference was that they both required a minimum of one full day each of scheduled and unscheduled observations. None of the three districts mentioned used client centered assessment; however, they were heavily entrenched in formative evaluation, common objectives (job targets) and unique objectives (school and personal goals).

In summary, it was clear that "The principalship today is being redefined. Principals want the skills to become successful school leaders. Principals want training in the basic elements and skills of annual school wide planning, designing successful staff development programs, providing on the job teacher coaching, monitoring performance and program development, implementation and evaluation."⁴⁵

Thus, the last decade, certainly the last several years, has seen the principal come "out of the closet" and into the light. Researchers were suggesting that principal evaluation progress from a "hire or fire" pur-

⁴⁵Snyder, Karolyn and Johnson, William, "Retraining Principals For Productive School Management", Educational Research Quarterly, Vol. 9, 1985, p.26

pose to one that promoted professional development, self-renewal, instructional leadership, communication with the central office, and goal setting. Generally, techniques currently advocated for use to evaluate principals were a combination of narratives, conferences and/or performance objective descriptors.

In summary, from the review of literature, the conclusions that emerge as components of a good process are listed below. The process:

1. Contains a formative phase.
2. Contains a summative phase.
3. Utilizes multiple data sources.
4. Has well defined procedures.
5. Was affected by the reform movement.
6. Employs a job description.
7. Encompasses yearly goals and/or leadership skills.
8. Involves the superintendent shadowing the principal.
9. Uses well defined evaluation criteria.
10. Utilizes student test scores as part of the evaluation process.
11. Emphasizes the growth and development of the principal.
12. Reflects state mandates.
13. Uses self-evaluation of the principal.

14. Is a cyclical and continuous process.
15. Allows the principal to supplement evaluation materials.
16. Is unique to each school.
17. Relates to other evaluation systems in the school.
18. Allows the principal adequate response time.
19. Is monitored for its effectiveness.
20. Is designed by the principal and superintendent.

Time, money, commitment and involvement were keys to implementing a good system. It was crucial that evaluation provided for the growth of the principal, that it provided him with a view of how others perceived him, and that it enabled him to set goals for himself. The more people involved in the evaluation, the better the data. As the Illinois Administrators Handbook stated, "An effective principal evaluation increases principal motivation and job-related communication between principals and central office. It provides a vehicle for discussing current performance, determining a principal's development and training needs and for talking about advancement desires and opportunities."⁴⁶

⁴⁶ Northwest Educational Cooperative, The Evaluation of Principals As Instructional Leaders, p.11

CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

The purposes of this chapter are to describe the subjects used for the study and to explain the methods utilized for collecting data. The data collection process was twofold and the purpose for collecting and analyzing the data was to answer the four following questions:

1. What is the current status of public high school principal evaluation?
2. What is the purpose of principal evaluation?
3. Who conducts the evaluation?
4. What is the process and/or instrument employed?

The first phase of data collection was a written questionnaire that was sent to fifty-two superintendents. The questionnaire contained six questions in addition to requesting demographic data about the district and superintendent. The survey is contained in Appendix A. Second, based on the information received from the written surveys, ten superintendents were selected for personal interviews. The following pages contain a discussion of the sample utilized for the written survey, and a

detailed review of the procedures employed to select the ten superintendents for the interviews.

Section One

Sample For The Written Survey

First, the sample consisted of the superintendents of the public high school districts in the five Illinois counties of DuPage, Cook (not including the Chicago Public School System), McHenry, Will and Lake. Superintendents of school districts in Kane County were not included as the districts in Kane county were all unit districts. Unit districts, elementary districts and private or parochial schools were not included in the sample for three main reasons. First, as was indicated by Farrar and others in the review of literature, elementary school principals had a different role than secondary school principals and thus the evaluation processes were different. Second, private and parochial schools were not included or covered by state mandates as Senate Bill 730; whereas, public schools were. Third, unit school districts tended to classify all principals the same whether or not they were in elementary schools, middle schools, or high schools. Therefore, to ensure that comparisons were valid, the sample was limited to similar systems. However, it was important to note that

the sample encompassed counties which had diversity in population, geography and socio-economic levels. Also, the school districts in the sample had been extensively involved in the instructional improvement as mandated by Senate Bill 730. As the review of literature portrayed, not much occurred during the last ten years in the area of principal evaluations. If the schools in the metropolitan Chicago area were trend setters, then it was assumed they were forerunners in the area of principal evaluation. Specifically, the sample included fifty-two superintendents with the breakdown illustrated in Table One. Appendix B contains a listing by name and school district of the superintendents who received the survey.

During the first phase of data collection a written survey was sent to the superintendents. The survey had been previously field tested with three public school elementary superintendents and one public high school superintendent. Based on the input received from these four individuals, the survey was revised. The final survey that was sent is contained in Appendix A. Those superintendents who did not complete the questionnaire and return it within a specified time period were sent a second letter with another copy of the survey enclosed. After two requests, forty-four of the fifty-two

TABLE ONE**Number of School Districts By County**

COUNTY	NUMBER OF PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS
Cook (excluding Chicago Public Schools)	27
DuPage	7
Lake	11
McHenry	4
Will	3
Kane	0
	<hr/>
	52 Total Districts

superintendents returned completed forms for an eighty-five percent response rate. Appendix C contains a listing of which superintendents completed and returned surveys.

Section Two

Sample For Interviews

From the forty-four completed surveys, ten superintendents were selected to be interviewed for the second phase of data collection. Selection was determined by comparing the written survey responses and materials submitted by each superintendent to the twenty criteria that were identified from the review of literature as important components of an evaluation process. The twenty criteria are listed subsequently. The process:

1. Contained a formative phase.
2. Contained a summative phase.
3. Utilized multiple data sources.
4. Had well defined procedures.
5. Was affected by the reform movement.
6. Employed a job description.
7. Encompassed yearly goals and/or leadership skills.
8. Involved the superintendent shadowing the principal.

9. Used well defined evaluation criteria.
10. Utilized student test scores as part of the evaluation process.
11. Emphasized the growth and development of the principal.
12. Reflected state mandates.
13. Used self-evaluation of the principal.
14. Was a cyclical and continuous process.
15. Allowed the principal to supplement evaluation materials.
16. Was unique to each school.
17. Related to other evaluation systems in the school.
18. Allowed the principal adequate response time.
19. Was monitored for its effectiveness.
20. Was designed by the principal and superintendent.

Again, it was important to note that only the superintendents' answers to the written questionnaire and the materials they submitted were evaluated and compared to the twenty criteria. All criteria were considered of equal importance and a tally made by district of the number of criteria employed. The results are illustrated in Table Two. Table Three reveals, by district, what criteria were used in the district's principal evaluation process. On the basis of the results shown in Table Two, the ten superintendents whose districts used the highest

TABLE TWO

Comparison of District Processes With Twenty Criteria

NUMBER OF CRITERIA EMPLOYED	NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS
20	0
19	0
18	0
17	0
16	0
15	0
14	1
13	3
12	6
11	2
10	3
9	1
8	2
7	0
6	3
5	2
4	3
3	4
2	10
1	2
0	2 *
Total 44	

* In the two districts with zero criteria, the superintendent is both principal and superintendent and although the surveys were returned, they were not included.

TABLE THREE

(Continued)

Criteria	District														TOTAL		
	D	E	I	J	N	O	P	R	S	T	U	V	W	X		Y	Z
1.	X			X	X	X	X										19
2.	X	X		X	X	X	X			X			X				28
3.				X	X		X		X		X			X			15
4.	X	X		X	X	X							X				16
5.				X	X	X				X							13
6.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	42
7.	X			X	X		X				X			X			22
8.																	1
9.	X			X	X	X											16
10.																	0
11.	X			X	X	X											15
12.					X	X				X							11
13.		X															8
14.				X	X												13
15.	X	X		X		X											15
16.																	2
17.	X					X											9
18.	X	X		X		X											17
19.																	1
20.																	1

1 No response from G, FF, GG, HH, KK, LL, MM and QQ

2 Superintendent and Principal the same O and Y.

number of criteria were selected to be interviewed. Table Two shows that these districts employed fourteen, thirteen or twelve of the criteria deemed necessary for a good system. Before the interviews were actually held, one superintendent left his job, so he was deleted from the interview schedule and the next superintendent in line was added. The ten superintendents were telephoned and an appointment time was set. Nine of the interviews were held in the superintendents' offices and one interview was held at the author's school because the superintendent was in the area and volunteered to meet at the author's building. A specific listing of those superintendents interviewed is contained in Appendix D. The ten superintendents who were selected to be interviewed represented twenty-three percent of the forty-two returned surveys. Of the ten districts, two were located in DuPage County, six were located in Cook County, one was located in McHenry County and one was located in Will County. It was important to note that the districts selected represented a wide diversity in geography, population and socio-economic values. The purposes of the interviews were to validate and clarify the written responses of the superintendents, to gather more in depth information concerning the process used, and to determine

TABLE FOUR

Percent of Districts Using Criteria

Criteria	Percent of Districts Using Specific Criteria
1. Formative	43
2. Summative	64
3. Client Centered Assessment	34
4. Well Defined Procedures	36
5. Reform Affected	30
6. Job Description	100
7. Yearly Goals	50
8. Shadowing by Superintendent	2
9. Criteria well defined	36
10. Student Test Scores	0
11. Growth/Development	34
12. State Mandates	25
13. Self Evaluation	18
14. Cyclical	30
15. Principal Supplements	34
16. Unique to School	5
17. Related to Other Evaluation	20
18. Principal Respond Time	39
19. Monitored	2
20. System Designed	2

the extent to which the superintendents believed the process they used either helped or hindered a principal's performance.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

In this chapter the results from the two phases of data collection are presented and analyzed. The first phase of data collection included a written survey that was sent to fifty-two superintendents of public high school districts in DuPage, Cook (not including Chicago), Will, Lake and McHenry counties, Illinois. Forty-four surveys were returned for an eighty-five percent response rate. Using the returned written surveys and materials enclosed with each, a comparison was made to the twenty components for a good process that were identified from the review of literature. Ten superintendents or twenty-three percent who were using the highest number of criteria were selected for interviews. Phase two of the data collection was the ten interviews. The first section of the chapter summarizes the responses of the superintendents to the written survey, and the second section details the information obtained during the interviews. For purposes of confidentiality, the written responses are summarized instead of being specified by district.

Also, the ten superintendents who were interviewed are labeled by the numbers one through ten.

RESULTS

Section One - Written Results

The first phase of data collection was a written survey. As was previously mentioned, forty-four of the fifty-two written surveys were returned for an eighty-five percent response rate. Of the forty-four questionnaires, two were not included in this summary of results because the superintendent performed the dual role of superintendent and principal. Their evaluation processes were directly controlled by their respective school boards; therefore, so that comparisons were valid, their surveys were removed from the results.

First, the demographic data pertaining to the individual superintendents and their districts are illustrated in Tables Five through Nine. The personal information solicited from the superintendents included the number of years the superintendents had been in their current positions, the number of total years they had been superintendent, and the highest educational degree they achieved. It should be noted that all fifty-two

districts of the original sample employed a male superintendent. In reviewing Table Five it was apparent that sixteen superintendents had been the superintendent in their district for four or more years. Furthermore, these same superintendents had remained in their original district for the entire length of their superintendency. The stability of superintendents in this five county area appeared to be much stronger than the national average. Table Six illustrated the degrees earned by the superintendents. Twenty-nine superintendents or sixty-nine percent of the superintendents had a doctorate with twenty of those holding an Ed.D. and nine obtaining a Ph.D.

In reviewing the district demographic data contained in Tables Seven, Eight and Nine, there were a few areas of particular importance. First, Table Seven shows the districts grouped according to the number of high schools contained in each district. Seventeen or almost half of the districts had only one high school and thirty-two districts or seventy-six percent were comprised of only one or two high schools. Table Eight displays the districts categorized by the number of pupils. Thirty-six districts or eighty-six percent had less than fifty-five hundred students. Only two districts contained more than sixty-five hundred students. Last, Table

TABLE FIVE

(Continued)

Number of Years in Current Position	Number of Years As Superintendent						
	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
1							
2							
3							
3.5							
4							
5							
6							
6.5				1			
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14						1	
15							
16							
17							
18							
19	1						

TABLE SIX
Degrees Earned by Superintendents

Masters	6
Certificate of Advanced Study	7
Ed.D.	20
Ph.D.	9
	<hr/>
Total	42

TABLE SEVEN
Number of High Schools In The District

Number of High Schools	Number of Districts
1	17
2	15
3	5
4	2
5	2
6	1
	<hr/>
	42

TABLE EIGHT

Sizes of the Districts Surveyed By Number of Pupils

Number of Pupils	Number of Districts This Size
less than 1,000	3
1,000 - 1,500	5
1,501 - 2,000	6
2,001 - 2,500	4
2,501 - 3,000	2
3,001 - 3,500	4
3,501 - 4,000	4
4,001 - 4,500	3
4,501 - 5,000	2
5,001 - 5,500	3
5,501 - 6,000	1
6,001 - 6,500	1
6,501 - 7,000	0
7,001 - 7,500	2
7,501 - 8,000	0
8,001 - 8,500	0
8,501 - 9,000	0
9,001 - 9,500	0
9,501 - 10,000	0
10,001 - 10,500	0
10,501 - 11,000	0
11,001 - 11,500	0
11,501 - 12,000	2

 42

TABLE NINE

Money Spent Per Pupil As Per the 1986-87 Report Card

Dollar Amount	Number of Districts
\$3,200 - \$3,600	1
\$3,601 - \$4,000	2
\$4,001 - \$4,400	3
\$4,401 - \$4,800	6
\$4,801 - \$5,200	6
\$5,201 - \$5,600	7
\$5,601 - \$6,000	5
\$6,001 - \$6,400	4
\$6,401 - \$6,800	3
\$6,801 - \$7,200	2
\$7,201 - \$7,600	0
\$7,601 - \$8,000	0
\$8,001 - \$8,400	0
\$8,401 - \$8,800	0
\$8,801 - \$9,200	1
\$9,201 - \$9,600	0
	Total
	40 *

* Two surveys had no answer for this item

Nine illustrates the money spent per pupil as reported in the district's 1986-87 State of Illinois Report Card. Sixty-six percent or twenty-eight of the districts were in the \$4,401 to \$6,400 range. So even though districts varied in geographic location, population, and socio-economic levels, there was some homogeneity in number of pupils and money spent per pupil.

Following the demographic data, the survey sought to ascertain the answers to six questions. The purpose of the first question was to determine if the district employed a formal evaluation process for principals. The results are detailed in Table Ten. Ninety percent of the districts employed a written process for principal evaluation; however, seventy-six percent of the districts with a process had used their current written process for three years or more. Nine of the districts or twenty-four percent with a process had only utilized their current process for two years or less.

The reason for question two was to discern if there was a written evaluation form completed and placed in the principal's permanent file and who completed the form. Table Eleven contains the responses to this survey question. Thirty-six of the districts or eighty-six percent required a written form to be placed in the prin-

TABLE TEN

The Written Principal Evaluation Process

1. Does your district have a formal (i.e. written) evaluation process utilized for principals?

Yes	38
No	4

Number of Years The Current Process Has Been In Use

Years	Number of Districts
1	3
2	6
3	10
4	4
5	3
6	1
7	2
8	0
9	1
10	4
11	1
12	1
13	0
14	0
15	1
16	1
	<hr/>
	38

principal's permanent file. In the majority of districts or sixty-one percent, the superintendent, alone, completed the form; however, as it is portrayed by question four, the superintendents received both formal and informal feedback from many sources before completing the form. One question had a one hundred percent agreement in responses, and it was the question concerning job descriptions. All forty-two districts had a written job description for the principal.

The current research on principal evaluation and the Illinois Administrators Academy advocated client centered assessment or the use of multiple data sources in evaluating principals. The purpose of question four was to ascertain from the superintendents' perspectives who participated either formally or informally in the principal evaluation process. Formal participation was qualified as meaning the person completed the written document; whereas, informal was specified as the evaluator receiving verbal feedback about the principal's performance. The results are displayed in Table Twelve. Only eight superintendents or nineteen percent formally involved staff, meaning teachers, in the evaluation process and only thirteen or thirty-one percent utilized teachers informally in the process. There was one superintendent

TABLE ELEVEN

Is there a written form to be completed and placed in the principal's permanent file?

Yes	36
No	6

Who completes the form?

Superintendent	26
Superintendent and Principal	3
Superintendent and Assistant Principal	2
Evaluator	1
Superintendent and Board	1
Assistant Superintendent	2
Principal, Superintendent, Staff	1
	<hr/>
	36

TABLE TWELVE

Participation In Principal Evaluation Process

	Number of Districts	
	Formally	Informally
Students	1	11
Teachers	8	13
Parents	8	14
Administrators	11	19
Superintendent	39	2
Board of Education	2	19
Other (Deans, Counselors)	2	0

who requested formal feedback from students and parents; whereas, eleven and fourteen superintendents requested informal feedback from students and parents respectively. The information in Table Twelve certainly supported the notion that superintendents received much of their information from informal, verbal feedback. As is illustrated later, this was very supported by the information received through the interview process.

Finally, questions five and six sought to determine if the superintendents believed their districts' policy and/or process of principal evaluation had been influenced by Illinois Senate Bill 730 or by their attendance at the Illinois Administrators Academy. In the first area, only eleven superintendents responded that Senate Bill 730 had influenced their process; whereas, thirty-one superintendents or seventy-four percent responded no. The eleven superintendents who responded yes explained that the legislation had caused them to formalize or revise their process. Similarly, the superintendents' attendance at the Academy had very little influence on their principal evaluation process. Although superintendents had to spend two days at the Academy, during which the entire time was spent discussing the principal evaluation process, thirty-three of the super-

intendents or seventy-nine percent said their Academy attendance had no effect on their district's process. Nine superintendents answered that the training they received did influence their processes; however, all of them indicated that the influence involved terminology and written format changes. One superintendent remarked that the Academy had taught him how to include teachers in the formal principal evaluation process.

In summary, from information procured from the written questionnaire, there emerged several themes and conclusions which are discussed and analyzed in detail later in this chapter. Briefly, all districts had a written job description for their principals, and ninety percent of the districts employed a written process. Eighty-six percent of the districts required a written evaluation placed in the principal's file and the majority of these were completed by the superintendent. The superintendents solicited very little formal input concerning a principal's performance from sources such as teachers, parents, students or others. The superintendents appeared to rely heavily on informal verbal feedback and this was one theme which is further explained and expanded in the interview data. Last, Senate Bill 730 and the superintendent's participation

at the Illinois Administrators Academy has had little, if any, effect on the principal evaluation processes currently employed.

Section Two - Interview Results

The second phase of data collection encompassed interviewing ten superintendents who were selected from the forty-four who returned the written survey. Selection was based on a comparison of each principal evaluation process to the twenty criteria identified in the review of literature. During this second phase of data collection, each of the ten superintendents was interviewed in his office (with the exception of one who came to the author's school) and asked to respond to twelve questions. The interview questionnaire is contained in Appendix E. In order to convey the patterns and idiosyncracies of each district's process, each interview is discussed separately in this section, followed by a summary of the responses of all ten. The purposes of the interviews were to validate and clarify the written responses, to obtain more in-depth information and to determine the extent to which superintendents believed districts' process helped or hindered a principal's performance.

Superintendent One stated that the reasons for principal evaluation in his district were for professional growth and increased student achievement. The key to his process was that each principal was required to demonstrate, on a yearly basis an area for improvement. He met three times a year with the principal; one to set objectives, the second as an interim and the third as a summative. The process utilized was based on the current research and the superintendent brought the process with him from his previous district when he came to this district three years ago. The process contained two parts. One was comprised of yearly objectives and the other was the principal's performance on twelve performance goals. This was one of the districts in which the superintendent solicited formal written feedback on the principal's performance from department chairs, counselors, and district office personnel. In addition, the principal was allowed to request a sampling of other staff members. The superintendent incorporated formal feedback from a principal self evaluation, the superintendent's evaluation of the principal and the subordinate or staff evaluation. He utilized a matrix to show how each principal was rated and used this in a discussion of the differences in perception of a principal's performance. The matrix defined

trends and the principal was numerically rated on a one to ninety-nine scale on the twelve performance goals. This system was unique as the principal's salary was related to his evaluation. The superintendent gave merit money based on performance, but the pool of money he had to use was not large. Student test scores were not utilized in the process and the superintendent did not shadow the principals. The superintendent visited the schools in his district every week and each semester spent one morning in each building just talking to students and faculty. He received much informal feedback. Senate Bill 730 and the Illinois Administrators Academy did not influence the principal evaluation process. The superintendent had never fired a principal with this process; however, it had assisted a principal in deciding it was appropriate to retire. Finally, Superintendent One believed the process helped a principal's performance as it was a tool for improvement. His district was currently reviewing the process as the Board of Education was not in total agreement with the numerical matrix. Also, the district was in the process of revising and updating the job description for a principal.

Superintendent Two believed that evaluation of principals gave a sense of direction and promoted growth

of the individual. The process used in his district was one he also brought with him from his previous district. He believed a principal's effectiveness was based on the staff's perceptions of the principal's performance. Therefore, he strongly advocated the staff's formal input. The process he employed was two pronged. It included ratings on administrative skills and a job description, and goal setting. The superintendent met with the principal three times a year for a goal setting conference, interim conference and summative conference. Superintendent Two had done much in the area of client centered assessment. Several years ago he requested all staff (ie teachers, secretaries, custodial) to complete rating forms about the principal; however, over the last four years he had reduced the number requested to a sample of fifty. Certain staff members attempted to sabotage the system so the superintendent most recently requested administrators to identify to the superintendent fifty people who could assess the administrator's performance, rather than a random selection of fifty. The superintendent then mathematically tallied the results for each item on a one to six scale. Since his office was in the high school building, he received much informal feedback. He did not utilize student test scores nor did he shadow the principal as part of the

process. The system was not influenced by Senate Bill 730 or the Academy. The superintendent believed the evaluation process was stressful, and that fifty percent of his battle was to assist the principal in understanding that the process helped the principal improve. He had never used the process to fire or demote a principal.

Superintendent Three believed the reason for evaluation was accountability and improvement of performance. In this district, the principals and superintendent developed the current process together and it included client centered assessment. The principals were formally evaluated in writing by the management team (Assistant Superintendent and Principals), the Deans of Instruction and a random sample of teachers selected by the principal. The superintendent summarized the comments from all the groups and added his own. The written instrument which was completed by all parties contained a checklist, which closely followed the job description, and a narrative. The principal was rated in one of the following categories: exceeds expectations, meets expectations or area of concern. As was found with the two previous superintendents, Superintendent Three did not use student test scores in the process, did not shadow the principals, and was not influenced by Senate Bill 730

or the Academy. He received much informal feedback from on site visits although he did not want to become involved at the building level. Finally, the superintendent believed the principals were comfortable with the process and that it helped their performance. The superintendent and the principals were reviewing the process to ascertain if student feedback was feasible.

Superintendent Four stated that the purpose of evaluation was accountability and that he was attempting to change his principals from managers to instructional leaders. The process he employed was borrowed one and a half years ago from another district and was selected by a district committee of administrators which included principals. The process involved the superintendent meeting with the principal four times a year. The first meeting was for goal setting, the middle two for an update and a final one for summative purposes. The superintendent believed his most effective and reliable source of information was the grapevine. He had three high schools which he visited every week. In this process, teachers were allowed to evaluate the principal on a written checklist; however, the teacher voluntarily acquired the form from the superintendent's office, and returned it with the teacher's name signed on the form.

If the teacher rated a principal at an extreme end of the scale, the teacher cited examples. The superintendent cut the names off the surveys and summarized the data for the principal. Specifically, the principal was evaluated in four areas. First, he was rated as needs improvement, acceptable performance, fully competent performance or meritorious performance on twelve administrative characteristics which closely paralleled the twelve skills espoused by the NASSP Assessment Centers. Second, the principal was rated on the same four point scale on the fourteen items of the principal's job description. Third, the principal was rated on the achievement of goals which he set with the superintendent at the beginning of the year. Last, the superintendent described any special incidents or situations which occurred which had either a positive or negative effect on a principal's performance. Again, like the previous superintendents; Superintendent Four did not use student test scores to evaluate the principal; he did not shadow the principal; he had not been influenced by Senate Bill 730 or the Academy; and he had not fired or demoted a principal using this process. He strongly believed the process helped a principal's performance. This was the second year the process had been used in his district.

Superintendent Five stated that the purpose of his district's principal evaluation process was improvement of performance. His district's process was developed in response to the Illinois Administrators Academy. The principals were involved in helping to develop the process which mandated two formal meetings between the superintendent and the principal per year. The first meeting was a time for the superintendent and principal to discuss self improvement goals for the principal, and the second meeting was for summative purposes. The process did not encompass multiple data sources and the superintendent gathered all the data used in the evaluation by himself. Specifically, the superintendent rated the principals on twenty-one duties and responsibilities on a four point scale ranging from unsatisfactory to superior. Then he also made a short written comment about each area. The superintendent visited each building site once a week, and because he ascended to his position from previous positions in the district, Superintendent Five stated that he knew everyone quite well and had had experience in handling their jobs. He agreed with the preceding superintendents and did not use student test scores to evaluate principals. Although Superintendent Five periodically observed the principals in a

parent or teacher conference, he did not officially shadow the principals. Also, he had never fired or demoted a principal with this process. This was the first superintendent who was interviewed who stated that his attendance at the Academy influenced the formation of the principal evaluation process. As is discussed later, his assistant superintendent was a teacher for the Academy. He strongly advocated the process as one that enhanced a principal's performance. The one concern he stated was that the factor of personnel and personalities was important. Since he was promoted from within the district, he had strong personal relationships with many of the administrators and thus, found it difficult to evaluate them. However, he firmly believed the formal process worked and complemented the informal everyday process of evaluation that occurred.

Superintendent Six believed principal evaluation had a threefold purpose. Evaluation provided the principal with support from the superintendent, it kept the goals of the individual buildings and the district aligned, and it centralized control so that there was more accountability. This superintendent had six principals to evaluate and six different sites to visit. He met four times a year with his principals as part of the

formal evaluation process. As the other superintendents indicated, the first meeting was to set goals, the next two were to review the principal's performance up to that date, and the last meeting was a final summative review. The process currently in use was developed five years ago when an interim superintendent was in place and the Board of Education wanted a reorganization and restructuring of the administrators. Job descriptions were changed and the principals given more input. The process had four areas in which the principal was evaluated. First, there were twelve administrative characteristics which were the same as the twelve skills identified by the NASSP Assessment Centers. A principal was rated in one of the subsequent categories: unacceptable performance, needs improvement, acceptable performance, fully competent performance, or meritorious performance. Second, there were fifteen items comprising a job description and the principal was rated at one of the five levels as listed above. Third, the principal was required to set goals for his performance with the superintendent. Fourth, there was a section in which the superintendent detailed any critical incidents and/or special considerations that had significantly affected the principal's performance in either a positive or negative way. Thus, these were the

same forms that Superintendent Four used in his district, and neither district developed them. Superintendent Six strongly believed in informal feedback that he received. He watched for signals from parents, staff, and others that indicated how quickly a principal responded to a situation and in how much conflict the principal was embroiled. As was mentioned previously, this superintendent had several buildings, so he attempted to visit two each week. Superintendent Six had the advantage of having been a principal in the district, so that he knew most of the staff. He did not shadow principals or use test scores to evaluate them. The Illinois Administrators Academy or Senate Bill 730 did not influence his district's process, but it did heighten awareness. This was the first superintendent who used his current process to remove a principal. By watching the removal process for one principal, the other principals were inspired to improve their performance. Superintendent Six stated that removal of a principal was difficult, and arduous. The superintendent and principals wanted to review the process, but had not been able to do so because of the time restraints. The superintendent was concerned that the process was too cumbersome and involved too much inspection and not enough supporting of the principals.

Superintendent Seven advocated that the purpose of the principal evaluation was to make principals the best they could be and to maximize each principal's potential. He met four times a year with each of his principals as part of the formal evaluation process. Goals were set at the first meeting, the next two meetings were formative and the last meeting was summative. The process which was utilized in his district was developed by his predecessor at least ten years ago. Superintendent Seven had added a narrative and goal setting to the written process. The written process entailed the superintendent's rating the principals on each function of the job description on a four point scale of satisfactory plus, satisfactory, marginal, or unsatisfactory. Also, in addition to the narrative and rating of job performance, the superintendent discussed areas of commendation and concern with the principals. The process did not involve multiple data sources as the superintendent gathered his information from personal observations of the principals and interaction with them at weekly administrator meetings. Also, he received much informal feedback from a multitude of sources which he sifted and categorized. He made a point of visiting each of his four high schools, once a week, and attended many evening and weekend functions at the buildings.

This was the first superintendent who shadowed each of his principals for one day. Unfortunately, the experience was not positive or productive, so after one year, he discontinued the shadowing. The superintendent stated that one day of shadowing did not provide accurate information. He had used the current system to remove an assistant principal and believed the process was so thorough that there were no surprises when a removal or firing occurred. Superintendent Seven did not use student test scores to evaluate principals and he was not influenced by the state mandates or his attendance at the Academy. He firmly believed the process helped principals improve performance because the criteria were well defined, there was ongoing communication between principal and superintendent, the principal was allowed to write a rebuttal, and there was no fear of the process. He believed it was a synergistic relationship that assisted the principals and that the principals knew the superintendent cared. The process was periodically reviewed by the superintendent and administrators.

Superintendent Eight contended that the two purposes of principal evaluation were for improvement of performance and for helping the principal set a focus for the year. The process used in this district had the

principal rated on his position description, administrative/leadership skills, and goals he had set with the superintendent. The superintendent met with the principals three times for the formal evaluation process, so it was both formative and summative. The process was developed by a committee of administrators in the district along with the assistance of an outside consultant. As part of the formal process, the superintendent did not use client centered assessment; however, if his principals conducted their own survey with their staffs, they were allowed to share the information collected with the superintendent. Superintendent Eight collected his information concerning a principal's performance through teacher comments made to him directly, information received from district office personnel, and information from personal observations. He looked for patterns in the information he received. Twice a week he visited each school in his district, and during the visits, he, as the previous seven superintendents, solicited data from as many people as possible. Again, he did not use student test scores or shadowing as part of the process, and the process was not influenced by Senate Bill 730 or the Academy. A principal had never been demoted or fired using this system; however, a district office person was

removed using the identical process. Because of both the formative and summative phases of this process, Superintendent Eight believed there were no surprises in the removal. Superintendent Eight advocated the process as one which helped a principal's performance because it forced the superintendent and principal to communicate, assisted the superintendent in showing leadership, and focused the principal on a course of action for the year. There had not been a review of the process since it had been in effect for only four years.

Superintendent Nine relayed his philosophy behind principal evaluation as one of empowerment of the principal, a reaction to state mandates, and a desire to help principals to do a better job. His direction was to empower the principals to be instructional leaders. The process he employed for principal evaluation had been developed over the last several years and had included input from the principals, with direction from the assistant superintendents. Interestingly, this superintendent's number one goal for the year was to make the evaluation process work all the way down the line from superintendent to teacher. He stated that it was crucial he modeled appropriate behavior so that principals employed correct behavior when evaluating their assistants

and department chairs. Superintendent Nine strongly promoted client centered assessment and each year had the entire staff complete forms anonymously concerning the principal's performance. The rating form encompassed rating the principal on his performance in nine competency areas with specific indicators for each area on a scale of one (poor) to five (excellent). The competencies and indicators used were extremely similar to those advocated by the Illinois Administrators Academy. It was important to note that all three assistant superintendents in this district were teachers for the Academy. This entire process was unique because not only did the staff members rate the principal's performance in competency areas, but they also rated each competency and indicator as to its relative importance to the school. The superintendent tallied the numerical results and used the results in assisting the principal in goal setting. The key in this process was that the superintendent was very careful to look for trends and to ignore the extremes. Test scores and shadowing were not part of the process, but on site visits of the schools were. He attempted to be in each building twice a week, and the system had not been used to remove a principal. Again, this superintendent's number one goal for the current

school year was to implement the system and model the appropriate behavior for principals.

Superintendent Ten brought his principal evaluation process to the district when he arrived there fifteen years ago. Several years ago he empowered an administrative committee, including the principals, to study and review the process. They elected to keep the same process after reviewing the literature and several other options. According to Superintendent Ten, the purposes of principal evaluation were to improve the individual first, and then by doing so, to improve the school building's educational program and faculty. As part of the process the superintendent met with the principal four or five times a year and then had one formal meeting at the end of the year. This superintendent did not utilize student tests scores, shadowing, or client centered assessment as part of the process. He believed client centered assessment did not give an accurate picture. His data collection was informal and for him, very effective. Superintendent Ten advocated that he made judgments by identifying patterns or trends in the information he received. In addition, he was very concerned about the source of the feedback, and the reason the person was giving him the information. In this respect he

ascribed to the beliefs of Machiavelli. Although Superintendent Ten had only one high school, his office was in a different location so he made certain to visit the high school two or three times a week. Superintendent Ten always had a purpose for the visits, but many times the purpose became secondary to what he learned when he arrived. He has been superintendent in this district for fifteen years and the current principal had been in the principal's job even longer. Specifically, the process in this district included both an appraisal of the principal in the areas of administrative effectiveness and leadership, professional characteristics and personal qualities; and an evaluation of how well the principal achieved his goals for the year. Superintendent Ten firmly advocated this process was positive and not punitive and that it provided a good opportunity for the superintendent and principal to discuss common concerns and goals. Although, not in his current district, he had employed this process to fire a principal. The key to successful removal of the principal was the superintendent's digging, evaluating, verifying, and probing of the information he received.

In summary, the purposes for the interviews were to validate and clarify responses on the written survey,

to solicit more in-depth information, and to determine if the process employed by a district helped or hindered a principal's performance. The subsequent is a summary of all ten of the superintendents responses to the interview questions followed by an in-depth analysis. First, the ten superintendents unanimously agreed that the processes their districts utilized for principal evaluation helped to improve a principal's performance; however, they did not all list this as a primary reason for evaluation. Second, the most popular purpose for principal evaluation which was espoused by six superintendents, was to improve the principal's performance. The next three reasons were for professional growth, for giving a sense of direction and for accountability. Other purposes listed included to increase student achievement, to align district and building goals, to support the principal, to concur with state mandates, to maximize a principal's potential and to improve the educational program. In reviewing the superintendents' stated purposes for evaluation, it appeared that the superintendents determined the purposes of the evaluation based on their individual and district needs. The number of meetings between superintendents and principals varied. Fifty percent of the superintendents met with principals four times a year for the spe-

cific purpose of evaluation, forty percent met with principals three times a year and ten percent met with principals twice a year. However, it was important to note that all ten superintendents strongly advocated and used both formative and summative evaluation.

Fourth, the question which sought to ascertain the history concerning how a process was selected or developed in a district had interesting responses. Only one district employed an outside consultant to work with a committee of administrators to formulate the process. Four superintendents brought the process with them from their previous districts; however, two of those allowed principals to review it, but it was not modified. Two superintendents were using processes developed by their predecessor and a committee, and two superintendents were utilizing processes developed with their current principals. Finally, one superintendent readily admitted the committee he empowered to formulate a process, "borrowed" one from another district. It was apparent that superintendents utilized a process with which they were comfortable.

Fifth, there was a definite polarization between the superintendents as to whether or not to employ client centered assessment. There was an equal split. Fifty

percent of the superintendents were strong advocates for client centered assessment and had used multiple data sources in a formal written matter with numerical and narrative tallies. The other fifty percent of the superintendents were strongly opposed to utilizing client centered assessment. It was important to note that of the five superintendents who employed teachers to evaluate principals, three of the superintendents relied on the principal to "randomly" select who completed the forms. This appeared to be bias; however, the superintendents were very pleased and satisfied with this procedure. In the two other cases, one superintendent required all teachers to complete a form and the other one allowed anyone who desired so to complete a form. In all five cases, all other administrators and the principal himself completed a form in addition to the teachers. In answering the question concerning how data were obtained for the principal's evaluation, all the superintendents responded that they used personal observation and informal feedback and searched for emerging trends. In addition, half of the superintendents relied more heavily on formal client centered assessment. Most importantly, all ten superintendents were firmly committed to reviewing, integrating and verifying informal feedback. The polari-

zation regarding client centered assessment is discussed thoroughly in the Analysis Section.

Sixth, all ten of the superintendents adamantly opposed using student test scores as a way to evaluate principals even though it was heavily promoted in California. In addition, shadowing of the principals was not used or espoused by any of the ten. Two superintendents had tried shadowing several years ago and were very dissatisfied with the results. The superintendents prided themselves on frequent on-site visits and felt because they spent so much time at the buildings they did not need to formally shadow the principals. In reviewing and analyzing the negative attitudes of the superintendents towards shadowing, it appeared they felt it was too contrived or artificial. If the principal knew the superintendent was to shadow the principal on a specific day, the superintendents questioned whether they would observe a typical day or a planned day. Frequent on-site visits provided the superintendents with more information than one day of shadowing. Also, if the superintendents officially shadowed the principal for a day, the superintendents were concerned that teachers viewed this in a negative manner, that the superintendent was worried about the principal's performance.

Seventh, the superintendents were firm believers in frequent on-site visits. Four of the superintendents visited each building once a week and all four were from districts with two, three or four buildings. One superintendent was housed on the site of his one high school, and another superintendent, although not housed on-site, had only one school which he visited two or three times a week. Two superintendents who had two and three different buildings, respectively, visited each building twice a week. The final superintendent had six buildings and he visited two buildings a week. On-site visitation was very important to the superintendents both as a time to gather information and to provide visibility. In examining the reasons superintendents believed on-site visits were important, several ideas emerged. First, superintendents solicited information from students, teachers and the principal and then used this information to check their perceptions. They observed the students, teachers, and principal interacting while at the same time the superintendents were visible. In addition to visibility, the superintendents were accessible to all staff. Staff felt more comfortable talking to the superintendent in their workplace as opposed to making an appointment to meet the superintendent in the superinten-

dent's office. Although on-site visits were not listed as part of the formal evaluation process, the visits were crucial to the superintendents' information gathering. Furthermore, the visits allowed the superintendent to model behavior to the staff and principal. Last, the visits provided the superintendents the opportunity to hear from numerous sources and then sift through the data for trends.

Only two of the ten superintendents had used their system of principal evaluation to remove a principal, and only two of the ten superintendents expressed that Senate Bill 730 or their attendance at the Administrators Academy had influenced the processes utilized in their districts.

Last, all the superintendents indicated that their processes were periodically reviewed. Some had been reviewed more recently and frequently than others and two systems were basically in operation for the first time.

Thus, the first part of Chapter Four has contained a summarization of the results of the written survey and interviews. The written survey indicated that ninety percent of the districts employed a written process of evaluation, that all the districts had a written job de-

scription for principals, and that the superintendents did not espouse client centered assessment. By far the majority of the superintendents relied on informal feedback. In addition, Senate Bill 730 or the superintendent's attendance at the Illinois Administrator's Academy did not influence their principal evaluation process.

The results gathered from the personal interviews with superintendents reinforced the above findings. They also indicated the importance superintendents placed on on-site visits, and the lack of importance of shadowing or student tests scores. Finally the interview data expounded on the polarization of the ten superintendents regarding the usage of client centered assessment.

ANALYSIS

In this section the results are analyzed in relation to the four research questions that prompted this study. The questions were:

1. What is the current status of public high school principal evaluation?
2. What is the purpose of principal evaluation?
3. Who conducts the evaluation?
4. What is the process or instrument employed?

Each question is discussed and analyzed individually.

Research Question One: What is the current status of public high school principal evaluation?

The status of principal evaluation is examined in this section in relation to two areas. First, as it related to the efforts in the State of Illinois and second as it compared to the twenty criteria identified in the review of literature. First, the State of Illinois had been very active in the area of school reform both with the passage of Senate Bill 730 and the required attendance of administrators at the Illinois Administrators Academy. Not only did the legislation and formation of

the Academy focus on instructional improvement and teacher evaluation, but it also targeted the principal. In fact all superintendents in the State of Illinois were required to attend a two day workshop on principal evaluation. Thus, with all the energy and state resources directed toward instructional improvement, teacher evaluation, the principal as an instructional leader, and principal evaluation, it seemed logical to assume the current status of public high school principal evaluation would be one of review, change and close scrutiny. The data from this study contradicted this assumption. Seventy-four percent of the superintendents who responded to the written survey stated Senate Bill 730 had not affected their process of principal evaluation. Furthermore, seventy-nine percent of the superintendents stated that their attendance at the Illinois Administrators Academy had not influenced their process of principal evaluation. Of those superintendents who indicated that yes, their process had been changed due to materials from the Academy, all of them stated that the changes were made in the areas of word terminology or format changes. The seeming lack of influence by the state was dramatically emphasized with the information gathered from the interviews.

Only two of the ten superintendents who were interviewed related that the Illinois Administrators Academy had affected their systems. Through more in-depth probing, it was apparent in both situations that the process of principal evaluation in their districts had not changed, but that people, mainly assistant superintendents, in their districts were teachers for the Academy. Thus, it seemed the two superintendents verbally applauded the Academy and its efforts because their staff were involved and not necessarily because the Academy influenced their district's process of principal evaluation.

So the question became what were the reasons for the state's lack of influence on the principal evaluation process? In analyzing this question, several reasons emerged. First, an obvious reason was that the majority of the districts (ninety percent) surveyed already utilized a principal evaluation process of some type and did not have a need to change. It appeared throughout the examination of written artifacts and certainly throughout the interviews that many districts had systems of principal evaluation with which they were comfortable. Seventy-six percent of the districts with a process, had a principal evaluation process that had been used for three

or more years (Table Ten). Senate Bill 730 did not mandate a change in principal evaluation processes, but rather dictated that a principal's job description emphasized the instructional improvement role of the principal. The Academy proposed a sophisticated process of evaluation, but again it was not required. Whatever processes the districts in this study utilized, they were basically in place before the reform measures. Thus the public high school systems in the Chicagoland area were indeed trend setters since they already had systems in place.

For example, the data portrayed that the status was that ninety percent of the forty-two districts employed a formal written process for principal evaluation, eighty-six percent had a written form to be completed and placed in the principal's permanent file, and one hundred percent of the districts had a written job description for the principal. During the interview process, it quickly surfaced that all the districts in which the superintendents who were interviewed were employed advocated very sophisticated processes which were detailed previously in Chapter Four.

A second reason that school districts had not been influenced by the state's efforts, was due to a surprising

trend that appeared in the demographic data for superintendents. In this area of the state and country, stability of the superintendents was high. The national trend dictated that a superintendent changed positions every three years; however, in reviewing Table Five there were several interesting exceptions. Twenty-five of the forty-two superintendents or sixty percent had been in their current position for four or more years. Furthermore, sixteen of the twenty-five had remained in the same district for the entire time they had been superintendents. (Although it was not part of the survey, in hindsight it would have been interesting to note how many of the superintendents had been promoted from within the system.) Because of their longevity in the district and therefore greater accountability, the superintendents were concerned that a good principal evaluation process was in place and that their principals performed well. This concern occurred before the reform measures.

A third reason concerning why the state's legislation had not greatly affected the principal evaluation processes employed by the school districts in the five county area for this study was noted several times in current literature on reform movements and noted in the review of literature in this dissertation. The

fact was that reform measures at a state level were not very effective when mandated from the top down. Change occurred more frequently in a successful manner when initiated from within the smaller units of the school districts themselves. In fact, one of the twenty criteria identified in the review of literature was that the process was unique to a school district and took into account local needs and concerns. The program mandated at the state level did not take into consideration a district's idiosyncracies.

Fourth, if the process advocated by the Illinois Administrators Academy was scrutinized closely, it was readily apparent that it was copied from the system, detailed previously in the review of literature, which was used in DeKalb County, Georgia. It did not appear as if an attempt was made to tailor the process to needs in this state, or to even assess the needs of districts in the state of Illinois.

Finally, the process for principal evaluation espoused by the state included much client centered assessment which was quite expensive and time consuming. As is noted later in the chapter when question three is addressed, superintendents were polarized as to the validity and need for multiple data sources.

Thus, state reform measures have had little effect on the principal evaluation processes utilized in the fifty-two districts surveyed. As the data illustrated, the current status of principal evaluation was not one of flux or change. It was one of stability, comfort and familiarity with current individual district procedures, and was not influenced by reform measures at the state level.

Next, it was important to examine the status of principal evaluation in comparison to several of the components synthesized from the review of literature. As was previously mentioned, one hundred percent of the districts maintained a principal job description and ninety percent of the superintendents stated that they had a formal written process for principal evaluation. Examination of the supplementary materials sent by superintendents revealed that sixty-four percent of the superintendents utilized their principal evaluation process for summative means and forty-three percent used the process for both formative and summative purposes. Thus, it appeared a little less than half the districts were employing their current process for more than a hire, fire, or salary purpose. Fifty percent of the districts required that principals write yearly goals and thirty-four

percent employed some form of client centered assessment. Therefore, it seemed some strides had been made to improve the process of principal evaluation in relation to what research had supported; however, more needed to be done. As is detailed later, several districts had extremely complex systems which contained many of the twenty criteria detailed in the review of literature; however, many districts did not.

Thus, in summary, the current status of principal evaluation in the five county area of Illinois, was one of stability. Ninety percent of the districts had a process, but the level of complexity of the process and the purposes of the processes were quite varied. Fewer than forty-three percent of the districts had a process that was formative and summative. The districts were polarized at two extremes of a continuum. Referring back to Table Two in Chapter Three, it was clear that fifteen of the districts employed ten or more of the criteria detailed in the review of literature as important to a good process; while sixteen of the districts utilized three or fewer of the criteria. It was even more noticeable to see that twenty-four districts or fifty-seven percent used less than six of the criteria. Thus, of the districts surveyed in this study ninety percent had

a principal evaluation process; however, the system was either complex and sophisticated and employed formative and summative phases or it was for summative purposes only. There appeared to be little middle ground.

Research Question Two: What is the purpose of principal evaluation?

Second, the next question addressed concerned what the purposes of principal evaluation were in the various districts. This question was not asked on the written survey as it was determined by the author that it was better answered in an interview situation in which the superintendent was asked to clarify and describe in detail the reasons for his evaluation of principals. However, in examining the written materials, some information emerged. It was apparent that thirty-four percent of the districts had materials which emphasized the growth and development of the principal as important. In reviewing the responses given by the superintendents during interviews, it must be noted that the ten superintendents who responded were selected because they were employed in districts with sophisticated processes of principal evaluation. Even so, their responses were not an unanimous vote for principal improvement or professional growth. Six superintendents indicated that prin-

principal improvement of performance was critical, but only two indicated professional growth as a purpose. Besides these two areas there was little agreement on the reasons. Two superintendents strongly advocated accountability as their main purpose. However, through further questioning it surfaced that both of these superintendents were attempting to change the images of their principals from manager to leader. In addition, they required the principals to delegate tasks and spend more time in the area of instructional improvement. Another superintendent said the purposes of principal evaluation in his district were to provide support for the principals and make certain building and district goals were aligned. These purposes were clearly understandable because this superintendent controlled one of the largest districts in the state with six buildings and six principals. Other single responses to the question included increasing student achievement, providing a sense of direction, maximizing a principal's potential, mandating by the state, empowering the principal, and improving the educational program and the faculty. Furthermore, it was critical to focus on the lack of several reasons being mentioned by the superintendents as purposes for evaluation.

For example, not one of the superintendents listed removal or dismissal of a principal as a purpose for evaluation. In addition, none of them responded directly that salary was a purpose for evaluation; however, during several interviews after much prodding and questioning, it surfaced that salary was linked directly to evaluation. Four superintendents tied salary increases directly to the summative evaluation, and two of those used to the process to determine merit pay increases.

In attempting to analyze why the responses concerning the purposes of evaluation were so varied, two reasons surfaced. First, the superintendents all utilized processes unique to their districts and which suited their needs. They had all refused the system suggested by the State of Illinois and instead used their own process, individualized to their district. Second, different superintendents had different goals and to achieve different goals there needed to be various purposes for evaluation. Obviously, the superintendent in the large district who was geographically separated from his principals wanted his principals to feel supported and desired to have building and district goals similar. The two superintendents who had the goal of changing their principals from manager to leader believed the purpose

for evaluation was accountability.

Thus, there were various purposes for evaluation with no one clear cut answer. From the interview phase of data collection, not one single purpose surfaced as the overwhelming response to why principals were evaluated. Although six of ten superintendents mentioned improvement of performance, the superintendents favored purposes that satisfied their needs, as they interpreted them, for their particular district.

Research Question Three: Who conducts the evaluation?

The third question examined and discussed involved who actually completed the evaluation and who had formal and informal input into the process. This question was asked both on the written survey and during the interviews. The written responses are discussed first. As to the first question of who completed the evaluation, it must be indicated, as shown in Table Eleven, from the written survey data, that six districts did not have a written form which was placed in the principal's permanent file; whereas, thirty-six of the districts or ninety percent did. Of the thirty-six districts, seventy-two percent required the superintendent to complete the report, with the other twenty-eight percent relying on a

combination of other administrators, and the principal. The critical issue with this question was not who was responsible for the evaluation, but how the superintendent made his judgments and who had formal and informal input into the process. The data gathered from the written survey indicated only eight or nineteen percent of the superintendents used formal, written data from faculty and eleven used formal feedback from other administrators. On examination of the materials which superintendents submitted with the completed questionnaire there were fifteen districts or thirty-four percent which asked for formal written feedback on a principal's performance from someone other than the superintendent. Also, in the written surveys, only thirty-one percent of the superintendents listed that they solicited teacher input on an informal basis.

During the interview process the issue of client centered assessment caused a fifty-fifty split in responses. Five of the superintendents strongly advocated including staff written evaluation of the principal as part of the process while the other five superintendents vehemently opposed using it. First, of the five superintendents who used a form for staff to complete, three of them used a form designed with a numerical rating scale

so that a specific number value was calculated for performance on each item. In all cases, the other administrators in the district and the principal completed the evaluation form in addition to the teachers. The five approaches differed when superintendents were asked specific details. One superintendent required all teachers to complete an evaluation of the principal anonymously; while another superintendent allowed the teachers to decide if they desired to complete a form. If they elected to complete a form, the teachers signed their name to it and the superintendent later deleted the name. Thus, he had discretion because he knew from whom the input came. The other three superintendents allowed the principal to select a group of teachers to complete the evaluation instrument. This appeared to be very bias; however, the superintendents all claimed that the sample was large enough, that they looked for trends, and that they ignored the extremes. All five of these superintendents adamantly supported using formal staff input. Interestingly, none of the five requested written input from students or parents regarding the principal's performance. Each of them summarized the data before submitting them to the principal and the principal did not receive any individual names. Why did the other five

superintendents oppose the idea of client centered assessment? In analyzing their responses, several reasons emerged.

First, not one of the five superintendents cited time, cost, or administrative details as reasons prohibiting the use of client centered assessment. It was important to note that these reasons were deterrents to using client centered assessment that surfaced in the review of literature. Instead these superintendents were comfortable with their current processes and information sources and thus stated no need to change. It surfaced that comfort and familiarity with a system were important to the superintendents. Of the five who used client centered assessment, four brought the process with them from their previous districts. Again, comfort and familiarity with a system were important.

Second, several superintendents questioned the accuracy of the data received in written form as opposed to that received verbally. In a verbal exchange the superintendent had the opportunity to question and ascertain if the teacher or parent had a specific reason for making the remark. These superintendents had a Machiavelli viewpoint in that they wanted to consider both the source and the reason for the source's supplying feed-

back.

Thus, superintendents elected to use or not use client centered assessment based on their comfort level with their current system, and their attitude concerning the accuracy of written data. In addition, what emerged as an extremely important information source for all ten superintendents was the informal grapevine. All ten constantly solicited input this way, sifted through it, and either accepted or rejected the information.

In conclusion, according to the written data, superintendents in general bear the responsibility for completing and conducting the evaluation of principals in their districts. From the interview data, differences arose as to how they obtained their formal data; however, they were all adamant concerning the positive use of the informal grapevine. Five superintendents solicited formal written feedback from staff; while the other five chose to use only their direct observations and contacts with the principal. All ten superintendents made extensive use of informally received data.

Research Question Four: What is the process or instrument employed?

The last question answered was what was the process or current instrument employed by school districts

for evaluation? This question was addressed specifically during the interview process as it was one not easily ascertained from the written materials submitted by superintendents and it was one that needed the clarification provided by a question and answer session. In reviewing the written materials from the forty-two districts, it quickly emerged that the great majority of processes included some type of goal setting as part of or as the total process. Also, other common threads which emerged were that none of the school districts used student test scores as a part of the process and only two percent of the superintendents shadowed the principal for a day or part of a day. This was particularly significant as the review of literature strongly advocated that shadowing was a part of the principal evaluation process, and some areas of the country specifically, California, were using student test scores to evaluate principal's performance.

In analyzing, the superintendents' lack of use of test scores or support for shadowing in the five counties, a few reasons surface. First, it was possible one reason that none of the superintendents used test scores to evaluate principals was because of the furor that was created in the state when ACT scores were included on

each school district's report card. The effect was compounded by the news media's subsequent rating and ranking of schools by test scores. Another reason for not utilizing tests scores as part of the process was that there was a question as to how much direct influence a principal had on test scores. Third, the question arose as to how a school district selected a test that adequately measured student's performance relative to the principal's performance.

From the interview processes, it was learned that shadowing was attempted by two of the ten superintendents interviewed and then abandoned. In both cases the superintendents believed it gave them a "false" sense of what the principal did. People who visited the principal's office were ill at ease with the superintendent's being there. All ten superintendents who were interviewed were visiting the individual buildings frequently and constantly soliciting feedback so that shadowing appeared not to be needed. Important to note was that thirty-two of the forty-two districts contained only one or two high schools. Thus, due to the generally small number of high schools per district in the sample for this survey, shadowing appeared unnecessary for the superintendents. With only one or two high schools, superintendents were

able to spend much time for on-site visitations.

Of the ten superintendents interviewed, eight used goal setting as part of the process and two did not. As a review of what was previously mentioned, four of the superintendents brought their processes of principal evaluation with them to their district, two used processes designed by their predecessor, three utilized a committee with principal involvement to formulate a process and one empowered a committee which borrowed another district's process. The specific processes employed by each of the ten districts were detailed previously in Chapter Four so contained in this section are a summary and analysis of their similarities and differences.

First, all the districts had a written job description on which the principal was evaluated. The rating methods varied. The methods were either, a number rating or a written qualification such as meets expectations, exceeds expectations or area of concern. The important difference in this area was that some districts had an even number of selections for rating and some had an odd number. This difference was significant because with an even number of choices, the evaluator was forced to choose between the positive or negative side; whereas, with an odd number of choices the evaluator was allowed

to select the middle choice and thereby not send the principal a clear signal about his performance. Also, all the districts included on the written form a place in which the superintendent made a narrative comment.

Second, in all the districts the principal evaluation process was a part of the total evaluation system used by the school district. In all ten situations, the process was both formative and summative. Five superintendents had four meetings a year with principals as part of the process, four met with the principal three times a year, and one met with the principal twice a year. The one superintendent who met with the principal twice a year happened to be a superintendent of a one building high school and his office was in the building.

Third, in all cases the process was cyclical and continuous. The goals or recommendations from one year, emerged as areas of concern or commendation for the next year. Fourth, all the superintendents believed the two best ways to obtain information were personal observation and informal grapevine feedback. They were all quick to clarify the need to verify grapevine information. Fifth, there was more of an emphasis on the instructional portion of a principal's job.

Differences in the processes existed in several

areas. First, as has already been mentioned, half of the districts used client centered assessment and half of them did not. Second, five of the districts ascribed to a process which reviewed a principal's administrative and/or leadership skills in addition to reviewing the yearly goals and the principal's job description. In fact, two of these districts employed the same twelve skills that were advocated by the NASSP Assessment Centers.

Third, a few of the processes were linked directly to the principal's salary increase and merit pay; while others were not according to the superintendents. Two superintendents indicated administrators salaries had nothing to do with the evaluation process but instead were directly related to teacher salary increases or to the whims of the Board of Education in the district.

A fourth area of difference appeared in two district's processes. These processes both included a category called "Critical Incidents". The superintendent wrote a statement in this section about a situation that had occurred during the school year and which had positively or negatively affected a principal's performance. Both superintendents ascribed strongly to this as it took into account the uniqueness of a school setting and the

difference between schools which were in the same district. In concluding this section, it was imperative to reiterate that these ten districts, in spite of their differences, all ascribed to very sophisticated, complex evaluation processes. So the next question became, why were these districts proactive in the area of principal evaluation and other districts not?

In attempting to analyze why these districts had "state of the art" principal evaluation processes, and others did not, several reasons surfaced. First, all ten districts had an elaborate evaluation system from the top to the bottom and principals were one part of the process. Second, it was apparent that geographic location, socio-economic level, or diversity of population had no influence on the process used in these five counties. As is shown in Appendix D, the ten districts in which superintendents were interviewed were definitely diverse and different in the three areas mentioned. Third, the superintendents all exhibited during the interviews a pride in their district and a pride in their principals. The performance levels of their principals were important to them, and although only two responded that they actually had removed a principal, the rest indicated they would not hesitate to do so if necessary. In addition,

four superintendents indicated that even though they had not used the process to remove a principal, the process had assisted several principals in making a retirement decision.

Fourth, size of the district in relation to the number of separate high school buildings seemed to have had a slight influence. The written demographic data portrayed that thirty-two of the forty-two districts with returned surveys contained only one or two high schools in the district. Of the ten superintendents interviewed, fifty percent of them were from districts with three or more high schools. So to some extent, it appeared the larger school districts, in terms of number of high school sites, had more defined systems.

Last, although two of the superintendents had only been a superintendent for one year, they were promoted from within the districts. All of the districts in which interviews were conducted had a history of stability in relation to the longevity superintendents. Accountability became a factor, because the superintendent intended to remain in the position for a significant time period.

Thus, from both the written survey and interviews it surfaced that no district had a process which used

student test scores and very few used shadowing. Goal setting was an important characteristic employed by many districts. In addition, in those districts in which the superintendent was interviewed, the process was part of a total evaluation system encompassing all employees.

Geographic location, socio-economic levels or ethnic diversity did not influence the process that was used in these districts. The longevity of the superintendents in these ten districts dictated the need for accountability and therefore a good process of principal evaluation.

Based on the preceding analysis of the four research questions, several conclusions and recommendations were made. The conclusions and recommendations are detailed in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purposes of this chapter are to summarize the procedure utilized for this study, to discuss the conclusions that emerged, to make recommendations based on the conclusions and to make recommendations for future study. The chapter is divided into four sections which contain a summary of the process, conclusions, recommendations, and recommendations for future study.

SUMMARY

The general purpose of this study was to ascertain the current status of principal evaluation in the five Illinois counties of Cook, DuPage, Will, McHenry and Lake. Specifically the answers to the subsequent four research questions prompted this study:

1. What is the current status of public high school principal evaluation?
2. What is the purpose of principal evaluation?
3. Who conducts the evaluation?
4. What is the process or instrument employed?

The procedures utilized in conducting this study consisted of a written questionnaire mailed to fifty-two superintendents of the public high school districts in the counties of Cook, DuPage, Will, McHenry and Lake. Forty-four or eighty-five percent of the superintendents responded. Two of the forty-four responses were subsequently deleted as the superintendents performed the roles of superintendent and principal. The responses from the written survey were compared with the twenty criteria identified in the review of literature. The ten districts whose processes encompassed the largest number of criteria were selected. The ten superintendents of these districts were interviewed. The purposes of the of the interviews were to validate and clarify responses to the written survey, to obtain more in-depth information and to determine if the superintendents believed the process helped or hindered a principal's performance. The results and an analysis of the data were detailed in Chapter Four. The subsequent sections contain conclusions and recommendations generated from the analysis.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The status of the principal evaluation processes was one of stability, and comfort with current systems. School districts in this study were not rushing to change their processes due to reform measures or state mandates. Ninety percent of the districts surveyed employed a process. Seventy-six percent of the districts with a process had had the process for three or more years. The stability of superintendents in this survey was noteworthy as sixty percent had been in their current position for four or more years. This contributed to the stability of the principal evaluation processes.
2. Ninety percent of the districts surveyed employed a written evaluation process; however, the processes varied greatly as to their complexity and purposes. All the districts in this survey had a job description for the principal; however, only forty-three percent of the written sample employed a process that was both formative and summative. Whereas, all ten districts selected for the interviews had processes that used both formative and summative phases. In comparison to the twenty criteria identified in the

review of literature as components of a good process, only fifteen of the original sample districts employed ten or more criteria; while, twenty-four of the districts used six or less of the criteria. From the interview data, it appeared there was no relationship between the complexity of the process employed and the areas of geographic location, socio-economic level, and ethnic diversity.

3. There was no one clear cut purpose for evaluation of principals. During the interview process, superintendents stated numerous purposes for evaluation. Although a slight majority indicated improvement of principal performance as an important purpose, all the superintendents articulated specific purposes based on their districts' individual needs and goals. Not one of the interviewed superintendents listed hiring or firing as a specific purpose.
4. The process of evaluation was conducted by the superintendents who relied heavily on informal grapevine information they received. The written survey data and interview data espoused the fact that superintendents relied on direct observation and informal discussion with teachers at the building sites to gather information concerning a principal's performance.

The informal grapevine was an important source of information. Shadowing was not supported as a method to collect data. In addition, the interviewed superintendents were all quick to mention that the use of verbal feedback allowed them to check the source and the reason the source revealed the information.

Client centered assessment was used by less than one third of the written sample, but was used by fifty percent of the interview sample. Time or money did prevent superintendents from using multiple data sources, but rather their familiarity with the process and concern over the validity of the data.

5. Senate Bill 730 and the superintendents' mandated attendance at the Illinois Administrators Academy had virtually no effect on the principal evaluation processes utilized by districts in this study.

Seventy-four percent of the superintendents who responded to the written survey indicated the above and of the few who had been affected, the influence had been in terms of word terminology or format changes. None of the superintendents interviewed had changed their process due to the state's efforts; however, two of them indicated their assistant superintendents taught at the Academy.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Illinois Administrators Academy should be reviewed to determine its effectiveness.
2. A statewide needs assessment might be considered to determine what assistance, if any, superintendents believe they need concerning principal evaluation.
3. Individual school districts should periodically review their principal evaluation processes to ascertain if the process is meeting their specific needs.
4. School districts which employ a summative process only, should be encouraged to utilize a formative phase also.
5. Superintendents should continue to verify and check the accuracy of the informal feedback they receive.
6. School districts should review the purposes of their principal evaluation process to make certain they include the growth and development of the individual principal.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDY

1. Interview principals in these same five counties to determine if their perceptions agree with the superintendent's views concerning the four research questions.
2. Re-survey the districts five years from now to ascertain what the status of principal evaluation is.
3. Compile an in-depth study on the effectiveness of the Illinois Administrators Academy.
4. Interview the superintendents of the districts which were using the fewest of the twenty criteria synthesized from the review of literature to ascertain why they do what they do.
5. Survey other areas of Illinois or the country to compare their processes with what is occurring in the five counties in this study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, Carol., Pellicer, Leonard., and Boardman, Gerald., "Model for Administrator Training, Development Uses Both Theory and Practice", NASSP Bulletin, January 1984, p.14-19.
- Allen, Sally V., "How Board and Head Measure Their Performance", Independent School, February 1982, p.69-72.
- Anderson, R.E., and Bartlett, Cleo., "Clearing Up The Evaluative Process for the High School Principalship", NASSP Bulletin, January 1984, p.10-13.
- Anzaldua, Gilberto., "An Effective Approach To Evaluation", Thrust, October 1984, p.15-17.
- Bailey, Gerald., "Faculty Feedback for Administrators, A Means To Improve Leadership Behavior", NASSP Bulletin, January 1984, p.5-9.
- Barnett, Bruce., and Long, Claudia., "Peer-Assisted Leadership: Principals Learning From Each Other", Phi Delta Kappan, May 1986, p.672-675.
- Barth, Roland., "The Principalship", Educational Leadership, October 1984, p.93.
- Bellon, Jerry., Developing A Comprehensive Personnel Evaluation Program, p.1-11.
- Black, John C., How To Improve and Evaluate the Principal's Performance, (Dallas: National Association of School Boards Association, 1981), p.1-8.
- Bottoni, Wayne., How to Evaluate and Improve the Principal's Performance, (Houston: National School Board Association, 1984), p.1-9.
- Brandt, Ron., "On Leadership and Student Achievement", Educational Leadership, September 1987, p.9-16.
- Brightman, Harvey., "Improving Principals' Performance Through Training in the Decision Sciences", Educational Leadership, February 1984, p.50-56.

- Burch, Barbara., and Danley, W. Elzie., "Supervisory Role Proficiency: A Self Assessment", NASSP Bulletin, February 1980, p.91-97.
- Buser, Robert L., and Stuck, Dean L., Evaluation And The Principal, Illinois Principals Association, 1976, p.1-58.
- Buser, Robert L., and Banks, Freddie A., "The Why, What, How and By Whom of Evaluating Principals", NASSP Bulletin January 1984, p.1-4.
- Culbertson, Jack., Evaluation of Middle - Administrative Personnel: A Component of The Accountability Process, (American Association of School Administrators, 1977) p.1-11.
- Duhamel, Ronald., Cyze, Michael., Lamacraft, George., and Rutherford, Carol., "The Evaluation of Principals", Education Canada, Summer 1981, p.20-27.
- Duke, Daniel., and Stiggins, Richard., "Evaluating the Performance of Principals: A Descriptive Study", Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 21, No. 4, Fall 1985, p.71-98.
- English, Fenwick W., Francis, Samuel., and Schmunk, James., "The Dilemma of Being in the Middle: A Contemporary View of the Principalship" NASSP Bulletin, February 1982, p.96-100.
- Erlandson, David A., "NASSP's Consortium for The Performance Based Preparation of Principals: An Update", NASSP Bulletin, November 1986, p.70-76.
- Ernest, Bill., "Can You Eat? Can You Sleep? Can You Laugh? The Why and How of Evaluating Principals?", The Clearinghouse, March 1985, Vol. 58, No. 7, p.290-293.
- Fansher, Ted., and Buxton, Thomas., "A Job Satisfaction Profile of the Female Secondary School Principals in the United States", NASSP Bulletin, January 1984, p.32-39.
- Finn, Chester E. Jr., "Pick Principals With Promise", The Executive Educator, June 1988, p.20-21.

- Fleming, Steve., et al., Teaching The Future - Guidelines for Performance Based Principal Evaluation, Liberty School District, Liberty, Missouri, p.1-26.
- Gallagher, Michael P., Assessment for 1983-84 School Year, Administrative/Supervisor Performance Review, Cleveland: Ohio Department of Research and Analysis, 1984.
- Glasman, Naftaly S., "Three Evaluation - Related Behaviors of the School Principal", Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, Fall Vol. 8, No. 3, 1986, p.227-236.
- Hardy, Robert., "Measuring the Competent Administrator A Tongue In Cheek Approach", NASSP Bulletin, February 1982, p.87-90.
- Harrison, William C., and Peterson, Kent., "Pitfalls in the Evaluation of Principals", The Urban Review, Vol. 18, No. 4, 1986, p.221-235.
- Harrison, William C., and Peterson, Kent., "Evaluation of Principals The Process Can Be Improved", NASSP Bulletin, May 1988, p.1-5.
- Hartley, Carolyn., "How Panic Taught Me A Lesson About Performance", The Executive Educator, February 1982, p.24-28.
- Herman, Jerry., "Guidelines for Evaluating And Compensating Administrators", NASSP Bulletin, December 1977, p.1-9.
- Herman, Jerry J., "Evaluating Administrators and Assessing Their Competence", NASSP Bulletin, May 1988, p.5-10.
- Hersey, Paul., How NASSP Helps Identify, Develop Superior Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1987, p.1-5.
- High, Reginald., and Achilles, Charles., "An Analysis of Influence Gaining Behaviors of Principals in Schools of Varying Level of Instructional Effectiveness", Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 22, No. 1, Winter 1986, p.111-119.

- Hunt, John., and Buser, Robert., "Evaluating the Principal Partnership or Paternalism", NASSP Bulletin, December 1977, p.10-15.
- Knoop, Robert., and Common, Ronald., A Performance Appraisal System for School Principals, (Canada: Canadian Society for the Study of Education, 1985).
- Lamb, Ronald., and Thomas, Donald., "The Principalship - The Calling and Its Requirements", NASSP Bulletin, January 1984, p.20-25.
- Langlois, Donald., "The Sky Won't Fall If Teachers Evaluate Principal Performance", The Executive Educator, March 1986, p.19.
- Lindahl, Ronald A., "Implementing A New Evaluation System For Principals: An Experience in Planned Change", Planning & Changing, Winter 1986, 17:p.224-232.
- Lilyquist, J. Gary., Evaluation of High School Principals By Boards of Education, Dissertation, July 1986, University of Wisconsin.
- Look, Ellen., and Mannatt, Richard., "Evaluating Principal Performance With Improved Criteria", NASSP Bulletin, December 1984, p.76-81.
- Louis, Karen Seashore., "Reforming Secondary Schools: A Critique And An Agenda for Administrators", Educational Leadership, September 1986, p.33-36.
- McGraw, Charles., Guidelines For Performance Based Administrative Evaluation Blue Springs, Missouri, Blue Springs R-IV School District, Blue Springs, Missouri, p.1-35.
- Malloy, Arthur, L., Performance Based Principal Evaluation Missouri Schools, Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, February 1987, p.1-51.
- Mass, Bernard., "The Principal: Directing External Influences for Leadership", The Clearinghouse, January 1985, p.203-206.
- McIntyre, Kenneth E., and Grant, Ed., "How Principals, Teachers and Superintendents View the Principalship", NASSP Bulletin, February 1980, p.44-49.

- Manasse, Lori., "Principals: As Leaders of High Performing Systems", Educational Leadership, February 1986, p.42-46.
- Manning, Renfro C., "Improving Principals' Performance Through Motivation and Evaluation", ERS Spectrum, Spring 1983, Vol. I, No. 1, p.33-35.
- Mayher, Laurence T., "Administrator Unions: Do They Strengthen or Weaken the Principalship?", NASSP Bulletin, January 1984, p.40-43.
- Melton, George E., et al., The Principals Job Specifications and Salary Considerations For The 70's, National Association of Secondary School Principals, Washington D.C.
- Michigan State Department of Education, The Michigan Institute for Educational Management Assessment Center Program, February 1985, p.1-16.
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education., Performance Based Principal Evaluation in Missouri Schools, February 1987.
- Murphy, Joseph., Hallinger, Phillip., and Peterson, Kent D., The Administrative Control of Principals in Effective School Districts, 1986.
- Murphy, Joseph., Hallinger, Phillip., and Peterson, Kent D., "Supervising and Evaluating Principals: Lessons from Effective Districts", Educational Leadership, October 1985, p.79-82.
- Murphy Joseph., Peterson, Kent D., and Hallinger, Philip., "The Administrative Control of Principals in Effective School Districts: The Supervision and Evaluation Functions", The Urban Review, Vol. 18, 1986, p.149-175.
- National Institute of Education, Principal Evaluation, ERIC Research Action Brief Number 12, 1980.
- Northwest Educational Cooperative, Administrators Academy Book 1986, The Evaluation of Principals As Instructional Leaders, Arlington Heights, Illinois.

- Prince, Julian D., "Performance Based Evaluation of School Principals: A Feedback Design to Support Effective Schools", ERS Spectrum, Vol. 5, No. 1, Winter 1987, p.38-46.
- Redfern, George., "Techniques of Evaluation of Principals and Assistant Principals Four Case Studies", NASSP Bulletin, February 1986, p.66-74.
- Redfern, George., "Evaluation of Principals", The Practitioner, June 1981, Vol. VII, No. 4, p.1-12
- Ritenour School District., Guidelines for Performance Based Principal Evaluation, Missouri, June 1986, p.1-25.
- Rist, Marilee., "Principals Mull The Merits of New Evaluation Techniques" The Executive Educator, April 1986, p.37-43.
- Rogers, Vincent., Talbot, Cynthia., and Cosgrove, Ellen., "Excellence - Some Lessons From America's Best Run Companies", Educational Leadership, February 1984, p.39-46.
- Rutherford, William L., "School Principals As Effective Leaders", Phi Delta Kappan, September 1985, p.31-34.
- Shreive, William., Radelaugh, Muriel., Norby, Janet R., Stueckle, Arnold F., Goetter, William., Zyskowski, Charlotte., DeMichele, Barbara., and Midgley, Thomas., "Why Teachers Flunk: Evaluation and Probation of Teachers, Counselors and Principals in Washington State", The Clearinghouse, January 1986, p.207-210.
- Snyder, Carolyn., and Johnson, William., "Retraining Principals For Productive School Management", Educational Research Quarterly, 1985, Vol. 9, No. 3, p.17-27.
- Thomas, Donald., "States Consider Four Issues In Reform of Education", NASSP Bulletin, September 1986, p.4-10.
- Tucker, Null., and Bray, SuEllen., Performance Based Leadership Assessment: DeKalb County Schools, Georgia: DeKalb County School System, 1984.

Tucker, Null A., and Bray, SuEllen., Increasing School Productivity Through The Assessment of School Leadership, Louisiana: Southeastern Educational Research Association, 1986.

Tucker, Null A., and Bray, SuEllen., Increasing School Productivity Through The Assessment of School Leadership", (Educational Research Association Meeting, March 1986), p.1-9.

U.S. Department of Education, Principal Selection Guide, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, June 1987, p.1-43.

Valentine, Jerry W., Performance Outcome Based Principal Evaluation, (Annahiem: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1988), p.1-25.

Wilhelm, Patricia M., "The Administrative Team, a Simple Concept To Facilitate Problem Solving", NASSP Bulletin, January, p.26-31.

Winter, William F., et al., Effective School Principals, Southern Regional Education Board SREB Commission for Educational Quality, 1986, p.1-28.

Zakrajsek, Barbara., "Evaluation Systems: A Critical Look", NASSP Bulletin, January 1979, p.100-111.

APPENDIX A

PRINCIPAL EVALUATION PROCESS SURVEY

I. Personal Data

Name _____

School District _____

Number of Years in Current Position _____

Number of years as Superintendent _____

Highest Degree Achieved Masters _____

CAS _____

EdD _____

PhD _____

II. District Data

Size of District (# of pupils) _____

Number of High Schools _____

Money spent per pupil as reported in your 1986-87 State

Report Card _____

III. Current Principal Evaluation System

1. Does your district have a formal (ie written) evaluation process utilized for principals? Yes _____ No _____
(If yes, please enclose a copy of it)

If yes, how long has the current process been in use?
_____ years

If no, please describe the district's view concerning principal evaluation. _____

2. Is there a written evaluation form that must be completed and placed in the principal's permanent file? Yes _____ No _____

(If yes, please enclose, if different than #1.)

If yes, who completes the form? _____

If no, how is a principal's performance documented? _____

3. Is there a written job description for Principals? Yes _____ No _____ (If yes, please enclose a copy)

If no, how is job content communicated to the principal? _____

4. Who participates either formally or informally in the process? Formal participation would indicate the person completes a written evaluation of the principal. Informally would mean the person who evaluates the principal requests verbal feedback from this group as to the principal's performance.

	<u>Formally</u> (Completes Written Document)	<u>Informally</u>	<u>Not at all</u>
Students	_____	_____	_____
Teachers	_____	_____	_____
Parents	_____	_____	_____
Administrators	_____	_____	_____
Superintendent	_____	_____	_____
Board of Education	_____	_____	_____
Others (Please identify)	_____	_____	_____

5. Has your district's policy and/or process for evaluating evaluating principals been influenced by Senate Bill 730? Yes _____ No _____ If yes, please explain how _____

6. Has your attendance at the Illinois Administrators Academy influenced your district's principal evaluation process?

Yes _____ No _____ If yes, briefly explain _____

7. Other comments _____

APPENDIX B

List of Schools In The Sample

Hinsdale District 86, Dr. John R. Thorson
Glenbard District 87, Dr. Robert C. Stevens
DuPage District 88, Dr. Robert Lopatka
Community District 94, Dr. Richard Kamn
Community District 99, Dr. David Hendrix
Fenton District 100, Mr. Carl Herren
Lake Park District 108, Dr. James M. Slezak
J. Sterling Morton District 201, Mr. Edmund R. Parpart
Evanston District 202, Dr. Robert W. Goldman
New Trier District 203, Dr. Roderick N. Bickert
Lyons District 204, Dr. John B. Patzwald
Thornton District 205, Dr. Richard J. Taylor
Bloom District 206, Dr. Richard M. Carrabine
Maine District 207, Dr. James L. Elliott
Riverside/Brookfield District 208, Dr. Charles LeCrone
Proviso District 209, Dr. Jack Stanley
Lemont District 210, Dr. John F. Murphy
Township District 211, Dr. Richard Kolze
Leydon District 212, Dr. Jack B. Schoenholtz
Township District 214, Dr. Stephen Berry
Morton/Fractional District 215, Mr. Al Vega
Argo District 217, Dr. Steven Holbrook
Oak Lawn District 218, Dr. Gene Cartwright
Niles District 219, Dr. John Hinck
Reavis District 220, Dr. W. Michael Morrissey
Glenbrook District 225, Dr. Jean McGrew
Rich District 227, Dr. Robert C. Rubenow
Bremer District 228, Mr. James E. Riordan
Oak Lawn District 229, Mr. Dominick A. Frego
Consolidated District 230, Dr. Ronald E. Barnes
Homewood-Flossmoor District 233, Dr. Edward J. Rachford
Evergreen Park District 231, Dr. O. Renfrow
Ridgewood District 234, Dr. David Jennings
Oak Park District 200, Dr. George Gustafson
Marengo District 154, Mr. Robert Seaver
Community District 155, Mr. Robert Cryer
McHenry District 156, Mr. Robert Swartzloff
Richmond/Burton District 157, Dr. Ronald Erdmann
Joliet District 204, Dr. Reginald S. Nolin
Lockport District 205, Dr. Donald Weber
Lincoln Way District 210, Mr. Lee F. Rosenquist
Township District 113, Dr. James H. Warren

Lake Forest District 115, Dr. Robert H. Metcalf
Antioch District 117, Mr. Gary K. Allen
Mundelein District 120, Mr. Wayne R. Bottoni
Warren District 121, Mr. Robert Shepard
North Chicago District 123, Mr. Kenneth J. Bond
Grant District 124, Dr. Donald J. Klusendorf
Adlai Stevenson District 125, Dr. Milton R. Herzog
Zion Benton District 126, Dr. David H. Cox
Grayslake District 127, Dr. Griff E. Powell
Libertyville District 128, Dr. Donald L. Gossett

APPENDIX C

Survey Responses

DuPage County Returned

District 86 Hinsdale
 District 87 Glenbard
 District 88 DuPage
 District 94 West Chicago
 District 100 Fenton

No Response

District 108 Lake Park

Lake County Returned

District 113 Highland Park
 District 117 Antioch
 District 120 Mundelin
 District 121 Warren
 District 123 North Chicago
 District 124 Grant
 District 125 Stevenson
 District 126 Zion Benton
 District 127 Grayslake
 District 128 Libertyville

No Response

District 115 Lake Forest

Will County Returned

District 205 Lockport
 District 210 Lincoln Way

No Response

District 204 Joliet

McHenry County Returned

District 154 Marengo
 District 155 Crystal Lake

No Response

District 156 McHenry
 District 157 Richmond

Cook County Returned

District 210 Morton
 District 202 Evanston
 District 203 New Trier
 District 204 Lyons
 District 205 Thornton
 District 206 Bloom
 District 207 Maine
 District 208 Riverside
 /Brookfield
 District 209 Proviso
 District 210 Lemont
 District 211 Palatine
 District 212 Leyden
 District 214 Prospect
 District 215 Thornton
 Fractional

District 217 Argo
 District 218 Oak Lawn
 District 219 Niles
 District 220 Reavis
 District 225 Glenbrook
 District 227 Rich
 District 228 Breman
 District 229 Oak Lawn
 District 230 Palos Hills
 District 233 Howewood
 /Flossmoor

No Response

District 200 Oak Park
 District 231 Evergreen
 Park
 District 234 Ridgewood

APPENDIX D

School districts selected in which the superintendent was interviewed.

DuPage County

Glenbard District 87

Hinsdale District 86

Cook County

New Trier District 203

Thornton District 205

Maine District 207

Morton District 210

Prospect District 214

Argo District 217

McHenry County

Crystal Lake District 155

Will County

Lincoln Way District 210

APPENDIX E

QUESTIONS FOR SUPERINTENDENTS INTERVIEWS

1. Describe the process your district uses regarding principal evaluation and the philosophy behind it. How many times do you meet with the principal as part of the evaluation process and what is the purpose of each meeting?
2. How was your process of principal evaluation determined and who was involved in the development of the process? Were any research studies and/or consultants utilized?
3. Has your district considered using multiple data sources or client-centered assessment?
4. How do you obtain information about the principal's performance for both formative and summative evaluation?
5. Explain how input from other groups is utilized in the process.
6. How do you feel about using student test scores versus not using them - California.
7. How often do you visit (on-site) the schools and principals?
8. Do you do a formal or informal shadowing of the principal? If yes, how often, announced or unannounced, and how do you give feedback?
9. Have you ever fired or demoted a principal using this current evaluation system?
10. Clarify/expand on how Senate Bill 730 and the Administrators Academy has or has not influenced your process of principal evaluation.
11. To what extent do you believe your process either helps or hinders a principal's performance?
12. Is your district's principal evaluation process periodically reviewed or evaluated?

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Laura Lee F. Murray has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Max A. Bailey
Associate Professor, Educational Leadership and
Policy Studies, Loyola

Dr. Melvin P. Heller
Professor and Chair, Educational Leadership and
Policy Studies, Loyola

Dr. Philip M. Carlin
Associate Professor, Educational Leadership and
Policy Studies, 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 Philosophy.

November 10, 1988
Date

Max Bailey
Director's Signature