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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

The evaluation of the elementary school principal is receiving increasing attention by the state legislature, the public at large and the educational profession.

Debra D. Nygaard conducted a study for Educational Research Service, Inc., which indicated the lack of formal elementary evaluation systems.

Traditionally, business and industry have led in the development and implementation of comprehensive management appraisal programs. Education by contrast, has had relatively little experience with formal administrative evaluation - especially with the integration of evaluation and other organizational processes. Administrative evaluation in the past has been largely an isolated process based on an individual supervisory style and consisting of a superior assessment of the personal characteristics or performance of the administrator. ¹

Roald F. Campbell believes there has long been some skepticism about what administrators do and questions whether the evaluation of administrative performance is part of the current accountability syndrome. He also states that

Every profession needs to assess itself - to determine the roles of its members and to develop procedures whereby the effectiveness of their performance can be ascertained. Only by doing so can knowledge be extended and individual growth assured. Both specialized knowledge and individual growth are required if a profession

is to serve the larger society, still one of the hallmarks of any profession.\(^2\)

While the lack of formal evaluation of elementary school principals exist, there are other factors and concerns with the evaluation systems that already exist. Jack Culbertson describes some factors: (1) It seems clear that increasing numbers of groups of individuals are pressing for more systematic ways for evaluating principals and for holding schools accountable, (2) a related condition is that principals increasingly are confronted about questions of purpose, policy and procedures by students, they must be able to give a reckoning to this group, (3) as decentralization tendencies evolve, school systems will need to establish goals and guidelines which will encourage leadership and initiative in all attendance units, however, the specific objectives of differing attendance units will necessarily vary because the learning needs of students in different schools will differ, the cultural traditions of attendance units in different areas will be dissimilar and the parent aspirations and concerns in different neighborhoods will be diverse (4) it seems clear that evaluation systems can be shaped by diverse values and emphases even at the attendance unit level.\(^3\)


Robert E. Greene is clearly dissatisfied with the present administrative appraisal systems. He believes that school administrators schooled in good management techniques frequently are not very effective when working with evaluation procedures. They may even use techniques that actually curtail the potential in other administrators equally knowledgeable in the precepts of good administration.

The tragedy is that appraisal programs in some of our school districts often accomplish the opposite of what is intended. The improvement of instruction is almost always cited in prefaces to appraisal programs as the purpose for evaluation. Indeed, that should be the goal. However, school systems initiating a formal evaluation process many times employ appraisal instruments at least fifty years old in concept. Typical rating instruments still devote considerable space to manner of dress, oral expression and other factors that are more indicative of personality than of administrative ability. Such factors are important and have a place in evaluation but not to the degree they are given on many forms. The process of appraisal is more important than the instrument used. This fact must be emphasized. Instruments, it must be remembered, are only vehicles to accomplish the task. 4

The Purpose

The purpose of this study is to analyze the process of evaluating the elementary school principal. Accountability is the key word for all educators in the 70's. Evaluation systems are currently being developed to provide a means for educational direction. Evaluation in education is a must and if anyone in education needs careful assessment, it is the school principal. Each individual principal has a special

---

need to examine the quality of his work. Only by arriving at
a clear and reliable analysis of the level of his administrative effectiveness, is it possible to improve the quality of
his performance in ways that will significantly affect his
educational program.

Since the principal is the leader of the educational
unit, his effectiveness is paramount to the success of the
total operation. The process of evaluating principals serves
as the means to an end and it needs careful analysis to de-
termine how each principal's performance can be improved. Im-
provement of each principal's performance should enhance the
educational opportunities for all who attend school.

This study has: (1) investigated and reported the
components of the process of evaluating the principal, (2)
identified the existence, purpose, frequency and the format
of the total process of evaluating the principal and (3)
suggested direction to future evaluation systems and programs
relating to the principal.

Hopefully, the results of this study will enable
Boards of Education members and central office personnel
to compare and contrast their own process of evaluating
principals and it will significantly contribute to the fi-
nalized components of their evaluation programs.

Method and Procedure

After studying the current research and professional
literature, six hypotheses have been derived concerning the
process of evaluating elementary school principals.
1. Formal evaluation of principals exists in a majority of elementary districts.

2. The evaluation of principals is an ongoing, continuous process during the school year.

3. The major purpose of evaluation of principals is to assess present performance in accordance with prescribed standards.

4. The written evaluation instrument of principals is the major component of the total evaluation process.

5. Performance objectives are integral components of the evaluation process in a majority of elementary school districts.

6. The process of evaluation of principals is dependent upon clear performance expectations as defined by the superintendent.

Three principal methods were used to collect data to support or refute the hypotheses. First, an analysis of written evaluation instruments of elementary principals was conducted; second, a questionnaire was sent to superintendents covering the evaluation process; and third, interviews were scheduled with selected superintendents.

Specific details on the procedures to obtain and analyze the written evaluation instruments were accomplished in the following manner.

1. One hundred and fifteen (115), kindergarten through eighth grade elementary school districts in Cook County (excluding Chicago) were contacted
to forward their evaluation instruments of principals. Chicago was excluded because of its unique size and administrative structure.

2. The available evaluation instruments of principals were analyzed using the following procedures.

A. Number of performance standards vs. the performance objective evaluation format.
   (Appendix A)

B. Listing of common elements of major performance areas.

C. The format of the evaluation instruments were analyzed according to the frequency of:
   (1) Rating of prescribed scale only.
   (2) Rating of narrative comments only.
   (3) Rating scale and narrative comments.

D. A percentage response was computed in procedures A and C.

In the second method, the data derived from the questionnaire were obtained from contacting the superintendent in one hundred and fifteen (115) Cook County elementary school districts. The questionnaire focused on the type of evaluation instrument used, frequency of evaluation, district practices and purpose. (Appendix B)

Twenty superintendents were interviewed in method three to identify all the components of their evaluation process of principals. Since Cook County is divided into four areas by the Educational Service Region, five super-
intendents from each area were selected at random for the interview. The areas and school district name and numbers are specifically listed in the 1976 Cook County Directory of Suburban Public Schools.\footnote{The 1976 Directory of Suburban Public Schools, Educational Service Region, Cook County, 1976, pp. 7-10.}

The interview format was designed to provide additional information for supporting or refuting each hypothesis. All questions were open-ended and depicted the superintendent's philosophy, policies, procedures, and purpose of the total evaluation process of principals. (See Appendix C) A narrative analysis of the evaluation process focused on the superintendent's expressed views highlighting the similarities and differences, strengths and weaknesses, advantages and disadvantages, and negative and positive effects.

The interview format was first tested on fellow students in the Graduate School at Loyola University, Chicago, and other superintendents not participating in this study.

Data gleaned from the analysis of the written evaluation instruments of principals, the questionnaire and the interviews were structured to support or refute the hypotheses. Conclusions were derived from the results of the methods described and a percentage response was computed regarding each hypothesis, (e.g., hypothesis one, formal evaluation of principals exists in a majority of elementary districts.) Conclusions were drawn from (1) responses of one hundred and fifteen (115) school districts contacted to forward their
evaluation instruments of principals and (2) responses from the one hundred and fifteen (115) school districts contacted in regard to the questionnaire. The acceptance or rejection of hypothesis one is based on (1) percentage response computed in conclusion one, (2) percentage response computed in conclusion two and (3) percentages computed in one and two will be averaged. Fifty-one (51) percent will determine the acceptance of hypothesis one.

Limitations and Delimitations

Limitations of this study would be the ones that are inherent of the interview method itself. "Many people are more willing to communicate orally than in writing, and, therefore, will provide data more readily and fully in an interview than on a questionnaire."6 From the respondents, incidental comments, facial and bodily expressions, and tone of voice, the interview provided information that would not be conveyed in written replies.

A structured interview was incorporated since this type of interview is more definite in nature than unstructured ones, yet respondents were given the opportunity to express their thoughts freely.

A further limitation of the interview method concerns the employment of a common vocabulary with the respondents. Similar language was used to identify evaluation components by practicing administrators. Operating conditions of the

superintendent's position are generally universal with respect to organizational charts and supervision of subordinate administrators.

This study is delimited to public school superintendents. It is also delimited by the fact that the study confines itself to the Cook County area.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

There are three major sources of research related to this study: (1) reports, (2) articles and (3) dissertations. All three sources are summarized with significant points highlighted as they relate to the process of evaluating elementary school principals.

Reports

Educational Research Service, Inc. has published three studies on evaluating administrative performance. In 1968, Educational Research Service conducted a survey questionnaire which was sent to all school systems enrolling over 25,000 pupils and to 31 randomly selected smaller systems. Of the 200 questionnaires sent 157 systems responded, however, 79 (51%) said either that their systems did not evaluate administrators or the procedures were rather informal. Another 16 systems reported that evaluation procedures were either in the process of formulation or of revision. Sixty-two systems provided the data for the analysis of procedures, purpose, personnel evaluated and evaluators.

That the trend toward evaluating administrators is growing is substantiated by the fact that a majority of the responding systems have recently introduced or revised their evaluation procedures. Twenty-five of the procedures have been established in the past five years and another 22 have undergone revision in the past year. Only 16 of the 62 systems have had some
form of administrative evaluation for more than ten years.\(^7\)

In 1971, a follow-up survey was completed by Educational Research Service. Two years of effort culminating in 1964 identified only 50 plans for appraising administrative personnel. The 1968 survey, mentioned previously in this study, uncovered 62 formal programs of administrative evaluation. For the 1971 survey only school systems enrolling 25,000 or more pupils were included, omitting smaller systems. Of the 192 questionnaires sent, 154 or 80% responded, revealing that 84 systems currently have formal procedures for assessing the performance of administrative personnel. The figures compiled on the 84 school systems appear to indicate that the larger the school system, the more likely it is to have an evaluation program for administrators and supervisory employees.\(^8\)


Evaluation processes vary widely depending upon (1) the focus of evaluation (in other words, the evaluative criteria selected due to their assumed relationship to administrative effectiveness), (2) the specific evaluation procedures and instruments utilized and


the general function of administrative evaluation within the educational organization.  

On the topic of purpose of evaluation, research has shown that some evaluation procedures actually can be harmful to performance and morale. In one study it was found that open recognition given to individual employees by supervisors had a significant negative relationship with group morale. According to another study negative feedback can fail to motivate the typical employee and even cause him to perform less effectively. Consequently, the evaluation process must be examined to determine whether or not it is performing its function.

Included in the 1974 Educational Research Service report is a survey specifically about the use of management by objectives by local school systems. Although the results of the survey on the use of performance objectives evaluations of administrators in systems utilizing management by objectives are not comparable to the two earlier Educational Research Service surveys, they do support the trend to greater use of performance objectives as the basis for administrative evaluation. (They are not comparable because information on the use of performance objectives in administrative evaluation was solicited only from the systems reporting the installation of a management by objectives system.)

Roald F. Campbell in a presentation at the American

Association of School Administrators Annual Convention, 1971, believed that a set of criteria for functions defined in behavioral terms is necessary for an evaluation of administrative performance. He suggested the major functions of an administrator are as follows:

1. To influence the goals and purposes of the organization and to help clarify those purposes in and out of the organization.
2. To encourage and support the development of programs designed to implement the purposes.
3. To recruit and organize persons into productive teams to implement the appropriate programs.
4. To procure and allocate the necessary resources to support the programs in the order of priority established.
5. To evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency by which all of these functions are being achieved.10

Jack A. Culbertson, in a similar presentation with Campbell at the American Association of School Administrators Convention, 1971, contended that evaluation systems inevitably reflect the values and aspirations of school districts.

These values may reflect much more of an orientation toward effective handling of the status quo or they may reflect a posture of effective efforts to improve the status quo. We strongly believe that evaluation systems for principals should be designed with the explicit objective of stimulating leadership and improvement efforts.

Among the action implications of interest to those involved in implementing evaluation systems are the following:

1. If more effective formal evaluation and accountability systems for principals are to be achieved, school superintendents and central office personnel

10Campbell, op. cit., p. 4.
will need to take the lead in bringing about the establishment of these systems.

(2) Evaluation and accountability systems, if they are to be responsible to public interests, will need to be supported by plans for communication systems which effectively link school and community personnel.

(3) School systems instituting evaluation and accountability systems in a climate of growing citizen interest will need to be prepared to reveal both the positive and negative aspects of school achievement.

(4) An important task of school system leaders is that of defining the general role of school principals in ways that will encourage initiative and leadership.

(5) Principals will need to take a greater leadership role in helping get formulated objectives which are unique to given schools; these objectives will need to be based in part upon data specific to given school populations and attendance areas.

(6) Representative students, teachers, and parents should be encouraged by principals to participate in the setting of school objectives.

(7) The central office of school systems will need to place less emphasis upon standardized evaluation forms and more emphasis upon evaluation that is adapted to the unique objectives of individual schools.

(8) Principals will need to have a significant role in specifying the criteria for evaluating achievements in the schools they head; they will also need to involve staffs in establishing the measures by which school achievement will be evaluated.

(9) Systems for evaluating principals should be open to new evidence and to a re-evaluation of existing evidence under circumstances where principals believe evaluative judgments are inadequate or unjust.\footnote{Culbertson, op. cit., pp. 8-9.}

Robert E. Greene, Director of Personnel, Culver City
Unified School District, was the major contributor to the document: Administrative Appraisal, A Step to Improved Leadership. It is divided into three sections which is specifically to aid principals throughout the country in giving leadership to the formulation or revision of appraisal systems. Section one outlines the weakness of present evaluation systems, while sections two and three suggest positive steps that principals can take in helping Boards of Education and superintendents to construct effective administrative assessment systems.

No single appraisal design fits the needs of all districts, however, general guidelines can assist the designing or redesigning of a system tailored to a district's particular need. A list appraisal committee can divide its work into three distinct steps. Phase one concerns the philosophy behind the approach, phase two encompasses the standards of performance and phase three involves the development of the instrument. These major development steps should be taken in sequence.12

Terry Barraclough summarizes the works of Campbell, Rosenberg, Pharis, DeVaughn, Redfern and Peebles in the Evaluation of School Administrators, School Leadership Digest. In conclusion he states:

The literature on administrative evaluation is often conflicting. Some writers favor the performance standards approach in one of its many variations, some prefer job targets approach. The performance standards approach is by far the most common. The research, however, gives a great deal of credence to the job targets approach, which, ideally tailors the evaluation to the individual and to his specific tasks.

The main point to be made in any discussion of administrator evaluation is that both the district and the

12 Greene, op. cit., pp. 11-12.
The Michigan Association of School Administrators (MASA) conducted a study on administrator evaluation which included a review of the latest report of Educational Research Service along with an analysis of the trends and practices; as well as recommendations from workshops in the state of Michigan.

The purpose of the survey of "Trends in Michigan" was to estimate the administrator evaluation trends as perceived by superintendents in 580 school districts. There were 409 responses included in the survey which represented a return rate of 70.5%. Some conclusions from the survey were:

(1) From the survey responses it appears that there is a very high interest in administrator evaluation by superintendents in the state of Michigan.

(2) From the surveys received 45% have indicated they have no formal evaluation system.

(3) Thirty-six (36) percent of the surveys indicated that there was a formal evaluation system in their district.

(4) There was 19% of the survey which indicated there was no formal or informal administrative evaluation system.

(5) Thirty (30) percent of the surveys returned indicated that administrative evaluation is based on a job description.

(6) Forty-six (46) percent of the surveys indicated that an appraisal conference is included as a

---

part of their administrative evaluation process.\textsuperscript{14}

The Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory is an instrument designed to provide a measure of principal effectiveness. The seven categories included are:

- Educational Programmatic Improvement
- Personnel Selection and Development
- Community Relations
- School Management
- Technical Skills
- Human Relations Skills
- Conceptual Skills

The inventory provides specific and reliable information about crucial areas which concern school personnel and have effects upon school productivity. The approach used consists of asking individuals to make qualitative judgments and express feelings and perceptions about principals' effectiveness.\textsuperscript{15}

The Illinois Principals' Association has prepared a monograph, Evaluation and the Principal, which is divided into three main sections. First, the principal as an evaluator, second, the principal as an evaluatee and third, a model instrument which identifies the major objectives of evaluation.

Section two, the principal as an evaluatee focuses on the who, what, why and how of their own evaluation. Specific recommendations concerning the position of the principals are:

- The principal must be active, individual and collectively, to insure meaningful involvement in establishing the requisites of the evaluation system.

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{MASA Study of Administrator Evaluation}, (Michigan Association of School Administrators: Membership Services Committee, 1974-75), pp. 3-4.

(2) The principal, acting individually or collectively, should be an active participant in the process of determining the instrument upon which his professional worth is assessed.

(3) The evaluation of record is primarily the responsibility of the superintendent and of those to whom he delegates the responsibility.

(4) The primary purpose of the evaluation of the principal is to assist him in his professional development. The evaluation should never become perfunctory; and when the principal receives any rating other than the highest the evaluator has a professional obligation to identify job targets or competencies to be reached and to suggest specific means for achievement.

(5) The criteria should be in a form that communicates job expectations and identifies the behaviors by which they are to be achieved. Additionally, the criteria should be arranged and/or weighted in a manner to reflect their relative priorities.

(6) Principals are entitled to Board-approved statements of both their positional rights and responsibilities.

(7) The adoption of a common instrument acceptable to the principal is essential to the evaluation process.\(^{16}\)

**Summary of Reports**

In comparing the similarities and differences of this study to the research reports, certain trends appear throughout the findings.

Similarities focus on:

(1) Number of formal evaluation systems which presently exist are increasing each year. Evidence for such findings are reported in 1968, 1971

---


(2) The assessment of performance in accordance with prescribed standards was described in 1968, 1971 and 1974 Educational Research Service reports and the Michigan Association of School Administrators study.

(3) The importance of the principal evaluation instrument and its relevance to the total process is supported by Robert Greene, Terry Barraclough, the Michigan Association of School Administrators study, the Illinois Principals' Association monograph and the Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory.

(4) Management by objectives or job targets are described and enumerated in the 1974 Educational Research Service report, Roald Campbell, Terry Barraclough and the Illinois Principals' Association monograph.

(5) The process of evaluation of principals was supported by Jack Culbertson, Terry Barraclough and the Illinois Principals' Association monograph.

Differences vary according to the degree and depth of the areas detailed in this study, however, the significant differences are:

(1) The reports highlight on standards of management by objectives and frequency while few (only
Barraclough and the Illinois Principals' Association monograph) describe the evaluation process and its effect on the principal.

(2) When the report or study indicated the frequency of evaluation, very little analysis or description of the ongoing process is highlighted other than just the number of contacts.

(3) There was little evidence the data to support the findings of the reports were collected through in-depth interviews as this study will attempt to complete.

**Articles**

Max Rosenberg has set up seven specific steps for implementing a principal evaluation program that principals will not resent. Rosenberg feels they will not resent the program because it has constructive and developmental goals that are grounded into a guidance and counseling approach.

A brief listing of the steps are:

(1) The principal completes a self-evaluation.

(2) Arrange for a follow-up evaluation to check on the subjective interpretation supplied by the principal in his self-evaluation.

(3) Set up criteria for evaluation program.

(4) Decide what evidence will be collected to support evaluations.

(5) Before the final evaluation the principal should provide background information.

(6) Summarize the overall achievement of a principal.
(7) Follow the evaluation with counseling action that is tailored to the specific needs of each principal.\textsuperscript{17}

In another article Rosenberg concluded that:

Evaluation in education is a must and if anyone in education must be carefully evaluated it is the all-important school principal. A growing number of school systems are concluding that they must be able to realistically, meaningfully and reliably assess the quality of leadership management provided by the school principal. The pressure is mounting - both from within the system and without - in growing demand for accountability. Satisfactory means must be found for evaluating - and then finding and improving this vital key to school success or failure.\textsuperscript{18}

Teacher ratings are rarely used in an evaluation system of principals, however, Rosenberg has formulated a 100 item checklist which is divided into eight general areas - school organization, instructional program, relationships with students, staff, community and superiors, plant and facilities and other management matters. This principal evaluation format is adapted from Leadership Action Folio #19, Croft Educational Services, Inc. 1969.\textsuperscript{19}

William L. Pharis, Executive Secretary of the National Association of Elementary School Principals, Arlington, Virginia, suggests that the adults involved in education

\textsuperscript{17}Max Rosenberg, "How to Evaluate Your Principals Without Scaring (or Turning) Them Off," The American School Board Journal, 160 (June, 1973), pp. 35-36.


\textsuperscript{19}Max Rosenberg, "How Does Your Principal Rate?," Teacher, 91 (May, 1974), p. 25.
of children are responsible for a relationship between the objectives promised, the resources utilized and the outcomes realized. Evaluation should be a matching of intent to results, a comparison of what was expected to happen with what did happen.

The use of more sophisticated principal evaluation programs will require a different way of viewing the entire process. The process is not just a means to an end but a way of determining the end. That end is better educational experiences for children. Good evaluation programs for principals are not the whole answer to that quest, but they can make a contribution.20

George B. Redfern, Associate Secretary of the American Association of School Administrators, believes there are several basic assumptions regarding evaluation.

(1) The principal productivity can be evaluated. Not only can it be, but it should be evaluated.

(2) The principal should understand what is expected of him. Responsibilities and expectations should be stated in written form and, if not in writing, oral understandings should be clear and carefully delineated.

(3) The principal should know to whom to look for direction and supervision and should understand that evaluation is an inherent component of accountability.

(4) Standard of excellence should be designed to be used by the principal as yardsticks against which his performance may be measured.

(5) Performance objectives related to the standards of excellence should be formulated cooperatively by the principal and his evaluator and used to evaluate performance.21

Robert B. Howsam and John M. Franco concluded that it does little good to protest the limitations of evaluations, and progress in evaluation depends largely upon the development of people. Within these limitations they have made the following recommendations:

(1) Play down formal administrative evaluation. Accept it for what it presently is - a necessary but poorly done part of the responsibility - accountability process for which refined and proven procedures do not as yet exist.

(2) Emphasize development of the kind of institutional climate and organization in which an administrator can hope to perform to his best ability and receive deserved rewards for it.

(3) Toward this end seek to have the whole administrative and supervisory staff spend significant proportion of their time in collaborating efforts to develop understanding of and skill in the performance of leadership and administrative processes.

(4) As the study progresses the group should use on itself the various devices and techniques which it discovers and considers useful.22

The organization of an objective evaluation for school principals can be a reality according to Marjorie Arikado and Donald Musella. They contend that (1) the evaluator-evaluatee roles should not include more than one principal and one


superintendent, (2) all criteria for "good" objectives must be included - the objective should be realistic, specific, time-bound, and outcome centered and (3) continuous open communication, high trust, consensus decision making - in other words a healthy, interpersonal relationship between principal and superintendent are necessary for a successful performance evaluation program.23

Winston Oberg, Professor of Management at the Graduate School of Business Administration, Michigan State University, describes the strength and weakness of nine techniques used with different performance appraisal objectives. He contends that management should fit practice to purpose when setting goals and selecting appraisal techniques to achieve them. A formal appraisal is at the very least a commendable attempt to make visible and hence improvable, a set of essential organization activities. Personal judgments about employee performance are inescapable and subjective values and fallible human perception are always involved. Formal appraisal systems to the degree that they bring these perceptions and values into the open, make it possible for at least some of the inherent bias and error to be recognized and remedied.24


Edward S. Hickcox believes that the general principles of administrative assessment are (1) develop and adopt a system for non-threatening, cooperative assessment of the performance of individuals, (2) tie the assessment process to some kind of reward system and (3) provide for changes in the function of personnel related to the assessment process.25

Performance evaluation as described by Harold R. Armstrong is basically a simplified process which focuses on job targets. George B. Redfern, Associate Secretary of the American Association of School Administrators has organized the procedure into six uncomplicated steps.

(1) At the start of an evaluation period each person involved examines the job he performs.

(2) In accordance with the rules that have been adopted for the plan, he sits down with the person assigned the responsibility for evaluation of the work.

(3) The two select a few specific areas of the job where a special effort will be made to improve the performance level.

(4) Near the end of the evaluation they jointly review what has been accomplished.

(5) They discuss the evaluation made by the evaluator and usually a self-evaluation also.

(6) From the analysis of the experience, they seek to determine what actions or alternatives, if any, should be considered for further improvement.26


The trends in evaluating school personnel focus on the participation of the person evaluated and on his needs and rights as a professional and human being according to Lorraine Poliakoff. The evaluation of school administrators has come a long way in less than ten years. It has grown in a time of strong teachers' unions and community demands for accountability and greater community control over schools. A number of schools have responded to this pressure.

In about twenty school systems (nineteen of them uncovered in a National Education Association survey on client oriented evaluation) principals are evaluated by teachers. One system solicits evaluations not only from the staff, but from parents and students. Student evaluations of teachers not to mention administrators, is nearly unheard of below the college level. While the job targets approach has humanized the evaluation process by focusing on the needs of the evaluatee, its structure does not call for the participation of parents or students (or teachers unless they had a voice in the original design). Whether or not this trend in evaluation can expand to encompass evaluation by subordinates may determine its future.27

E. Allen Slusher states that results or goal achievement measurements of a manager's performance are used by most organizations, with varying degrees of sophistication. Too often, however, the system's view of the performance appraisal process is overlooked. It is from such a viewpoint that a broader perspective on the management of human resources can be developed. The major focus of appraisal should be future oriented. Improving future organizational

performance and enhancing employee potential should be the primary concern when managing the human resource system.28

The Stull Bill, AB 293, was passed by the California Legislature and signed by the governor on July 20, 1971. It became Article 5.5 of the Educational Code. The intent was to "establish a uniform system of evaluation and assessment of the performance of certificated personnel within each school district of the State." It is noteworthy that the act applies to all certificated personnel.29

Summary of Articles

Most of the articles focused on evaluation procedures and the suggested techniques to implement sound administrative evaluation systems. Max Rosenberg, William Pharis, George Redfern, Robert Howsam and John Franco, Winston Oberg and Harold Armstrong support an organized evaluation process which includes:

(1) Awareness of job expectations
(2) Discussion between evaluatee and evaluator
(3) Selection of specific areas to improve
(4) Joint review of what has been accomplished
(5) Evaluation conference
(6) Determine actions or alternatives for future improvement.


The combined process as described by the preceding steps support the intent and focus of this study. It is appropriate to mention that specific items such as frequency, type of instrument and major purpose of the evaluation process are in-depth areas of this study while the articles focus on a system with little emphasis on comparisons or analysis. The focus of the articles represents the author's point of view based on his experience with principal evaluation systems.

Other authors have slight differences as related to this study. Marjorie Arikado and Donald Musella focus on the interpersonal relationships between the principal and superintendent and its importance to a successful performance evaluation system. This relationship, although it was explored in the interview procedure, is not a major factor in this study. Edward Hickcox provides general principles which include (1) system, (2) rewards and (3) provisions for changes and although the information is related to the process it lacked specific points as described by this study. Lorraine Poliakoff emphasizes evaluation of principals by subordinates which has little effect or purpose to the study. Allen Slusher supports a broader perspective of human resources which generally supports the purpose of this study but has limitations when focusing on specifics. The Stull Bill supports a future trend in mandating performance evaluation which may be the result of other state mandates to insure accountability for the public.
After studying the dissertations since 1900 to the present, only a few focus on the evaluation process of the elementary principal.

In 1965 Max Rosenberg proposed a basic question: Is it possible to develop a procedure for appraising the performance of a school principal which will be sound, balanced, valid and reliable? The chief findings of the study are as follows: (1) It appears from this exploratory investigation that a useful program for the evaluation of school principals can be developed, (2) It appears that with the evaluation program developed in this investigation, significant conclusions can be drawn concerning the quality of a principal's performance, (3) More research is necessary before programs for the evaluation of school principals can be developed beyond the pioneering stage and (4) Because of the number and nature of the problems involved, it does not appear that a final and perfect evaluation system for principals or for other administrators can be anticipated in the near future.30

The status of central office supervision of elementary school principals and their recommendations for improved supervisory practices was determined in a study by Garrett Clifford Nichols. His findings were (1) programs

for formal evaluation of elementary school principals were recommended twice as often as they were reported in current practice, (2) written Board of Education rules and regulations were reported by 93% of respondents, administration procedure guides 85% and principal handbooks by 37%; recommendations were consistently higher, (3) regular meetings of the superintendent or his delegate with the elementary principals' group were an almost unanimous recommendation of respondents and in fact constituted current practice, (4) recent inservice training has been provided for elementary principals' in responding districts as follows: curriculum 69%, personnel practices 65%, office management 30%, recommendations favored such practices at percentages of 95, 94, and 80 respectively, (5) reports based on conference attendance were required in fewer than 50% of reporting districts and (6) specific job performance criteria were less frequently reported than was "complete freedom" for the elementary school principal.31

Albert Perry Ross conducted a study to evaluate the instructional leadership role of the elementary school principal in DeKalb County, Georgia. The major findings were (1) teachers and principals perceive improvement of instruction to be the major role of DeKalb County principals

(2) DeKalb County principals were perceived as operating within a democratic framework, (3) teachers believed that DeKalb County principals respected the worth and dignity of others, (4) DeKalb County principals assisted teachers in improving instruction, (5) teachers and principals in DeKalb County considered in-service education to be a faculty responsibility and (6) teachers believed that DeKalb County principals should expand their supervisory practices and techniques.32

In 1969 Warren Finley MacQueen proposed a study to determine how the effectiveness of the services performed by principals of large public high schools is evaluated and how such evaluation may be improved. Major findings were (1) of 263 school districts in the United States with large public high schools, fewer than one-half (44%) were using a system for evaluating high school principals, (2) of 100 jury validated criteria relating to the job performance of a high school principal, 62 were rated "very important" or "important" by the survey participants and (3) of 16 jury validated criteria relating to procedural aspects of the evaluation process, 13 were rated "very important" or "important" by the survey participants.33

---


What is the degree of acceptability of an assessment program for an elementary school principal within and between groups of superintendents and school board presidents in the State of Wisconsin? Donald Ellis Barnes studied the above question and concluded that (1) commonality for acceptance of the instrument existed regardless of school size, (2) the subpublics selected for the random sample express acceptance of the items on the instrument with the superintendent favoring seven more items than school board presidents, (3) the safety of the children in the school building and on the school grounds was a high priority criterion, the types of accidents rather than the number of accidents was a high priority evidence, (4) the supervision of school personnel and related evidence and procedures were important in the assessment of tasks accomplished by elementary school principals, (5) in-service for the teaching staff was an important criterion as well as the related evidence and procedure, (6) the induction of new staff members and the related evidence and procedure was an acceptable criterion for assessment, (7) a program of management by objectives was an acceptable criterion for assessment as was the related evidence and procedure for gathering the evidence, (8) more than one evidence to support one criterion may be used with acceptance, (9) more than one procedure may be used with acceptance for collecting evidence and (10) an assessment program incorporating criteria, evidence and procedures was acceptable as a format for assessment.
The Instrument for Performance Assessment (IPA) was developed by the researcher and mailed to the subpublics, randomly selected, to determine the degree of acceptance of the items on the instrument. The instrument was divided into three categories - criterion for judgment, evidence related to that criterion item and procedure for collecting that evidence.34

Robert Mayfield Towns' study was designed to determine the status of performance evaluation of secondary public school principals in Michigan as perceived by the principal. Major findings were (1) thirty-eight percent of the respondent schools indicated the use of formal performance evaluation procedures, (2) fifty-six percent of the metro county school respondents and twenty-three percent of the non-metro county school respondents reported the use of formal performance evaluation procedures, (3) the prescribed rating scale method of formal performance evaluation was reported used by forty-two percent of the respondents, (4) thirty-eight percent of the respondents indicated the use of the performance objective method of evaluation and (5) ninety-six percent of the ninety-six principals who indicated the use of formal performance evaluations, reported they favor formal evaluations of secondary school principals. One hundred percent of the principals who support formal

evaluations also indicated that evaluations helped them improve their efficiency as an administrator.\textsuperscript{35}

**Summary of Dissertations**

Robert Towns' study closely resembles this study since its main emphasis is on the status of performance evaluation. Specific areas are similar and include (1) existence of formal evaluation, (2) use of rating scales, (3) use of performance objectives and (4) percentage of principals supporting evaluations. One major difference is the performance evaluation as perceived by the superintendent or the evaluator not the principal or the evaluatee.

Garrett Nichols, Warren MacQueen and Donald Barnes dissertations all support similar areas which are (1) evidence of formal evaluation, (2) description of rating scales and (3) definitions of job classifications. These studies differ in the scope and depth of their findings as compared to this study. The investigation and subsequent report of findings regarding the entire process of evaluation is absent from these studies. Max Rosenberg and Albert Ross have related studies; however, the major text of their findings focus on the need for principal evaluation and possible future use and the emphasis on the instructional leadership role as it relates to job performance. Their major findings do not have a significant effect on the principal evaluation process.

CHAPTER III

STATE MANDATED PROGRAMS

Introduction

Since 1967 several states have enacted statutes requiring school systems to evaluate the services of their employees. These statutes give school systems great latitude in designing evaluation procedures, however, most states rely on the traditional postperformance rating procedures.

George B. Redfern, Associate Secretary of the American Association of School Administrators, feels that administrative evaluation is necessary, however, a critical look at the procedures used to assess school personnel is long overdue.

Evaluation, in some form is carried on in most states and school systems on a voluntary basis. The overwhelming practice, however, is to use rating scales and checklists that emphasize the rater's biases as heavily as the evaluatee's performance. Raters are assumed to be well qualified and informed enough to judge the performance of the evaluatee in all its aspects. Validity is given the assessments by multiplying the number of observational samplings or by using multiple evaluators. This approach to evaluation is not only oversimplified there is little evidence that it does more than provide a "report card" estimate of competence.

The trend toward mandating evaluation either by state law or by regulation by state Boards of Education deserves scrutiny by teachers, principals, central office administrators, and supervisors. Members of Boards of Education and citizens who are vitally interested in public schools are also keenly concerned
about these developments.36

In the spring of 1974, Educational Research Service sent an inquiry to the chief school officer in each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia requesting information regarding administrative evaluation policy. Forty-seven of the states and the District of Columbia responded. The survey results indicated that nine states - California, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Kansas, Nevada, Oregon, Virginia and Washington mandate the evaluation of local school building administrators. Three states New Hampshire, South Dakota and New Mexico are in the process of developing accountability programs involving administrative evaluation.

Hawaii provides a standard state developed appraisal procedure and instrument. The remaining states with evaluation mandates require that local school districts develop standardized procedures and criteria for the evaluation of school-level administrators and submit those to the state Board of Education. The state mandates differ - though in terms of (1) the frequency with which evaluation is to be conducted, (2) the extent to which procedures and criteria are dictated by the state statute or by the state department of education and (3) the assignment of responsibility at the local district level for the development of evaluation procedures.37

Individual states and the highlights of their programs will be listed in sections that follow.

California

The substance of the California evaluation procedures


is contained in the following statement:

It is the intent of the Legislature to establish a uniform system of evaluation and assessment of the performance of certificated personnel within each school district of the state. The system shall involve the development and adoption by each school district of objective evaluation guidelines.38

In implementing the evaluation program each Board of Education is required to (1) establish standards of expected student progress in each subject and to indicate techniques that will be used to assess the extent of attainment of the standards, (2) assess the competence of certificated personnel as it relates to the attainment of the standards of expected student progress, (3) assess the adequacy of performance with reference to the other duties normally assigned the individual and (4) assess the degree of effectiveness with which the individual is maintaining proper control and is preserving a suitable learning environment.

A very significant aspect of the California statute governing evaluation is the requirement that the advice and participation of staff members in each school district had to be obtained in the development of the evaluation procedures.

Connecticut

In 1973, the Connecticut General Assembly passed a statute requiring annual evaluation of all certified employees below the rank of superintendent. The state Board of Education was directed to provide local school districts with

---

38Paragraph 13485, Article 5.5 Evaluation and Assessment of Performance of Certificated Employees, The Stull Act, Assembly Bill No. 293, Chapter 361.
standards of evaluation. The 1974 session of the General Assembly reconsidered its 1973 act and reassigned the responsibility of developing evaluative criteria and procedures to the local school districts. Guidelines developed following the passage of the 1973 statute include:

1. Each professional shall cooperatively determine with the evaluator(s) the objectives upon which his or her evaluation shall be based.

2. The evaluation program is cooperatively planned, carried out, and evaluated by all levels of the staff.

3. The purposes of the evaluation program are clearly stated in writing and are well known to the evaluators and those who are to be evaluated.

4. The general responsibilities and specific tasks of the teacher's position should be comprehensively defined and this definition should serve as the frame of reference for evaluation.

5. The accountability relationship of each position should be clearly determined. The teacher should know and understand the means by which he or she will be evaluated in relation to that position.

6. Evaluations are more diagnostic than judgmental. The process should help analyze the teaching and learning to plan how to improve.

7. Evaluation should take into account influences on the learning environment such as material and professional resources.

8. Self-evaluation is an essential aspect of the program. Teachers are given the opportunity to evaluate themselves in positive and constructive ways.

9. The self-image and self-respect of teachers should be maintained and enhanced. Positive self-concepts can be fostered by an effective evaluation plan.

10. The nature of the evaluations is such that it encourages teacher creativity and experimentation in planning and guiding the teacher-learning experiences provided children.
11. The program makes ample provision for clear, personalized, constructive feedback.39

Florida

One of the earliest laws governing the evaluation of all instructional administrative and supervisory personnel was enacted in Florida in 1967. The thrust of the statute is the improvement of administrative and supervisory performance.

Each county is given latitude to design its own evaluative criteria and procedures. These must be filed with the state and five conditions must be met by the evaluation procedures.

1. Assessment of each individual must be conducted at least once a year.

2. The administrator directly responsible for the supervision of the individual conducts the evaluation.

3. Prior to formal assessment, each individual must be informed of the criteria and the procedure to be used.

4. The written assessment must be shown to the evaluatee and discussed by the administrator responsible for preparing the report.

5. A written record of each assessment must be maintained in the district.40

These five conditions do not restrict the county school systems from incorporating other requirements and


the approach used in the counties is a decision left to the school personnel.

**Hawaii**

The Hawaii State Department of Education mandates the annual evaluation of administrative personnel. Procedures and forms are developed by the State Department and are standardized throughout the state.

**Kansas**

Evaluation of administrative school personnel was mandated by a 1973 legislative act. The act stipulates that every certificated school employee must be evaluated at least two times per year during the first two consecutive years of employment, at least once per year during the third and fourth years of employment and at least once every three years thereafter.

Local school boards are responsible for the adoption of written evaluation policies and procedures that must be filed with the Kansas State Board of Education. According to the act, local evaluation guidelines must comply with the following guidelines:

1. Evaluation policies must be developed by the Board in cooperation with the persons responsible for conducting evaluations and the persons to be evaluated.

2. Community attitudes and interests should be taken into consideration.

3. Evaluations are to be made by personnel designated by the Board.

4. Consideration should be given to efficiency,
personal qualities, professional deportment, ability, health, results and performance and other matters deemed appropriate.

5. Persons to be evaluated should participate in their evaluation and be given the opportunity for self-evaluation.

6. Written assessments must be shown to the evaluatee and signed as an acknowledgment of its presentation.41

Maine

Maine does not specifically require the evaluation of administrative personnel, however, it does mandate school self-evaluation. This self-evaluation involves administrators as well as all parties concerned with the educational process. The manual which acts as a vehicle for school self-assessment and improvement is classified the "Elementary Self-Evaluation K-8 Manual."42

This manual must be completed in full by the administrators and by the teacher, pupil, parent and community groups (represented by committees) designated in each section. In collecting feedback from these groups, the manual aids the elementary school in examining itself, identifying its educational needs and determining long and short range priorities.

Nevada

A statute requiring evaluation of school level

41Kansas Laws, Title 72, Chapter 281, Sections 1-5 (1973).
administrators was enacted by the Nevada legislature in 1973. The statute directs each local board of school trustees to develop objective administrative evaluation policies and file those with the state Board of Education. Evaluation policies must be developed with the consultation and involvement of elected or designated representatives of administrative personnel. The statute suggests student, superior, peer and self-evaluation as evaluative procedures.\textsuperscript{43}

Oregon

The text of the Oregon law enacted in 1971 states:

The district superintendent of every common and union high school district having an average daily membership of more than 500 students in the district shall cause to have made at least annually an evaluation of performance for each teacher employed by the district to measure the teacher's development and growth in the teaching profession. A form shall be prescribed by the state Board of Education and completed pursuant to rules adopted by the district school board.\textsuperscript{44}

The word "teacher" used in the Oregon law is defined in a broad sense and includes administrators. To emphasize the latitude given local school districts in devising and implementing evaluation procedures, the form required by the Oregon Board of Education is a very simple one. It merely requires the local district to indicate five items: (1) whether the teacher has met, failed to meet, or exceeded his or her performance goals and objectives during the eval-

\textsuperscript{43}"Evaluation of Administrators," Nevada Revised Statutes, Title 34, Chapter 391, Section 3127 (as amended by Act 790, 1973).

\textsuperscript{44}Section 5, Oregon's Fair Dismissal Law.
uation period and an explanation of the response, (2) areas in which the teacher has shown development and growth in the teaching profession, (3) areas in which the teacher needs to demonstrate additional development and growth with suggestions for improvement, (4) additional comments and (5) recommendations of the supervisor. Under the heading of recommendations, four options are provided, (a) renewal of contract, (b) non-renewal of contract, (c) advancement in salary and (d) non-advancement in salary and other recommendations can be made.

**Virginia**

In 1972, the General Assembly of Virginia enacted the "Standards of Quality for Public Schools in Virginia, 1972-1974." It requires that principals and assistant principals be evaluated in terms of eight criteria, designated with indicators which give specific directions for meeting the criterion. As a guide to local school districts, the state department of education developed evaluation schedules, procedures and instruments.45

**Washington**

Evaluation of all certificated personnel, including administrators and supervisors, was mandated by a state statute enacted in 1969. The statute directs the local school boards to establish evaluative criteria and procedures through the appropriate negotiation processes. Certain

---

stipulations are provided in the statute.

1. Evaluation of all certificated employees should be conducted at least once annually.

2. New employees must be evaluated within the first ninety calendar days of their employment.

3. Every employee whose work is judged unsatisfactory must be notified in writing regarding the deficient areas and must be provided recommendations for improvement by February of each year.46

**Illinois**

Although Illinois does not have a state mandated evaluation program for administrators, specifically principals, there have been attempts in the legislature to amend the School Code. In 1975, HB 42, although defeated provided the following:

(Ch. 122, par. 24-11) amends the School Code. Provides for evaluation and review of the professional performance of certified administrators and teachers and increases the initial probationary period for teachers from 2 to 3 years. Requires local boards to adopt standards and procedures for such evaluation and review. Effective July 1, 1975.47

**Summary of State Mandated Programs**

The nine states highlighted in this chapter focus on the discretionary power of each Board of Education to establish the criteria and procedures to evaluate school administrators. Each Board of Education is required to adhere to guidelines, procedures or conditions which set the frame-

---

46 *Washington Laws, Title 28, Chapter 34, Section 11 (1969).*

47 *House Bill 42, Presented at the 79th General Assembly, State of Illinois, December 5, 1974.*
work, however, they do not restrict the school systems from incorporating other requirements which they deem necessary.

Most guidelines are structured like policy statements which allow each school district to be as rigid or flexible as the situation may demand. All statutes require (1) at least an annual evaluation, (2) criteria and procedures shall be determined cooperatively and (3) a written conclusion of evaluative judgments completing the process.

It appears the statutes are so simplistic and fundamental that any district which has a formal administrative evaluation program certainly complies with the intent and the implications of the law. The assurance of an administrative evaluation program is a worthy attempt by the legislature. The statutes, however, do not ensure the improvement of quality education.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This study is confined to the one hundred and fifteen (115), K-8 elementary school districts in Cook County (excluding Chicago) as defined by the 1976 Cook County Directory of Suburban Public Schools. Cook County is divided into four major geographic areas which have a significant number of elementary school districts in each section. (See Appendix D)

TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number of Elementary School Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North-Northwest</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six hypotheses were derived after studying the current professional literature and their acceptance or rejection is based on the analysis of the data.

Hypothesis I
Formal evaluation of principals exists in a majority of elementary districts.
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Hypothesis II
The evaluation of principals is an ongoing, continuous process during the school year.

Hypothesis III
The major purpose of evaluation of principals is to assess present performance in accordance with prescribed standards.

Hypothesis IV
The written evaluation instrument of principals is the major component of the total evaluation process.

Hypothesis V
Performance objectives are integral components of the evaluation process in a majority of elementary school districts.

Hypothesis VI
The process of evaluation of principals is dependent upon clear performance expectations as defined by the superintendent.

Three principal methods were used in collecting and analyzing the data. First, written evaluation instruments of elementary principals were collected and analyzed. Second, a questionnaire covering the evaluation process of principals was completed by the superintendent and third, interviews were conducted with selected superintendents.

Written Evaluation Instruments
A request was sent to one hundred and fifteen (115) elementary school districts in Cook County for (1) a copy of the principal evaluation instrument and (2) a copy of
the procedures currently used to implement the evaluation process. In response to the request the following chart indicates the responding districts and the number of principal evaluation instruments returned.

**TABLE 2**

NUMBER OF RESPONSES RECEIVED CONCERNING PRINCIPAL EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total Response</th>
<th>Prin. Eval. Instruments</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Percentage of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North-Northwest</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The forty (40) principal evaluation instruments are best described by placing them into four major categories. In the first category, all instruments which were classified as a rating scale, whereby principals are evaluated in accordance with established performance criteria, totaled nine (9). The second category which stressed narrative comments had a total of eleven (11) instruments. Nine (9) instruments in category three had a combination of the rating scale and narrative comments. In the final category, eleven (11) instruments emphasized performance objectives as a major part of the evaluation process. The geographic areas and the four major classifications are summarized in the following chart.
TABLE 3

MAJOR CLASSIFICATIONS OF TYPES OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Prescribed Scale</th>
<th>Narrative Scale and Comments</th>
<th>Prescribed Scale and Narrative</th>
<th>Performance Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North-Northwest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The common elements of the major performance areas of thirty-seven (37) principal evaluation instruments are listed in order of frequency. It should be noted that three (3) principal evaluation instruments focus solely on performance objectives and therefore eliminated any listing of major performance areas.

TABLE 4

COMMON ELEMENTS OF MAJOR PERFORMANCE AREAS ON PRINCIPAL EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Analysis</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Improving Staff through Teacher Evaluation</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leadership</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community Involvement</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communications</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Personnel Relationships</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Education Programs, Curriculum Improvement</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Analysis</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Problem Solving</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Professional Growth</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Knowledge of Work</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. General Management</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personal Characteristics</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Records and Reports</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Initiative</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Written Evaluation Instruments

Of the 115 districts contacted, 80 responded to a request for a copy of the written evaluation instrument. From the 80, a total of 40 instruments were produced which would indicate at least 50% of the districts have a formal evaluation program. In an analysis of the geographic areas the north-northwest, with 15 of 22 districts or 68% far exceeds the other areas. The south and southwest areas are relatively the same with one of every two districts having a written evaluation instrument. The west area has one of every four districts with an evaluation instrument.

The chart also indicates of the 40 districts with principal evaluation instruments only 17 have written procedures and 11 of these districts are from the north-northwest area. The north-northwest area is highly structured and more formalized than the other areas in Cook County. Some of the formal organization may be attributed to the early develop-
ment and commitment to the program plan budgeting systems (PPBS) which indicates a trend toward accountability. Other reasons may be the Board of Education or superintendent belief in management or evaluation systems.

The trend in evaluation of principals seems to be on the upswing in the south and southwest areas; however, it is difficult to explain why only one of four districts in the west area have any written principal evaluation instrument. With the educational accountability movement gaining considerable momentum in the past five years, there may be an increase in formal principal evaluation instruments.

There is almost an even division of the forty principal evaluation instruments into the prescribed scale, narrative comments, prescribed scale and narrative and performance objectives. The nine, eleven, nine and eleven respective distribution indicates the variety of instruments used by different districts and the lack of a perfect instrument to evaluate the principals. Most districts tailor their instruments to suit their purpose or they use the type of format which is compatible with the chief administrator's style. If the superintendent feels comfortable with a prescribed scale and can convince the Board of Education this instrument is best suited to meet the district goals, the district adopts the instrument to produce the desired results. There is relatively little justification for any instrument selection because the evaluator can structure any
format to his personal use, thus insuring special emphasis on his priority areas.

With respect to the common elements of the major performance areas, teacher evaluations rank number one in frequency because of the involvement with other areas and the ability to consolidate curriculum, management, and discipline. This area undoubtedly is the most difficult area for principals because of time, staff, and the increasing pressure of teacher organizations. In order to excel in this performance area, the principal must also excel in other areas and be able to communicate them effectively to the teacher. Leadership, mentioned on twenty-four instruments, is crucial to any administrative position although it is an intangible area which can be measured as many different ways as it appears on the instruments. Its importance is evidenced by the rank order and the basic skill a principal must have to be effective. The area of community involvement is a sign of today's educational institutions and their relationship to "the people." Most principals must communicate with their communities and seek support for the educational program. Former Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Illinois, Dr. Michael Bakalis forced school districts to involve community participation by requiring a district to develop a program plan which derived district goals and objectives from parents and community leaders. Other reasons community involvement ranks high are the con-
stant parental feedback to the superintendent and the teacher organizational pressure to control community relationships prior to any educational issue.

With respect to the other areas listed on the principal evaluation instruments, they are a result of districts' priorities and their relationship to the principal evaluation process.

**Questionnaire**

Questionnaires were sent to one hundred and fifteen (115) elementary school districts in Cook County to secure information regarding the types, procedures, practices and purposes of the principal evaluation process. (Appendix B) Eighty-four (84) districts responded to the five question survey. The seventy-three percent (73%) response includes twenty-eight (28) districts from the north-northwest area, seventeen (17) from the west area, seventeen (17) from the southwest area and twenty-two (22) from the south area of Cook County Educational Service Region. The following chart illustrates the distribution of responses:

**TABLE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In reporting the responses to the questionnaire each question and response will be distributed according to the four geographic areas of the Cook County Educational Service Region.

Question 1
Which evaluation instrument of principals is used in your school system?

| TABLE 6 |
| NUMBER OF RESPONSES RECEIVED CONCERNING THE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT OF PRINCIPALS |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>North-west</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>South-west</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Standards</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Objectives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2
How frequently does the evaluation of each principal occur during the school year?

| TABLE 7 |
| NUMBER OF RESPONSES RECEIVED CONCERNING THE FREQUENCY OF EVALUATION OF PRINCIPALS |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>North-west</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>South-west</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Time</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Times</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Times</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Times</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 3

Which of the following practices are included in your evaluation process? (Check all that apply)

### TABLE 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response by Area</th>
<th>North-west</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>South-west</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use form which calls for rating in terms of a prescribed scale</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use narrative form (providing space for evaluator's comments only)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation is recommended</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference is held before evaluation period begins</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal evaluator-evaluatee &quot;conferences&quot; are held during the evaluation process</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference is held after evaluation is completed</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 4

What method is used to communicate the performance expectations of the principals?
TABLE 9

NUMBER OF RESPONSES RECEIVED CONCERNING THE METHODS USED TO COMMUNICATE THE PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS OF THE PRINCIPALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>North-west</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Southwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job description</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation instrument</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 5

For what purposes do you evaluate principals? (In the list which follows, please check each purpose for which, in your experience, the evaluations have been actually applied in your school system - NOT the purpose for which evaluations ideally should be used.)

TABLE 10

NUMBER OF RESPONSES RECEIVED CONCERNING THE PURPOSES OF EVALUATION OF PRINCIPALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purposes</th>
<th>North-west</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Southwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To assess evaluatee's present performance in accordance with prescribed standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help the evaluatee establish relevant performance objectives and work systematically toward this achievement</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purposes</th>
<th>North-west</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>South-west</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To identify areas in which improvement is needed</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine qualification for permanent status</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have records of performance to determine qualifications for promotion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, e.g., salary increments, Board policy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Questionnaire

Each question has been analyzed in terms of its relationship to the principal evaluation process. In question one, the results obviously support a combination of the performance standards and performance objectives. The districts apparently favor the combination because of its versatility and flexibility. It is important to emphasize the number of performance objectives as opposed to the performance standards since the trend for management by objectives systems is obviously growing in management.

Question two, the frequency of evaluation, supports the annual evaluation by a five to two margin. In conjunction with the annual evaluation, it appears to be customary to establish an ongoing, continuous and informal conference. If the informal conferences would prove to be insufficient
additional evaluation could become necessary.

The practices defined in question three indicates that (a) conference is held after evaluation is completed, (b) self-evaluation is recommended, (c) informal evaluator-evaluatee conferences are held during the evaluation process, (d) conference is held before evaluation period begins, (e) use narrative form and (f) use form which calls for rating in terms of a prescribed scale, in their order of frequency, respectively.

The practice of holding a conference after evaluation is completed is customary since the instrument must be interpreted and an exchange of communication may be pertinent to the final document. There is an increasing practice of having the principal complete a self-evaluation, since most superintendents believe that in order to improve upon a deficiency, the principal must be able to identify and recognize the problems. Mutual agreement in recognition of principal failures is highly recommended in the initial stages of professional improvement. Conferences which are held during the evaluation process support the overwhelming frequency for the annual evaluation. The evaluation process would be grossly deficient without any informal conference to monitor the system. In an effort to explain the standards of evaluation or interpret the evaluation system most districts have conferences before the evaluation period begins. This conference can serve a dual purpose of (1)
identifying the components of the evaluation process and (2) giving the principal a chance to provide input and clarify any areas in question. The use of the narrative form can be a factor if the district does not have any instrument; however, its use is devoid of any standards or pre-determined performance. The narrative format provides a great deal of flexibility on the evaluator's behalf.

Last in the use of practices is the prescribed scale format which is losing its popularity because of the management by objectives models as well as its possible negative effect on principal performance. If used alone the prescribed scale format tends to encourage the principal to meet minimal standards rather than concentrate on professional growth areas with established criteria for measurement.

In an effort to pinpoint the process of communicating performance expectations of principals, question four clearly indicates the most prevalent method used is the conference (47%). Most superintendents indicated they feel more comfortable with a conference whether they have a formal or informal evaluation system, because verbal communication is easier to accept and provides an avenue to cover unwritten priorities. The job description and evaluation instrument are also important methods. Their effectiveness is questionable, however, since a written format must still be interpreted by the superintendent and the principal.
Job descriptions cover areas of responsibility in a general manner while evaluation instruments focus on the specifics of the job.

Responses to question five list the number one purpose of evaluation as identifying areas in which improvement is needed. Identifying areas of improvement still deals with the process of evaluation although it is the first step in the correction of problems or concerns.

As an example, the superintendent concentrates on weak or improvement areas and thus accomplishes his goal. The superintendent focuses on individual principal priorities as opposed to the regular item checklist. The superintendent and principal accept this system because this procedure is the easiest to establish and work with on a continuous basis. The performance objective system seems to lack accountability. Other purposes for evaluation fall into the general category and include salary increments and Board policy.

There appears to be a relatively low accounting for assessing performance according to prescribed standards. This low placement and the trend from the literature indicate this system is considered antiquated by superintendents. Its supporters still favor the direct, no nonsense approach.

**Superintendent Interviews**

In addition to collecting, itemizing and analyzing the principal evaluation instruments and the questionnaire,
a series of twenty interviews were completed to identify all the components of their evaluation process. This indepth interview was designed to provide additional information for supporting or refuting each hypothesis. The superintendent's philosophy, policies, procedures and purpose of the total evaluation process of principals were explored with each question.

The interview was structured with a series of twenty-eight (28) questions which were open ended and probed into the critical areas of the hypotheses. (See Appendix C) Each series of questions corresponds to a hypothesis and the value for the superintendent response was designated at a maximum of 5%. This five percent was based on twenty superintendents multiplied by the maximum of five percent which totals one hundred percent. Pertinent comments from the superintendents' interviews are included to justify the percentage response rating.

Selection of the interviewed superintendent was at random; however, five superintendents were designated from each of the four major geographic areas as illustrated in the Cook County Educational Service Region. Each interview took approximately 45 minutes to one hour. The interviews were scheduled from January 20, 1976 to May 24, 1976.

In reporting the results of the interview the superintendents' identification is withheld and consecutive letters are used to relate their expressed views. Since
the structure of the interview format is designed to test each hypothesis, the response of the superintendents will correspond to key phrases of the hypothesis. The key phrases will be identified as (1) existence of formal evaluation, (2) evaluation process is continuous, (3) major purpose of evaluation, (4) written evaluation instrument, (5) performance objectives and (6) performance expectations.

Superintendent A

Existence of formal evaluation - Superintendent makes reference to several formats during the past years. He concentrates on a "game plan" with a specific time table. Significant elements of the process are (1) setting goals and priorities, (2) assessment of performance and (3) written form to communicate findings. He feels the superintendent should dictate the evaluation process and although a board policy does not exist, he recommended formation of one as the first thing to do if he were a new superintendent.

Evaluation process is continuous - The standard reveals a minimum of one formal written evaluation for existing principals while new principal receives a minimum of two. The last two new principals were evaluated monthly for one-half of the school year. Self-assessment does not work with some people because they view the evaluation process as a negotiating process.

Major purpose of evaluation - Improvement of performance is primary purpose while secondary purposes are (1) forcing
central administration to comply with unwritten policy and (2) acquire information for merit raise.

**Written evaluation instrument** - Written evaluation is evident with an open-ended comment section. Rating as well as instrument changes to suit the superintendent. The instrument dictates the process.

**Performance objectives** - Performance objectives are added to the rating scale. Principal and superintendent agree on selection and final format.

**Performance expectations** - Priorities are set by superintendent. The process of evaluation is communicated to principal by conferences, memos and written evaluations.

**Analysis of Superintendent A** - A ten year history of evaluating principals supports a clear and well defined process. Throughout this decade of evaluation the superintendent has experimented with different forms, rating scales and procedures, however, the evaluation process has virtually remained the same. The process begins with initial conferences with the principals highlighting the basic forty point scale and focusing on personal or district performance areas. Once these are identified the superintendent monitors the performance of each principal through the use of building visitations, observations and reports from teachers, parents and other administrators. The evaluation process culminates with a written evaluation and a conference to clarify important areas of strength and weakness.
Although the principals participate in the structure and direction of the evaluation process, the superintendent's philosophy does not support changes to enhance individual strength and weakness. He, therefore, places little emphasis on subordinates participating in the development of the process.

According to the superintendent the lack of policy only exists because the board and superintendent rely on past practice and the ten year long history of administrative evaluation. The superintendent reports that policy is important in new situations primarily for (1) the evaluation process would be communicated to the principal and comes as no surprise and (2) the Board of Education would delegate this authority to the administration.

George Redfern, Associate Secretary of School Administration, clearly agrees with the superintendent appraisal of policy when he stated that:

The principal should understand what is expected of him. Responsibilities and expectations should be stated in written form and, if not, in writing, oral understandings should be clear and carefully delineated.48

Since the major purpose of evaluation is "to improve the principal's performance," the purpose also initiates communication from the superintendent to the principal and forces the superintendent to gather accurate information

48 Redfern, op. cit., p. 86.
which he must translate to the principal at the yearly conference. The superintendent communicated the importance of evaluation throughout the district starting with the Board of Education and the superintendent. All employees receive a yearly evaluation which makes the evaluation of principals an acceptable and palatable practice. There is a firm belief that the evaluation process protects and assures the public that administration is doing their job.

The written instrument includes a basic set of forty statements and expands into personal and district goals. The emphasis is directed at the goal level which identifies and hopefully corrects individual weaknesses. The superintendent commented on (1) avoidance of focusing on the principal's last minute mistakes, (2) changing the rating scale to avoid stereotyping of the principal's past performance, (3) the perfect instrument or process is relatively unimportant as compared to the entire evaluation program and (4) the evaluation process describes the expectations of the superintendent and the Board of Education.

Max Rosenberg commented on the importance of principal evaluation programs:

The right kind of evaluations will help principals gain insights into their strengths (and how they can be capitalized on) and weaknesses (and how they can be shored up.) Principal evaluation programs are important for school boards too, because the programs can help clarify the expectations that boards and superintendents have for their principals can result in better and more individually tailored inservice training and retaining strategies
and may have long-range beneficial effect on something called the professionalization of principals.\textsuperscript{49}

In summary, the superintendent has an organized principal evaluation program regardless of the lack of written policy. The superintendent monitors the program through extensive observations, visitations, interviews, conferences, surveys and general meetings. The conclusion of the process is synthesized by the forty statement written instrument and the evaluation conference. The effect of the principal evaluation process is a segment of evaluation programs throughout the district including the Board of Education and the superintendent. This total program describes and supports the evaluation philosophy of the district.

\textbf{Superintendent B}

**Existence of formal evaluation** - Evaluation process is structured into a specific format which highlights the principal's strengths and weakness. Superintendent believes that communication is the most important element of the evaluation process. A written policy supports the entire evaluation program.

**Evaluation process is continuous** - Informal evaluation takes place all the time. Number of contacts depends upon problems or situations and the experience level of the principal. Half-dozen conferences is the average rate for the superintendent and principal through the school year.

\textsuperscript{49}Rosenberg, op. cit., p. 35.
Major purpose of evaluation - Superintendent states that "helping principals bring about a better program in their buildings" is the major purpose of evaluating his principals. Leadership and developing strengths are other focal points of the process.

Written evaluation instrument - Total evaluation process is incorporated into the written instrument. Instrument serves as a vehicle for the total process. Development of the instrument is a product of superintendent and principal's input.

Performance objectives - Narrative format plus goals are included in the process. Selection and alterations are joint ventures by superintendent and principal. Monitoring and evaluation are solely superintendent responsibility.

Performance expectations - Top priority is "cohesiveness of staff." Job description clearly spells out responsibilities although it is absent from evaluation process. Superintendent gives individual attention to principals to explain their duties.

Analysis of Superintendent B - The superintendent has a well defined process which incorporates a narrative and goal setting procedure into a flexible instrument. The instrument is designed to highlight areas of strength and describe and define areas of weakness. At the conclusion of the school year, the superintendent and principal confer on the principal's performance and establish goals for the
coming year. This conference and goal setting process represents the final evaluation for the school year. Once the principal has been in the district for over one year the evaluation process becomes part of a professional growth cycle. The superintendent believes the goal setting or establishing performance objective is the most important point in the entire process. Marjorie Arikado and Donald Musella have established the importance of performance objectives and their relationship to an evaluation program:

The principal-initiated objectives must be presented to and discussed with the superintendent. A thorough discussion of each objective and of the activities the principal will undertake to achieve successful results is an essential part of the evaluation program. We are indicating here a two-way dialogue between the principal and his superintendent - a dialogue in which each contributes to improving the objective that is the activity to be undertaken. The problems must be analyzed, resources identified, constraints and limitations taken into account and alternatives considered. The superintendent with a broader area of responsibility and hopefully a broad perspective and the principal with direct responsibility for one school, both contribute to the development of the final list of objectives. This list then becomes the principal's "contract" in that he has agreed to be accountable for the success or failure of the results.50

The evaluation program is initiated by a policy statement which has been in existence for several years. Throughout the process the superintendent plays a low key figure; however, he dominates through the art of extensive communication.

Formal evaluation is an annual event, as described by the end of the year conference. Other informal conferences occur throughout the year as needed and the superintendent made special mention of the personal attention to problem areas created by the principal. A principal's performance depends upon his ability to keep the superintendent informed of pertinent issues which may have a negative effect on the district's instructional or public relations program.

Principals must concentrate on improving the instructional program as the major priority and develop a leadership style which fosters strength and independence. As this evaluation process is described and interpreted, there seems to be a dependence upon the superintendent for the leadership and direction.

Performance objectives and the written instrument focus on areas the principal may improve his performance. Some principals will use his personal performance objectives as a guideline to establish goals with his teaching staff. Throughout the school year the superintendent will monitor the progress of the objectives and other areas of principal performance.

In summary, this evaluation process is dependent upon a communication system and performance objectives to improve the principal's role. The process culminates with a year end conference whereby new performance objectives are derived and implemented during the next school year.
performance areas and the objectives are monitored by the superintendent. Informal conferences average six during the school term with special emphasis on problem areas.

The superintendent's philosophy is projected throughout the evaluation process and is the key factor in the communication process. Whenever there appears to be a breakdown in the communication system, the superintendent becomes personally involved in the evaluation process. This evaluation process is controlled and regulated solely by the superintendent.

**Superintendent C**

Existence of formal evaluation - Principals are observed on a day-to-day basis which ties into an informal evaluation process. Principals have no input into the development of this informal program. The Board of Education policy indicates that superintendent must evaluate and recommend the employment of principals to the Board of Education.

Evaluation process is continuous - Conferences throughout the school year total about 8 to 10. Two of the sessions are structured into major conferences and they all remain informal.

Major purpose of evaluation - Justification of the existence of the principal's position and salary increments are the major purposes of evaluation. Other factors are the understanding of job expectations and improvement of job skills.

Written evaluation instrument - An instrument does not exist.
The process is dependent upon verbal interaction. Any performance objectives or goal setting process is non-existent in the district.

**Analysis of Superintendent C** - The entire evaluation process is dependent upon verbal communication from superintendent to the principal. An informal evaluation program describes the day-to-day contact, with the emphasis on problem solving. There is nothing formal scheduled nor does a written principal evaluation instrument exist. According to the superintendent the daily contact is the most important part of the program. A policy statement conveying the district's philosophy regarding administrative evaluation has existed for several years.

Twice a year the superintendent conducts a summary conference to update the progress and professional growth of each principal. Inservice programs are limited to outside conventions or weekend conferences which focus on specific topics. During the school year approximately eight to ten informal conferences are scheduled to update progress and discuss current problems. A self-assessment instrument is non-existent throughout the evaluation process.

The superintendent identifies the major purpose of principal evaluation as a justification for the existence of the principalship and the determination of a salary. Other reasons to continue with the evaluation process are
the awareness of the superintendent's expectations and the hope that the process will make better principals.

Since the evaluation process is all verbal communication, a written instrument, performance objectives and goals are unnecessary. The common criterion identified as a performance standard is the job description which synthesizes the superintendent's expectations. The evaluation process appears to be closely related to the work - standards approach as described by Winston Oberg.

Instead of asking employees to set their own performance goals, many organizations set measured daily work standards. In short, the work standards technique establishes work and staff targets aimed at improving productivity. When realistically used, it can make possible an objective and accurate appraisal of the work of employees and supervisors.

To be effective, the standards must be visible and fair. Hence, a good deal of time is spent observing employees on the job where possible, and attempting to arrive at realistic output standards.51

Priorities described by the superintendent are (1) community communication, (2) curriculum planning and (3) faculty development. The job description highlights these performance responsibilities.

In summary, the evaluation process is a verbal process which is dependent upon a series of informal conferences. The evaluation program is virtually non-existent, primarily because of the lack of organization and structure. Without

51 Oberg, op. cit., p. 65.
a written instrument to formalize and culminate the process, the results are dependent upon day-to-day operations with minimal planning for the future. The existence of a written Board of Education policy would seemingly dictate a formal program, however, the superintendent's evaluation process must be compatible with the district philosophy as evidenced by the superintendent's longevity which exceeds ten years.

Existence of formal evaluation - An evaluation program is structured by the superintendent including opening meeting regarding the instrument, ongoing contacts with principal and final written evaluation at the close of the school term. The superintendent places a high priority on the principals participating in the formation of the present evaluation process. There is an "unwritten" Board of Education policy regarding evaluation of principals.

Evaluation process is continuous - The principals are formally evaluated in March, however, as many as six to eight conferences are held during the school year. Poor performance indicates a higher number of conferences. A self-assessment completed by the principal is mandatory.

Major purpose of evaluation - "Helping principal become better administrator" is the major purpose of the evaluation program. A salary is also determined as a result of the evaluation process. The superintendent has very little faith in self-assessment process primarily because prin-
cipals do not honestly examine and report their deficiencies.

Written evaluation instrument - The culmination of the entire process is the written evaluation instrument and it is the most important element of the entire process.

Performance objectives - A limited format exists in self-assessment instrument. The structure or model is left to superintendent-principal's discretion.

Performance expectations - The superintendent takes the direct approach when communicating expectations. A job description serves as a guide.

Analysis of Superintendent D - The evaluation process as described by the superintendent is a very informal program primarily planned during the first administrative meeting at the beginning of the school year. An instrument and performance goals are the main ingredients of the evaluation process with the major emphasis on the written instrument. Throughout the school year the superintendent visits the school buildings and programs on a regular basis to help monitor the principal's progress. An unwritten policy supports the superintendent's position and implementation of the evaluation program.

Although the final evaluation conference is scheduled in March, several informal conferences are held throughout the school term. Throughout the evaluation process, the superintendent indicated a desire to help the principals become better administrators and his plan to accomplish this
task was extensive and extended conferences. In an effort to exchange an evaluation of the principal's performance a self-assessment prior to the final conference was mandatory. The superintendent expressed great concern over the honesty of the self-assessment process and the ability of the principal to fairly evaluate their own strengths and weaknesses. According to the superintendent the results had a tendency to hide or cover up the poor performer. George B. Redfern indicates the importance and the difficulty of self-assessment when he reported that:

Seeing ourselves as others see us is easier said than done. Self-assessment is a subtle process. It involves the capacity to weigh strengths and weaknesses; to measure accomplishment against declared goals; to admit failure as well as accept success and to evaluate achievement in terms of one's own concept of satisfactory service rather than in terms of comparing accomplishment with that of others who are doing the same type of job in the school system.

Self-assessment is an attempt to estimate accomplishment and to identify problems that may have impeded it. The problem is to minimize reluctance to admit inadequate performance for fear that the evaluator may "downgrade" his estimate of accomplishment. It becomes very important that self-assessment be viewed in proper perspective. It is the starting point of a comprehensive assessment of performance effectiveness.52

When the superintendent was identifying important elements of the evaluation process, he described the written evaluation instrument as the most important ingredient of the program. Performance goals are incorporated into the
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52 Redfern, op. cit., p. 91.
self-assessment instrument and are developed to improve the principal's professional growth. The priorities as described by the superintendent were (1) the instructional program, (2) teacher morale and (3) discipline.

As evidenced by the evaluation program structure, the major force in the evaluation process is the written instrument. The instrument initiates the evaluation process, is the monitoring guide for the superintendent and culminates the program in March when final conferences result in the discussion of the principal's performance. The evaluation program structure is very informal which appears to coincide with the superintendent's intent and unwritten policy regarding the evaluation process.

Self-evaluation seems to be a problem because of a lack of direct communication from the principal and the resistance to change which may lead to a discovery of poor performance. Although there is a formal program and an established process, along with a self-assessment and the determination of salary, the major focus on principal evaluation is directly associated with an informal approach which is directly related to the superintendent's low keyed style. Since the evaluation program is working well, according to the superintendent, it appears that an unwritten policy can be a productive force to implement an evaluation program as compared to a district with a detailed formal policy statement.
Superintendent E

Existence of formal evaluation - Management by objectives and a self-evaluation guide highlight the program. Over one hundred statement-questions indicate the status of the principal followed by the goal setting process. The superintendent and principal concentrate on six or eight prime areas and the entire process is absent of a rating scale.

A Board of Education policy charges the superintendent with the responsibility of evaluating all administrative personnel.

Evaluation process is continuous - A series of conferences are held weekly concerning the management by objectives program. The principal, with the superintendent's approval, may update, modify or change his objectives.

Major purpose of evaluation - Program must "help the principal help the teacher who in turn must help the child."

The principal must provide the leadership for the best educational environment.

Written evaluation instrument - An instrument does not exist in this form.

Performance objectives - Management by objectives is the major program. Superintendent and principal mutually agree on selection of objectives. A management by objectives model is a composite of available programs.

Performance expectations - Job descriptions and log of daily events clearly spell out responsibilities. Expectations are communicated by the superintendent in continuous conferences
throughout the year.

Analysis of Superintendent E - The evaluation program for all staff, including principals, changed significantly during the past two years. Prior to the change, a traditional rating evaluation system was used district wide. A management by objectives format is presently implemented after the principal and superintendent review the status and performance of the principal. Objectives are designed to concentrate on key areas as determined by past performance. The evaluation process appears to concentrate on a wide range of performance areas, as evidenced by the one hundred and twenty-six questions and a specific area or areas which were designated by the superintendent as priority areas for the coming school year.

The superintendent describes his evaluation process as ongoing and continuous because of the series of conferences which take place during the school year. As a result of past performance and practice special in-service programs are scheduled throughout the administrative meetings. Prior to the final conference with the superintendent a self-assessment instrument is completed by the principal and reviewed by the superintendent. Weekly conferences designated a definite time period for the evaluation process and the in-service programs and the self-assessment instrument indicate a follow-up program is established.

As a result of the identification process, the on-
going conferences and the self-assessment instrument a management by objectives format is the culminating point of the entire program. All the preliminary steps lead to an objectives model which is intended to help the principals become better managers. According to the superintendent, the principal must be the leader in the attendance center. The management by objectives approach which is monitored by the superintendent is based on mutual agreement for the selection and final approval of the completed format. The model used in the management by objectives format is a modification of available programs. As a result of the evaluation process, it appears that the program is still in the infancy stage of development and the components need to be synthesized into meaningful steps.

The priorities are described as (1) management of teachers, (2) management of students and (3) management of the community. A job description which clearly lists responsibilities led to the structure of the management by objectives model. The priorities and the job description appear to structure the evaluation process to the extent that the program becomes as rigid as the superintendent desires. Its flexibility seems to be limited to non-priority areas.

In summary, the district is moving from an antiquated rating system to a management by objectives program. The new system is in the early stages of development (second
The entire process is dependent upon complicated, detailed statements which describe the status of the principal and provide a foundation for the setting of objectives. On the surface, the evaluation process appears to be a complex system for the principal; however, the impression the superintendent related is based on a simple, professional growth aspect of identifying weak areas and setting goals to improve them. The evaluation process is difficult to analyze at this stage primarily because all the aspects are still undecided. Home-grown models generally take a longer period of time to finalize into a workable format to suit the superintendent and district's needs.

**Superintendent F**

**Existence of formal evaluation** - There is an informal management by objectives system with highlights on mutual goal setting, establish timetables and evaluation criteria. The emphasis is on principal involvement throughout the entire process. The primary concern is (1) improve performance, (2) bring about change in their building and (3) provide a service to teachers, students or the community. A brief policy statement requires the superintendent to evaluate the principals.

**Evaluation process is continuous** - An evaluation is scheduled for once a year. Self-assessment is encouraged, however, it is not required. Two conferences per year are normal, however, if progress reports on the objectives are unsatisfactory more
conferences are scheduled.

**Major purpose of evaluation** - Improvement of performance is the primary purpose with salary considerations and promotion factors, two other reasons for evaluation.

**Written evaluation instrument** - A very informal reporting system plus conferences are used as a substitute for a written evaluation instrument.

**Performance objectives** - Objectives are interwoven into the evaluation process. An open-ended narrative format is utilized and if a disagreement occurs, the final decision rests with the superintendent. A management by objectives model is non-existent.

**Performance expectations** - Differences vary according to building and community and the performance expectations are predominant in the evaluation process. The superintendent communicates priorities to principals through the evaluation process.

**Analysis of Superintendent F** - The evaluation process is primarily structured on the development of objectives which include a time frame for completion and a criteria for evaluation. The superintendent has established an informal system which emphasizes an individual approach with each principal and the major emphasis in the design of the evaluation program is the input received from all principals. A policy statement which simply states that the superintendent will evaluate the principals is the basis for implemen-
tation three years ago. The evaluation process appears to emphasize flexibility and individual differences within buildings and communities. It can be structured several different ways by the superintendent whose basic philosophy is individualized instruction from top level administration through the student.

The effectiveness of management by objectives in improving performance at the school district level is demonstrated in a study conducted by Brick and Sanchis:

One objective "providing the community with information about their schools," was selected for analysis. Six randomly selected principals were asked to submit their community information plans for the year. Then their communities were administered pre-tests to determine the current level of community knowledge. After the base-line data were collected the principals were informed about the management by objectives test objective, provided the pre-test results and left to construct with their staffs a needs assessment and community information plan. The principals were required to submit monthly progress reports and were offered the assistance of the district level administration in the resolution of problems. Within twelve weeks, post-test results indicate that parental knowledge increased by an average of 25 percent. The number of principal contacts with the community was also reduced from the total 270 planned initially to the 58 contacts planned under the management by objectives process.53

One formal evaluation and conference is scheduled each year with a series of mini-conferences planned throughout the school year. The number of conferences and extent of content are dependent upon the progress and success of the
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performance objectives and the principal's ability to coordinate and organize his activities. The superintendent expressed the main purpose of evaluation was to improve performance while salary and promotion areas were two additional factors which resulted in the successful completion of the evaluation process. The purposes, as listed, appears to satisfy the intent of the evaluation program and the superintendent's philosophy of individualized instruction.

When the final evaluation conference is completed the superintendent and the principal describe the final outcome of the conference in narrative form to insure both parties have the same perceptions. This open ended narrative is exchanged and it remains part of the evaluation record. The priorities for principals are (1) work toward individualized instruction for the teaching staff and students, (2) in-service the staff to meet the needs of the students and (3) evaluate ongoing programs. Since the district is engrossed in individualized instruction, the principal's standard job description varies from building to building with special emphasis on the community's unique characteristics.

There is an overwhelming commitment to individualized instruction philosophy which permeates the principal evaluation process. The superintendent is well organized, however, the evaluation process is very informal and flexible. It is difficult to associate this evaluation process with a systematized program since the key emphasis seems to focus
on variation. The verbal communication used exclusively in the process is an effective and efficient tool, however, both parties must understand and trust each other completely. Since the narrative open-ended format takes a different structure each time, the comparisons, progress updates and accomplishments are difficult to assess relative to past performance. The evaluation process is a direct association with the superintendent's philosophy of individualized instruction and its implementation is dependent upon his perceptions of the past and the present situations.

Superintendent G

Existence of formal evaluation - A performance review checklist, along with conferences and visitations to the buildings are the three main factors in the principal evaluation process. The principal and superintendent each select two areas from the performance review checklist for the evaluation criteria. Documentation for accurate judgments are mutually agreed upon by the superintendent and principal. The Board of Education policy merely reflects a report of principal effectiveness.

Evaluation process is continuous - The intent of the program is to schedule three conferences, however, only one will take place this present year. Principals do not complete any self-assessment prior to their evaluation conference.

Major purpose of evaluation - "Helping principals become better administrators" is the first priority while reporting
back to the Board of Education and communicating expectations are two additional purposes. The superintendent feels the evaluation program needs further refinement and work to meet the first priority of the district.

**Written evaluation instrument** - Although the superintendent feels the written evaluation is only part of the evaluation program, he believes it still is the most important part of the process.

**Performance objectives** - Objectives are an outgrowth of the performance review check list. Conferences are scheduled for November, January and March. A management by objectives model was not used when the evaluation program was developed.

**Performance expectations** - The job description is outdated and needs to be rewritten. New job description will dovetail with evaluation program. Superintendent feels principals are not aware of their job expectations, however, the program is only in its initial year.

**Analysis of Superintendent G** - The evaluation process is in its initial year of implementation and the superintendent has set some district guidelines which he intends to follow. Prior to his superintendency a very informal principal evaluation program existed with the major emphasis on verbal communication. This year performance review check list along with visitations to the buildings are the major focal points of the entire process. Once the check list is completed the superintendent and principal select two perform-
ance areas for concentration and agree on the source of documentation for the criteria of evaluation. The policy statement as interpreted by the superintendent is a report to the Board of Education. The present evaluation process appears to be in a transition year with a commitment from the superintendent to implement a formal program. Based on previous school years and former evaluation programs, the trend seems to focus on key performance areas and a written instrument to communicate the principal's status.

The number of conferences scheduled for this year was three, however, it will only be one since schedule commitments have affected the timetable. As a substitute, the superintendent will try to schedule three or four informal conferences to review progress. A self-assessment instrument is neither mandated nor used voluntarily by the principals. The evaluation process, although scheduled and accountable on paper, is completed with limited contact and it appears the program will have a difficult time meeting the superintendent's commitment. There is also a question whether enough documentation to support an evaluation will be gathered and used effectively.

A written instrument, the check list, is considered by the superintendent as the most important part of the evaluation process. The four performance areas are the keys to improving principal performance and providing information for the superintendent to report to the Board of Education.
Although the evaluation process is designed to communicate the superintendent's expectations and may be used for salary review, the superintendent believes the process needs to be reshaped to meet the purpose of the evaluation program.

A job description is available but it is outdated and needs an update. The priorities as described by the superintendent are (1) public relations, (2) discipline and (3) work with the teachers. Since the evaluation program and process is in the first year, the priorities will become a focal point and must be coordinated with the key performance areas to insure the superintendent that the principal will be concentrating on major areas.

Since the evaluation program is in its infancy, the superintendent is having some problems with communicating the standards and implementing the "formal program." The present superintendent has just replaced a long tenured superintendent whose evaluation program of principals was informal. The effectiveness has yet to be determined and the principals probably are taking a wait and see attitude with the Board of Education.

In the final analysis very little appears to be in progress, although the written instrument and related job description will help formalize the criteria, the key to the entire program appears to be an improved monitoring system to gather information for necessary judgments by the superintendent and the attitude and acceptance of the eval-
uation program by the principal. Time and the Board of Education emphasis of the evaluation program and process should hasten the superintendent's and principal's commitment.

Superintendent H

Existence of formal evaluation - The superintendent has changed from a rigid, formal rating scale to a self-assessment and an assessment by the chief administrator. All of the assessments conclude with an informal conference. An understanding of the superintendent's expectations is identified as the most important element. Board of Education policy is non-existent.

Evaluation process is continuous - Two major conferences are scheduled, however, the process is described as "daily or continuous." A minimum of ten conferences are held yearly and in some cases the number may reach fifty.

Major purpose of evaluation - Superintendent's first priority is to strengthen the school program while the principal's yearly retention can also be affected by the evaluation process.

Written evaluation instrument - Since the evaluation process was changed from the formal system to an informal assessment process, the written evaluation instrument has been eliminated.

Performance objectives - Targets are set by the principal and superintendent cooperatively. Results are basically for
future direction. Model is described as a hybrid of different programs.

Performance expectations - District priorities are established for the principals by the superintendent who expects (1) stability within the school and (2) improvement of instruction. Job descriptions are used as a guide to communicate the Board of Education expectations. Superintendent believes a free exchange of problems takes place during his informal conferences and he can deal with them more effectively.

Analysis of Superintendent H - A major change of philosophy by the chief administrator has modified the principal evaluation process from a formal rating scale to an informal assessment process by the superintendent. The major impetus for the new program stems from the experience and longevity of the principals and their familiarity with the district's requirements and expectations. The superintendent believes that a formal system may be necessary for a new principal, however, principals who have been in the district a number of years need a flexible principal evaluation system and process. It appears a formal program gives the inexperienced principal a systematic approach to the district's evaluation program, the expectations and the priorities. The Board of Education does not have a policy on evaluation of principals.

Although the evaluation program is informal the superintendent and principal schedule a formal conference twice
a year to review their performance throughout the year. The superintendent describes the evaluation process as continuous, daily contact. A self-evaluation, although done on an informal basis by principals, is not required by the superintendent. Throughout the year a minimum number of ten conferences are held, however, some principals and superintendent conferences may exceed fifty contacts. The informal evaluation program and the ongoing evaluation process suggest that a formal program and process would hinder their present program and its effect on the principals produces more concern over ratings than the criteria communicated by the superintendent. It appears that this informal program will create more of an open, honest exchange of concerns and problems than the past formal program.

The major purposes of the informal evaluation process is to strengthen the school program, help the principal develop better working relationships with people and sometimes it is used for retention of principals. Since there is no written instrument performance objectives are set at the beginning of each school year along with timetables to complete each task. Their management by objectives model is a compilation of various other models which were reviewed by the principals and superintendent before a decision was reached.

Priorities at the building level vary according to the needs of the community, however, the two main district pri-
orities are (1) establish good human relations with the community and (2) improve the instructional program. The job description is used in the evaluation program and it does communicate the performance expectations to the principals.

In summary, the superintendent appears to feel more comfortable with an informal evaluation process because the principals are free to exchange thoughts and ideas. The written evaluation used in the past seemed to hinder the process because of its inherent accountability and legal documentation. There is a high priority on honesty and the new process is structured to encourage direct principal input.

The entire process is best described as informal with a tremendous amount of superintendent flexibility. Although it appears that the principals are less accountable, they can be burdened with the superintendent's likes and dislikes especially in questionable areas like staff morale and administrative style. An informal system has merit if the superintendent and principals understand and communicate areas of responsibility and accountability.

Superintendent I

Existence of formal evaluation - The district has established broad goals which set up the parameters which the principals must adhere to when developing their job targets. In addition to the principal job targets, the superintendent establishes another target for each principal. The evalu-
ation process focuses on curriculum or building problems and their main objective is to facilitate professional growth. The current evaluation process is a result of a previous rating scale and an informal communication system. Although the principals are not specifically named in the Board of Education policy there is a clear intent of professional personnel evaluation.

**Evaluation process is continuous** - An annual evaluation is scheduled with several conferences in the spring to develop job targets. A minimum of three conferences are held during the school year.

**Major purpose of evaluation** - Program improvement is the primary purpose with personnel improvement closely related to major purpose.

**Written evaluation instrument** - This evaluation process is void of a written evaluation instrument.

**Performance objectives** - Job targets are the major component of the entire process which is established on a cooperative basis. Time tables are built into the objective format. Results are used to build new targets which ensure the evaluation process to be continuous. A management by objectives model was not used to establish the process.

**Performance expectations** - Criteria statements substitute for a formal job description. Expectations are communicated by the superintendent. The major focus is to change principal evaluation process from a rating system to professional
improvement program.

Analysis of Superintendent I - Colleague improvement is described as the major purpose of the evaluation process. The superintendent tries very hard to eliminate a superior-subordinate relationship and works toward a self-assessment process which eventually develops into specific job targets. A principal selects four job targets and the superintendent selects one which comprise the evaluation program. All job targets are developed within the framework of the district goals each year. This self-assessment, job target development process was composed seven years ago when the district used the traditional rating scale system. A Board of Education policy encompasses a principal evaluation statement. The evaluation process appears to focus on distinct performance areas identified by the superintendent. Although it appears to be informal, the structure and follow-up process are well organized.

This evaluation process can be compared to the research results of Hans Anderson, Ralph Mosher and David E. Purpel who indicate that evaluation, if it is to result in improved performance, should be supportive and concerned with the professional growth of the administrator.

A client centered counseling approach is recommended through which (1) the supervisor is a facilitator of self-evaluation, (2) relationships between the administrator's activities and results are explored, (3) consideration is given to obstacles and (4) the administrator is encouraged to develop revised ways
of thinking.\textsuperscript{54} \textsuperscript{55}

An annual evaluation conference is scheduled to review recent job targets and set new ones for the coming school year. A minimum of three conferences follow up the initial job target setting and adjustments, alterations and changes are considered before the final document is finalized. All areas within the job target setting process focus on instructional program improvement and improving personnel effectiveness.

The format used for the job targets has a timetable for achievement and is continuous once the process is initiated. Priorities for the principals are (1) the ability to relate well to people, (2) instructional knowledge and (3) organizational skills. A job description does not exist, nor is anything similar used in the evaluation process, however, the superintendent believes the principals are aware of their expectations. The evaluation process appears to be tailored to suit the superintendent's philosophy of colleague improvement and professional growth.

In summary, the superintendent is very comfortable with his evaluation program and is opposed to a rating system


\textsuperscript{55}Ralph L. Mosher and David E. Purpel, Supervision: The Reluctant Professor (Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1972), pp. 197-200.
which is only an instrument. The setting of goals or job targets is very important to the process since they act as a catalyst to the entire program. The targets stimulate other concerns or areas and act as a continuous cycle when the results serve as a basis for other or new job targets.

This evaluation process appears to be sound because of the experience of the superintendent and the principals who have over five years of administrative experience and expertise. Programs which are developed through an understanding of clear expectations can easily be administered, however, there is a danger of interpretation. One concern, which does not impede the process, is the unclear relationship with job status. It seems as though the process does not identify weak administrators. Another system or format might be necessary to eliminate undesirable principals.

Superintendent J

Existence of formal evaluation - Goals and objectives are developed as a result of interaction between the principal and his education development committee. The superintendent then reviews the goals and objectives to finalize the standards. A self-evaluation is completed by the principal and forwarded to the superintendent who completes a performance review which is based on an industrial management system. Evaluation process is based on administrative directive, not a Board of Education policy.

Evaluation process is continuous - One formal evaluation is
scheduled each year. Several mini-conferences are also held at various times. A minimum of ten conferences or contacts are a result of the goals and objectives evaluation process. Updates and reassessments are part of the entire process.

**Major purpose of evaluation** - "Improve performance" is described as the major purpose with staff morale and program improvement as other key areas.

**Written evaluation instrument** - Performance review instrument is regarded as the culminating point of the entire evaluation program. It clearly focuses in on the major goals of the program.

**Performance objectives** - Objectives are generated from problems and are the major focus of the evaluation results. Teachers, principal and superintendent are all involved in the process. A specific model related to Peter Drucker's approach with slight modifications are the primary source.

**Performance expectations** - A job description is considered unsatisfactory and they are in the process of updating new formats. Evaluation process essentially highlights principal's performance responsibility and the numerous conferences held by the superintendent enables him to communicate his priorities.

**Analysis of Superintendent J** - A management model is the framework for the evaluation process. The principal is expected to work with his teachers and develop goals and objectives which specifically relate to problem areas in
the building. After this preliminary, but most important, step is completed the superintendent reviews and finalizes the program with the principal. A performance review is completed in a conference setting in the spring of the year. The evaluation process appears to focus on a performance review and the goals and objectives developed by the principal. As a result of the industrial model the superintendent concentrates on the results and places little value on the process. It appears as though the reason for the major focus on results is to eliminate the evaluation of personalities and administrative style.

The philosophy which supports the principal and teacher combination of developing goals and objectives is closely related to the faculty team concept which establishes the staff as the effective body for decision-making and objective setting. Gerald H. Moeller and David J. Mahan cite numerous studies in support of the group as the unit determining organizational performance. The results demonstrate that the faculty team should be more productive and enjoy high morale standards.

According to Moeller and Mahan, district-wide objectives should be transmitted to the school's faculty team. The team conducts a school-level needs assessment, establishes school objectives contributing to district goals, establishes school strategies, collects evaluative data from all involved, and controls progress toward the goals. The principal functions primarily as the facilitator of group communication and action. It is the principal's responsibility to lead the team in defining specific areas of responsibility and to see that members understand their
roles in terms of the established goals.

The performance of the staff is evaluated both collectively and individually. The principal, as well as other staff members is evaluated according to his contribution to group defined goals.56

One formal review each year culminates the evaluation process, however, there are numerous conferences held during the school year to determine progress. The evaluation program is defined as ongoing and continuous as cited by development of new performance areas at the concluding conference each year. Although the principals and their staffs develop the goals and objectives, they are directed toward the major purposes of the district goals for principal evaluation such as (1) improve performance, (2) improve staff morale and (3) improve the instructional program. After reviewing this process and its purpose it is likely that the total principal evaluation program is concerned with a total involvement of staff working toward district goals rather than a principal evaluation program. The efforts of the principal seem to be directed at faculty involvement thus making an isolated evaluation of the principal difficult and unnecessary.

A format to develop the goals and objectives are derived from the district's model which is completed each year for the Illinois Office of Education. The timetable to complete

objectives generally is the same time frame as the school year. Priorities for the principal are (1) continued improvement of the instructional program and student performance, (2) management of personnel and (3) management of material resources. Although the job description exists, it is not used in the evaluation process because the superintendent terms it unsatisfactory.

In summary, this evaluation program focuses on a formal management system which highlights behaviors and eliminates style and traits of principals as performance areas. The superintendent's approach is probably the most unique trait of the entire process, whereby he manages the district and personnel with an industrial research model thus trying to eliminate subjective judgment. There seems to be a great deal of emphasis on detail and record keeping.

As the evaluation process suggests, the faculty team concept of developing goals and objectives is paramount to the participatory decision making and responsibility at the building level. This aspect of the program may make an isolated evaluation of the principal a difficult task. The values of staff participation and morale may encourage the superintendent to overlook any deficiencies in their process.

In order to have confidence in this system, the superintendent must believe that management is primarily a science and this management skill can be isolated, inventoried and evaluated. Some educators contend that education is
primarily a process which depends upon many different factors and is closely related to an art. It may be a difficult task to apply scientific management skills to a highly defined and complicated art.

Superintendent K

Existence of formal evaluation - Superintendent characterizes his program as "very formal" with a written instrument culminating the process. Monthly visitations and memos serve as the primary monitoring program. The written evaluation instrument has the greatest impact on principals since verbal communication was used extensively in the past. The Board of Education expects the superintendent to evaluate the principals, although a specific policy does not exist.

Evaluation process is continuous - Formal evaluation takes place once a year. Only two conferences are held during the school year.

Major purpose of evaluation - Superintendent believes that "motivation and improvement of staff" are the major reasons for his evaluation program. Developing better principals and improving relationships with staff and community are other purposes of the process.

Written evaluation instrument - Although the instrument is important, the conference to clarify and highlight the main areas of administration is the major component. The tool or vehicle for communication is the evaluation instrument.

Performance objectives - These are not used in the process.
Performance expectations - Job description exists in the district, however, it is rarely used. A major revision will probably take place in the future. Superintendent believes principals are aware of their job expectations and they are slowly changing some of their behavior.

Analysis of Superintendent K - A very formal evaluation instrument was constructed by the superintendent five years ago to help eliminate any misunderstandings which have occurred through a verbal communication process. The district now has a very formal evaluation process which is culminated by the written evaluation instrument and described by the superintendent as the most important element in the program. The priorities are set forth in the written evaluation instrument and may establish the potential grounds for dismissal of a principal. Although a specific Board of Education policy does not exist, there is a clear direction that the Board of Education expects the superintendent to evaluate the principals. As the evaluation process suggests, the superintendent believes the written instrument has more impact on changes which should occur throughout the district.

The entire evaluation format has changed from a very informal, verbal communication process to a structured written communication process which emphasizes the district's priorities. It is evident that the written evaluation instrument, which is primarily a checklist, is the entire program, although it has limitations and weaknesses.
William Pharis has made some very discouraging remarks and comments regarding checklist rating devices and their purpose.

Typical checklist rating devices are characterized by sweeping generalizations whose interpretation is more witchcraft than science. What, for instance, is meant by personal appearance, emotional stability and relationship with teachers? The use of such measures necessarily tell us more about the evaluator than it does the evaluatee.57

The formal evaluation is scheduled once per year, with very little evidence of supporting statements or documents to indicate a significant number of preliminary conferences or meetings prior to the final conference. Only an average of two conferences take place during the school year. A self-assessment is neither required nor completed by the principal: There is little evidence to support an ongoing evaluation process and it appears that the written evaluation instrument is the formal document which controls the entire process.

The major reasons for the evaluation of principals are (1) motivation and improvement of staff and (2) improve the individual principal's interpersonal relationships. The superintendent described the evaluation conference as a very valuable tool to interpret the ratings to principals and clarify the importance of performance. Performance objectives or anything similar are not included in the process.

57Pharis, op. cit., p. 38.
Priorities are described as (1) teacher evaluation, (2) follow-through and (3) professional loyalty to each other. Although a job description exists, it is not used in the evaluation process and the likelihood for a revision is very remote unless the principals request one. The evaluation process as described by the purposes and priorities focus on the principals weaknesses and place a great deal of emphasis on strenghtening them or even eliminating them entirely.

In summary, the superintendent appears to indicate by design and direction that he prefers a no nonsense approach to principal evaluation. He prefers the traditional checklist rating instruments as the entire evaluation program and process and prides himself on talking "cold turkey" to incompetent principals. The superintendent's main vehicle for this communication is his written evaluation instrument and there is a change of philosophy which supports a written memo for every important or key responsibility for principals. Verbal communication on less important areas is still an acceptable practice, however, if a performance area continues to be unacceptable the superintendent will communicate in writing.

Other factors which help place importance on this new evaluation process are budgetary reductions, transferring principals and recent dismissals. There seems to be a great deal of difficulty accepting this "written program" as
opposed to the previous verbal communication system. This superintendent must have received a great deal of support from his Board of Education to change the evaluation program, because of the problems which may and already have occurred.

Superintendent L

Existence of formal evaluation - A combination of performance objectives, a self-assessment and a rating scale are all used in the evaluation process. The performance objectives are developed at the beginning of the school year and then reviewed by the superintendent. An exit conference is scheduled at the end of the school year to review and assess performance. The final rating scale is placed in the principal's file following a conference and discussion of the self-assessment instrument. A job description is available, however, the Board of Education policy does not refer specifically to principal evaluation.

Evaluation process is continuous - Formal evaluation is completed twice a year with many informal conferences taking place during the year. Three conferences are officially held to discuss the principal's performance.

Major purpose of evaluation - Improvement of the education program through the principal competencies is the reason the evaluation program is implemented. Another purpose is to develop skills.

Written evaluation instrument - It is only one of two major vehicles, however, the performance objectives rate as the
most important because it concentrates on the weakness and subsequently helps improve it.

Performance objectives - A simple format includes job targets with no maximum number. The timetable is the school year and a home-made model is used as the format.

Performance expectations - The job description has just been revised and the new program calls for the development of a rating scale which closely relates to performance responsibilities. Since the principals had just completed the job description they are obviously aware of their job expectations.

Analysis of Superintendent L - At the beginning of every school year the principals develop a set of performance objectives which are reviewed and approved by the superintendent. During the school year, specifically at mid-semester, a review is scheduled to update progress and at the end of the school year an exit conference is held to determine the overall performance of each principal. Prior to the exit conference each principal completes a self-evaluation form and the superintendent compares and discusses his ratings before a short evaluation form is placed in the personnel file of the principal. The superintendent and principal are presently working on a new rating form which will closely resemble the job description. Although a specific policy on principal evaluation does not exist, the principal's job description is part of the policy manual. It is unusual and unique that a district would employ three elements specifi-
ally performance objectives, self-evaluation and a rating scale, to evaluate the performance of the principals. All three elements individually have their advantages and disadvantages, but collectively they appear to satisfy the superintendent and district needs.

A formal evaluation is completed twice a year with several informal conferences unscheduled throughout the year. Three conferences are officially held to discuss principal performance and other matters relating to administrative functions. From the multitude of principal evaluation instruments, it would appear more scheduled conferences would become necessary in order to acquire the data and information for a performance review. One evaluation conference per month may be more practical as compared with the complexity of the evaluation process.

The purpose of the evaluation program is to improve the instructional program through the improvement of principal competencies. Performance objectives dovetail with the major purpose of evaluation in a simple format with no required number and the emphasis on individual weaknesses or program improvement. The timetable is the standard school year with the review scheduled for the exit conference.

Priorities are described by the superintendent as (1) development of an educational program to meet the needs of the students, (2) health and safety of students and (3)
good administration and operations in the building. The job
description will serve as a basis for the development of a
new checklist which is scheduled for review this year. When
the checklist is completed, it is expected to become part of
the policy manual. The purposes and priorities appear to be
structured to enhance the educational process, although more
emphasis should be placed on specifics and less generalization.

In summary, the evaluation program is complex and flex-
able enough to account for performance objectives, self-
assessment, and a formal rating scale, however, it is in-
teresting to note how dependent one part of the process is
upon another. Very little emphasis is placed on the rating
scale and the entire process is unrelated to any salary
determination.

The evaluation process seems conventional and without
complete knowledge of the actual account it is difficult to
analyze its parts. The multitude of elements in the evalu-
ation process gives the superintendent an opportunity to
employ the advantages of each instrument and reduce the dis-
advantages. It appears as though more time should be
scheduled to monitor the process and acquire data for the
performance review.

Superintendent M

Existence of formal evaluation - The superintendent has a
major four hour conference at the end of the school year to
discuss the rating system and establishing new goals for the
coming year. The monitoring system is highlighted by a series of informal conferences. The Board of Education policy indicates the responsibility of the superintendent in evaluation of principals.

**Evaluation process is continuous** - The principals are evaluated annually. On occasion the principal completes a self-assessment prior to the major conference at the end of the year. The superintendent estimates from fifty to seventy-five informal conferences are held during one school year.

**Major purpose of evaluation** - Superintendent expects the principals to establish an appreciation for the total philosophy of the total school system as a result of the evaluation process. The process also allows the superintendent to structure his ideals and priorities on the principals.

**Written evaluation instrument** - The final stage of the evaluation conference becomes the benchmark and guideline for communication each year. Superintendent would not rank the instrument as the most important component.

**Performance objectives** - Objectives are established by the principals and approved by the superintendent. The number is unlimited, although they usually write between five and ten. The main reason for objectives are primarily a reminder. District operates on a home-made management by objectives system.

**Performance expectations** - A job description exists in the policy manual and the superintendent refers to the principal's
responsibilities in the final evaluation conference. Because the staff has a policy manual the superintendent believes everyone including the principal is aware of their job expectations.

Analysis of Superintendent M - The major evaluation tool is a rating scale, which may change at the superintendent's discretion, to determine the principal's performance throughout the school year. In order to monitor the evaluation process and collect data the superintendent visits the school buildings four to five times per week. During this observation period, if the superintendent is exposed to a questionable practice, he has an immediate conference with the principal to discuss and hopefully rectify the situation. At the bi-monthly administration meetings, the superintendent and principals establish procedures and discuss the philosophy of the district. Observations of the principal's behavior is condensed into the rating scale and sent to the principal prior to the major four hour final evaluation conference. Sometimes the superintendent requests the principal to complete a self-evaluation prior to their conference. The Board of Education policy clearly states the evaluation of principals as one of the superintendent's responsibilities. From the description of the evaluation process it appears that the major aspect of the process is focused on the superintendent's visitations and the informal conferences which support the final evaluation con-
ference. This process, as established by the superintendent, seems to limit the principal to a rigid schedule, an overwhelming number of superintendent building visitations plus the constant knowledge of the superintendent's presence which may diminish the leadership role of the principal.

An annual written summary, as expressed in the rating scale and the superintendent's subjective comments, is scheduled as the major item for communication at the final conference. The superintendent expressed an average number of informal conferences per year was about fifty to seventy-five. If the evaluation process is completed as described by the superintendent there would appear to be some severe problems within the buildings. Even the lowest average number of conferences (50) projects an informal conference every week for each principal.

As an outgrowth of the final conference and a review of the rating scale, performance objectives are established for the coming school year. On an average five to ten objectives are established regarding personal achievements, building improvements or staff modifications. The initial format is written and the achievements are discussed with the superintendent. There is no reference to any management by objectives model.

In setting priorities, the superintendent expressed (1) the faculty has total understanding regarding district operations, (2) the principal be well acquainted with the
needs of the students and (3) successful planning to improve student achievement at a reduced cost. A job description which is part of the policy helps spell out the performance responsibilities of principals and describes the role identification. It appears that the principals operate under a dual role function as described by Dale Johnson and Donald Weiss.

According to their view, the principal's role is both that of school leader and follower of the district organization. All of his activities and interactions both upward and downward will determine his effectiveness.58

In summary, the evaluation process seems to take place in a very sterile atmosphere. The superintendent is very involved in a monitoring process as evidenced by his four or five visitations per week and the fifty informal conferences. Although there is a written instrument, the major thrust is on the informal conferences and a final evaluation which lasts for four hours.

The superintendent revealed that his philosophy and ideals were high priority items to the principals. Based on the low building enrollment the superintendent expects the principals to know the individual needs of his students

and work very closely with his staff. The end result may foster a teaching-principal role whose official administrator becomes the district superintendent.

Superintendent N

Existence of formal evaluation - A rating format and performance objectives structured the evaluation process along with a self-assessment instrument. Major conferences are scheduled in November and March to review progress, establish objectives and communicate responsibilities. There is no Board of Education policy regarding evaluation of principals.

Evaluation process is continuous - A formal evaluation is completed annually, however, informal conferences take place almost daily. The self-assessment format is completed prior to the final evaluation. A minimum of three formal conferences are held each year and several other informal meetings also take place during the school term.

Major purpose of evaluation - An end result of the evaluation process is to improve the instructional program. Salary and job classification are two purposes which will receive strong consideration in the future.

Written evaluation instrument - The superintendent describes the instrument as the major factor in the evaluation process. He also indicated that they are just in the early stages of developing an effective tool.

Performance objectives - Objectives are included in the
self-assessment form. Because of the early stages of developing the format the ultimate use of the results were undecided. The format is structured after the George Redfern model.

**Performance expectations** - The job description is utilized in the evaluation process as a communication avenue for responsibilities. Since the district is involved in the evaluation process as a group and several inservice programs have been scheduled as a result, the principals are aware of their responsibilities.

**Analysis of Superintendent N** - The "Redfern approach" is the basis for the evaluation program although it is in the infancy stage of development. During this first year of operation the superintendent met with principals to review the appraisal plan, set up individual conferences to discuss performance objectives and scheduled meetings to update the progress toward achievement of the objectives. Unlike the Redfern approach this evaluation program has a rating scale which covers performance areas with a numerical value. A self-appraisal form completed by the principal is scheduled for review at the final conference in May of the school term. This self-appraisal format is described as the most important element in the evaluation process. The priorities are established by the administrative team which is comprised of the superintendent, assistant superintendent, curriculum director and the building principal. There appears
to be a decided effort to change from a complete lack of an evaluation system to a formal program with a direction toward accountability.

Some modifications in the evaluation process may be necessary if the district intends to copy the George Redfern model and subscribe to his philosophy. Dr. Redfern places very little value on a rating or checklist system.

The traditional emphasis in evaluation is one of post-performance rating based upon predetermined standards. Great stress is placed upon the use of rating scales and checklists. Raters are presumed to be able to judge administrative behavior and leadership actions in all their facets. Judgments allegedly are made valid by multiplying supervisory sampling and/or by using more than one rater. I find this an oversimplified approach to evaluation. I doubt its validity. I am dubious about its usefulness and I am apprehensive about its consequences.59

The evaluation process is concluded with a written evaluation instrument after several informal and a minimum of three formal conferences have taken place between the superintendent and the principal. Consideration to expanding the formal conferences may be a decision the superintendent will enforce once the program is solidified. Performance objectives or job targets depend upon several conferences especially during the initial years.

Although the major purpose is to improve the instructional program, improve the supervisory process and determine the principal's job status, the superintendent

59 Redfern, op. cit., p. 89.
does not feel the evaluation process is tailored to meet the
district's objectives. Since the superintendent is just
beginning to shape the process, the evaluation program needs
time to take hold and bear its fruits.

The priorities are (1) effective communication with
staff and students, (2) effective administration of the
building program and (3) effective administration of the
building schedule which dovetails with the major purpose of
the evaluation process is apparently structured to stress
accountability of all personnel, especially principals. A
job description is used to communicate the superintendent's
expectations and it affects the district's priorities and
job targets. The job description serves as the minimum
level of competency and requires a successful level of com-
pletion by the principals.

In summary, the district is in the early stages of
developing its own evaluation system. Included in the ini-
tial attempt is the principal evaluation process which is a
formal program for the first time. Although the superinten-
dent is using a rating scale, self-assessment and perform-
ance objectives, the only clear indication of any progress
or immediate use was the rating scale. There is obviously
an attempt to implement the process on a continuous basis
since the overall plan indicates fall and spring conferences
with several informal meetings as needed.

At this point the evaluation process seems to be
struggling without a clear direction. The superintendent indicated the use of Dr. George Redfern's approach, however, this would eliminate the rating system entirely. In time the superintendent believes the district will have the evaluation process working at an effective level.

Superintendent

Existence of formal evaluation - The total process involves a review of the job description, two lengthy conferences in the fall and spring and finally a written evaluation which is entirely narrative. The superintendent feels the daily communication is the most important element in the evaluation process. The Board of Education policy states that all employees shall be evaluated.

Evaluation process is continuous - A written narrative follows each formal conference in the fall and spring. The principals do not complete a self-assessment prior to these major conferences. An estimated number of conferences held during the school year totals six.

Major purpose of evaluation - The superintendent feels "that working to achieve the goals of the district" is the major purpose of the evaluation program while improving the relationship between administrators can also be a factor.

Written evaluation instrument - The communication between the superintendent and principals is the focal point of the entire program. According to the superintendent the written instrument only conveys the final aspects of the conferences
and serves as a record.

**Performance objectives** - Objectives are not included in the evaluation program.

**Performance expectations** - Priorities for the principals are (1) relate well with people, (2) commitment to follow up on projects and (3) understand the expectations of the job. The job description is used in the evaluation program, as it serves as the outline for the narrative. Because the job description is highlighted exclusively in the process the superintendent feels all principals are totally aware of their performance expectations.

**Analysis of Superintendent 0** - Two lengthy conferences which cover the principal's job description responsibilities and other performance areas are highlighted in the evaluation process in the fall and spring of the school year. Prior to the narrative written evaluation the superintendent and principals exchange comments, questions and concerns regarding the principal's performance and accomplishments during the past. The formal document then is placed in the principal's personnel file. Since there are no rating scales, self-assessment or performance objectives the entire evaluation process is dependent upon an extensive communication process which is the most important element of the program. A Board of Education policy which indicates that the superintendent must evaluate all employees was a priority when the superintendent came to this district.
The process appears too simple to be effective, yet Harold Armstrong indicates the necessary tools for performance evaluation are basic pencil and paper.

The basic procedures of performance evaluation are disarmingly simple. Indeed, the simplicity of basic steps and tools may be a handicap. At first glance, they do not seem to be complicated enough to be impressive.

The evaluative instrument, for example, can even be a plain sheet of paper. This represents a shocking departure for many educators who have been accustomed to complicated multi-question, multi-response rating lists. Too often teachers and administrators seem to have implicit faith that the right kind of evaluation instrument will result in good evaluation. This is not the case in performance evaluation.60

Several informal conferences take place during the school year besides the two major formal interviews. Since the purpose of the evaluation process is to have the principals work to implement the goals of the district the communication process appears to become paramount in the day-to-day operations of the district.

The job description is very important to the evaluation process since it establishes the priorities and expectations of the superintendent. It is the only written guideline for principals to relate or compare their performance and responsibility areas. Other priorities which the superintendent indicated were (1) relationships with all people, (2) commitment to follow up on projects and (3) understand the relationships the principals have to

60Armstrong, op. cit., p. 53.
central office. The job description and the priorities again indicate the premium placed on the communication process and its importance to a successful administrator in the district.

In summary, the superintendent has a clear direction of the entire evaluation process. He believes in the direct approach and involves the principals in decision making such as setting time-lines and reviewing the elements of the job description. The evaluation process suggests that the superintendent believes in a very simple format of communicating expectations.

Although there is no specific instrument the review of the job description, two major conferences, two written evaluations and several informal conferences highlight a very extensive evaluation process. The key elements are still the basic communication of the priorities of the principal's job and how the superintendent wants these implemented. Superintendent P

Existence of formal evaluation - The administrative compensation program is tied directly to the principal's evaluation process and the final program. The principal completes a self-assessment prior to the major conference in June with the superintendent and assistant superintendent. The format for the self-assessment is taken from the job description which is approved as Board of Education policy. In addition to the self-assessment process, goals are developed by the principal and they relate directly to the
Evaluation process is continuous - Formal evaluation is held at the conclusion of the school year. A self-assessment is a major component of the evaluation process. At least six to ten conferences are held each school year.

Major purpose of evaluation - "Helping principals do a better job" is the major reason for the evaluation program. Other purposes are helping principals establish priorities consistent with district philosophy and coordination of activities.

Written evaluation instrument - The self-assessment instrument which is completed by both the principals and superintendent serves as the formation of the paperwork and is considered the major part of the entire process.

Performance objectives - The district refers to their objectives as goals and the format is very specific with (1) target group, (2) performance, (3) time frame, (4) measurement and (5) success criteria, as the elements. The results of the goals are directly associated with the compensation program. The goal format is a home-made model.

Performance expectations - Instructional leadership is the number one priority for a successful principal. A job description is used extensively in the self-assessment format. Because the evaluation program is structured with job descriptions, self-assessment and goals the superintendent believes the principals are aware of their responsibilities.
Analysis of Superintendent P - A self-assessment instrument and a goal developmental format are the means to the administrative compensation program developed by the district. According to the superintendent, it is the only stated administrative compensation program in the area and is presently being used as a model for several other districts. Although the salary increments are directly associated with the successful completion of the goals and the self-assessment instrument, compensation is the least important element in the process. The emphasis is on teamwork and communication. The Board of Education policy clearly spells out the administrative compensation program and the responsibility of the superintendent to evaluate administrative personnel.

There appears to be a distinct difference in this evaluation process with administrative compensation as compared to other evaluation programs without any salary determination. The first distinction seems to be the specific detail and direction an administrative compensation program would necessitate primarily because of the predetermined levels of success and the increments directly related to these achievements. The second distinction is related to self-motivation and its effect on performance. Compensation plans should encourage better performance if the principals are aware of the criteria for success and the assessment process is fair and just. It is rare for an educational system to have a stated compensation program as evidenced
by the consideration for a model program and the results from the Educational Research Service in 1971.

From the responses on the Educational Research Service questionnaire form, it is evident that in educational circles administrative evaluations are seldom used to make salary determinations. In responding to the question, "For what purposes do you evaluate administrative and supervisory personnel?" only 12 of the 84 systems indicated that evaluations are used to determine regular or merit increments in salary.61

Several conferences are held on an informal basis throughout the school year. One formal conference is the culminating point of the entire process which follows the completion of the self-assessment instrument by the superintendent, assistant superintendent and the principal. The evaluation process is expected to help principals do a better job, help principals establish priorities consistent with the district philosophy and coordinate the activities of the district. The stated purposes and process appear to be structured in a manner which will attain the goals of the evaluation program.

Performance objectives are specifically structured to include all related individuals and functions as well as the success criteria. The specifics and details appear to be justified as an end to the compensation program.

In summary, the evaluation process is highly structured and formalized into a two part component (1) self-assessment and (2) goals developed by principals. The direct relationship

to compensation is unique and rare for any district to equate performance to salary. This process lends itself to a great deal of communication and the self-assessment instrument is keyed into mandatory timetables.

Generally, a formalized program like this one described in this district seems to concentrate more on system objectives rather than the results, however, the superintendent clearly indicated the emphasis on process as opposed to merely product. Since compensation is a major factor the degree of difficulty of the principal's goals remains an unknown factor when analyzing the merits of the evaluation program.

Superintendent Q

Existence of formal evaluation - The teaching staff and the superintendent complete an evaluation instrument on each principal and copies of the forms are placed in the principal's personnel folder. A conference is scheduled at the conclusion of the superintendent's completion of the evaluation instrument. The superintendent feels the evaluation instrument is derived from the job description and is stated in behavioral terms. The basic monitoring process is primarily accomplished at the weekly Tuesday administration meetings and several informal conferences. A Board of Education policy specifically outlines this process which was adopted one year ago.

Evaluation process is continuous - Formal evaluation is
completed annually. The principals do not complete a self-assessment prior to their evaluation conference. A minimum of ten conferences are scheduled during the school year.

**Major purpose of evaluation** - Improvement of instruction is the major purpose of the process. It also provides an opportunity to communicate positive comments to each principal.

**Written evaluation instrument** - The superintendent feels the instrument has a relatively minor part in the entire evaluation process. The major value is the extension of the job description which provides the principals with clear performance responsibilities.

**Performance objectives** - This aspect is completed on an informal basis, primarily by superintendent memo. They appear as superintendent directives rather than performance objectives.

**Performance expectations** - The instrument is basically formulated from the job description with specific emphasis on detailing responsibility. Since the evaluation instrument was just completed by a committee and is in its first year of implementation, the principals are certainly aware of their responsibilities.

**Analysis of Superintendent Q** - The evaluation process is highlighted by informal weekly administrative meetings whereby the superintendent observes and analyzes the styles and behaviors of the principals. Primarily because of the size of the school district, the communication interchange is a
helpful tool to determine the principals effectiveness. At the conclusion of the evaluation process the teaching staff and the superintendent complete an evaluation instrument on each principal. All the information gathered is placed in the principal's personnel file after a discussion and reaction to the ratings and comments. The most important part of the evaluation process as described by the superintendent is the self-introspection of accomplishments by the principals. The evaluation process appears to be structured in an informal manner to meet the superintendent's priorities. Throughout the interview the emphasis on "sitting down and talking to the principal," other informal conferences and the weekly administrative meetings all support this administrative style and pattern.

Teacher ratings of principals seems to be a rare technique for our area. Not only are the teaching staff given an opportunity to evaluate the principals, their findings are placed in the principal's personnel file. This technique does not coincide with the superintendent's informal evaluation process, however, some school districts use this form of monitoring program as part of the evaluation process.

San Bernadino (California) City Unified District collects evaluative data through a combination of techniques, including supervisor observations; opinionnaires distributed to students, parents and teachers; and self-evaluation. The staff survey form which evaluates principal assistance to teachers emphasizes the supportive function of the principal.62

---

In Kalamazoo (Michigan) Public Schools, half of the principal's evaluation score is derived from self-evaluations and questionnaires completed by teachers, resource specialists, other building administrators and district administrators.\textsuperscript{63}

One formal conference is scheduled at the conclusion of the evaluation process to review the findings of the written instruments. Several informal conferences take place between the principal and superintendent to insure that nothing will come as a surprise to the principal when he receives the final ratings.

Priorities described by the superintendent as the ability to get along with people, hard working and good public relations sense continue to support an informal communicative process. The formal structure of the principal's role and expectations are maintained through the use of the job description.

In summary, the superintendent relies almost exclusively on informal contacts to convey his expectations of his principals, although there is a written evaluation instrument. This is the only district which involves teachers in the evaluation process to the extent that the results are placed in the principal's personnel folder. The teachers' participation is also described in the Board of Education policy statement. Although policy statements may be

changed, it is questionable to understand why the teachers would share this authoritative position with the superintendent over the principal. Popularity contests may be a result of this process.

There seems to be a great deal of emphasis on informal evaluation as the primary source of communicating priorities even though the formal evaluation exists. Teacher participation, although unique, could alter the principal's management style and enforcement of policy and rules. Hopefully, teacher input will strengthen the communication and ultimately the evaluation process.

Superintendent R

Existence of formal evaluation - A combination of a rating scale and goal setting format is the primary tool for the evaluation process. Depending upon the competence of the principal, either the rating scale or goal setting format is the most important element. During the year, the superintendent reviews the goals informally, as needed, to discuss progress. An evaluation conference is scheduled at the conclusion of the school year at which time the goals for the following year are established. A Board of Education policy concerning evaluation is written for all personnel.

Evaluation process is continuous - An annual evaluation is completed by the superintendent which is followed up by a conference. Self-assessment is recommended although it is
not mandatory. The superintendent estimates a minimum of fifteen to twenty informal conferences plus two formal meetings which are scheduled at the conclusion of the rating scale and goal setting format.

**Major purpose of evaluation** - Improving principal performance is the primary reason for evaluation. Salary, termination and promotion are other factors for the process.

**Written evaluation instrument** - Although the instrument is the culminating part of the evaluation process it plays a minor role when compared to the other areas.

**Performance objectives** - Goals are established by the principals and are used primarily for professional growth. The ratio of rating scale to goals is approximately 90% to 10%. The process becomes continuous since new goals are developed after the evaluation of the current school year. The model used for the goals was developed in-district.

**Performance expectations** - A job description was used to develop the evaluation instrument which communicates the superintendent's expectations. The superintendent places a high priority on people management skills and communicates this to the principals.

**Analysis of Superintendent R** - The rating scale is the primary source of evaluation of principals during the school term while the goal setting process enables the superintendent and the principal to plan together for improvement in professional growth areas. As the superintendent monitors
the evaluation process, by monthly visitations to the buildings, the priorities which are communicated in the rating scale are discussed and reiterated throughout the year. The superintendent differentiates between the rating scale and the goal setting process when the performance of the principal is considered. If the principal has received a good to excellent grade the rating scale becomes less important and his major concentration is focused on the goal setting process. On the other hand if the performance of the principal is average or questionable the major thrust for the year becomes the basic priorities on the rating scale. It appears that the superintendent has established an evaluation process which may be individualized depending upon the competence of the principal. Such a flexible program is desirable under given conditions when the basic priorities must be mastered first before the principal can afford to concentrate on the goal setting process.

One formal evaluation is scheduled to discuss the rating scale and the completion of the goals in the spring of the year. At the conclusion of this conference, new performance areas are discussed for possible use in the coming year. The amount of emphasis on the goal setting process should be apparent to the principals and its relationship to the performance ratings on the written instrument.

The priorities established by the superintendent are (1) ability to select and evaluate staff, (2) ability to
work with teachers and (3) public relations. The expectations of the superintendent and the district are communicated by the evaluation procedures. As the superintendent has described, the direction and emphasis clearly states the current performance of the principal and the succeeding program is structured to alleviate or correct any deficiencies.

In summary, the evaluation format combines a rating scale along with goals which are developed by the principals. The superintendent concentrates on the rating program primarily because it contains the basic elements for success. The goals are basically to challenge or induce professional growth with little impact on the total performance rating the principals receive. It is unique to observe the superintendent involvement in the evaluation process to the degree where he initiates, monitors, alters and evaluates a large number of principals.

The superintendent indicates a willingness to coordinate the evaluation program to a compensation plan to insure more motivation and accountability. Rating scales and goals, without direct relationship to rewards, do not seem to generate the performance expected by the superintendent. Difficulties in describing the priority areas and weighting their relationship to salary would seem to present some problems in the transfer period.

Superintendent S

Existence of formal evaluation - The superintendent and prin-
principals work together to set and evaluate objectives. Establishing objectives takes place in the fall and the evaluation process culminates in the spring. The principals conduct a self-evaluation prior to the spring conference to assess the progress of the objective. The principal evaluation process is developed from the teacher's program. Although a Board of Education policy exists on teacher evaluation the administration and Board are currently working on an administration evaluation policy.

Evaluation process is continuous - The principals are evaluated annually, however, several conferences are scheduled during the school year. An estimated eight to ten conferences are held between the establishing of objectives and the spring evaluation conference.

Major purpose of evaluation - "To get the very best performance of principals that he is capable of giving" is the major purpose of evaluation. Other purposes relate to the instructional process.

Written evaluation instrument - The instrument structures the evaluation process as well as facilitates the communication relating to the objectives. The superintendent feels it is the major factor in the entire process.

Performance objectives - Objectives are developed in accordance with established criteria. Timetables are not essential in the structure although all objectives are completed in the spring. The format is a home-made management by objectives model.
Performance expectations - Although there is a job description, it is not used in the evaluation process. A list of criteria, also used in setting objectives, are used to set a frame of reference for the job description. The superintendent feels the principals are constantly reminded of their expectations by superintendent conference and the individual community members.

Analysis of Superintendent S - The setting, monitoring and evaluation of performance objectives is the entire evaluation process which is preferred by the superintendent. Principals are expected to be self-motivated and professionally competent to perform the responsibilities and demands of the leadership role. A self-evaluation must be completed prior to the evaluation conference. The absence of policy language regarding the evaluation of principals may be an oversight or the Board of Education expects the chief administrator to fulfill this responsibility without a written directive. At the point of the interview the Board of Education was presently working on a specific policy. There appears to be a very narrow approach to the evaluation of principals as evidenced by the one dimensional program.

There is a probable danger in working exclusively with performance objectives or a management by objectives plan. Researchers have expressed concerns regarding the pitfalls and problems with management by objective programs.
Management by objectives has been criticized because of the possible tendency to (1) emphasize those goals that are easiest to accomplish or to appraise rather than those most important to the educational process and (2) ignore other areas not covered under the management by objective contract. In order to counteract these tendencies, school systems using management by objectives usually evaluate overall performance as well as progress in reaching objectives. The administrator might also be evaluated in terms of his ability to formulate realistic and significant goals, the effectiveness with which resources are utilized in the accomplishment of goals and the administrator's analysis of the relationship between means, intervening variables and ends.64 65

The superintendent may choose to include these options in his management by objective plan or he may prioritize the areas which principals may select for their performance objectives.

One formal evaluation conference is scheduled in the spring including several other informal conferences which are necessitated by the performance objectives. Two main incentives, recognition and the satisfaction of solving problems, were mentioned by the superintendent as substitutes for additional compensation.

The priorities for the principals are (1) positive working relationships with students, parents and teachers, (2) find better ways to educate children and (3) maintain


a balance between skills and creativity. The absence of any rating scale places greater emphasis on the performance objectives and their results. This program is a planned effort to reduce subjective ratings and eliminate the emphasis on administrative style.

In summary, the entire process is focused on performance objectives and the appraisal system. Although the evaluation process is structured, it seems very difficult to pinpoint skills or determine a weakness in principal effectiveness. The key to the process is the effectiveness of the superintendent when he negotiates the objectives with the principals. It is difficult to determine what pressures are brought to bear on the principals to fulfill minimum requirements.

The superintendent seems sold on the process for developing effective principals, however, it lacks a direct method for citing and remediating principal skills. The process is tailored to suit its purpose, but there may be other reasons which the process must also serve.

**Superintendent T**

**Existence of formal evaluation** - The superintendent and principals mutually agree on performance objectives early in the school year and evaluate the progress at the conclusion of the term. This process is communicated in narrative form which is absent from any model or structured format. A general Board of Education policy regarding
evaluation of all personnel exists in the district.

**Evaluation process is continuous** - All principals are evaluated annually. A self-assessment is completed by the principals in a letter format evaluating the progress of their objectives. Six conferences regarding the evaluation process are held yearly.

**Major purpose of evaluation** - Improvement of the education program in each building is the main reason for the evaluation process. Other purposes are establishing record keeping for personnel files and a communication vehicle for the superintendent and principals.

**Written evaluation instrument** - The district does not have a written evaluation instrument.

**Performance objectives** - A letter substitutes for the format of performance objectives. Although no set number of objectives exists, usually four objectives are average. The district does not use a management by objectives model.

**Performance expectations** - A job description may be used to establish performance objectives, however, the responsibilities are listed in broad terms. The superintendent feels all principals are aware of their job expectations.

**Analysis of Superintendent T** - Performance objectives dominate the evaluation process as evidenced by the absence of any other evaluative instruments or written formats. The superintendent structures the evaluation process by a series of letters which communicate changes, up-
dates or other informational notes. There is little structure beyond these letters although the final evaluation conference is condensed in narrative form. Accurate and continuous communication is the key to the program as described by the superintendent. The evaluation process appears to be functional, although the structure is very informal.

The evaluation process seems to elicit a team approach whereby all administrators are working together toward district goals. In a similar situation a school district in New Jersey reviewed over twenty-six different methods of evaluation including subjective essays, charts, critical incident, field review, ranking, work standards and a variety of checklist methods.

A self-evaluation system which concludes with a conference with the superintendent is still in effect, but will soon be supplemented by a management by objectives program. The administrative team opted for management by objective because measurement of growth is based on accomplishing specific goals and not on personality characteristics.66

The superintendent cites evaluation as the cornerstone upon which he has built an administrative team.

An annual evaluation is supported by a letter regarding the status and evaluation of the performance objectives and several informal conferences throughout the school year. The priorities for the principals are (1) ability to assist

teachers, (2) ability to communicate effectively and (3) sound financial management. According to the informal evaluation conferences, evaluation letter and the priorities, they all emphasize a loosely structured evaluation process.

In summary, the evaluation process is very informal as evidenced by a lack of a written instrument and the absence of any structure in the performance objectives. The superintendent feels he has the latitude to tailor any evaluation to suit the individual needs of a principal, however, there seems to be too much dependence on intangibles rather than objective measurements or responsibilities.

There is a question whether the evaluation process can be totally productive since it lacks the written format which forces principals to come to grips with their performance. It seems as though the process will counsel personnel out rather than directly apply pressure through a rating system. If all the principals are competent, professional growth rewards can be enormous.

**Summary of Superintendent Interviews**

In an effort to illustrate the percentage rating of each superintendent interview, a chart is designed to summarize the score for each hypothesis. The criteria for the percentage rating was based on the following:

(1) 5% - Information derived from the superintendent expressed views indicated complete support of the appropriate hypothesis
(2) 3% - Information derived from the superintendent expressed views indicated partial support of the appropriate hypothesis.

(3) 0% - Information derived from the superintendent expressed views indicated no support of the appropriate hypothesis.

**TABLE II**

**SUMMARY OF THE ANALYSIS OF THE RESPONSES BY SUPERINTENDENT INDICATING A PERCENTAGE RATING OF EACH SUPERINTENDENT INTERVIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td><strong>346</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Superintendent Interviews

In an attempt to interpret the professional positions and attitudes of the superintendent, an analysis was made according to similarities and differences, strengths and weaknesses, advantages and disadvantages, negative and positive effects and summary comments.

**Similarities and Differences** - Most of the evaluation proc-
esses are very similar to one another and followed a distinct
d format with (1) an established criteria, (2) a monitoring
system, (3) a written evaluation format and (4) a conference
to discuss the contents. With rare exception, the standard
answer to the major purpose was to help improve the prin-
cipals. Eighty-one (81) percent of the superintendents
interviewed stated that they clearly communicated the ex-
pectations of the district to the principals.

Since the evaluation process is very similar, the
only differences which were mentioned focused on the end
result of the evaluation process and its relationship to
the principal's salary. One district had an elaborate plan
while another district was seriously considering adopting
a plan. Only one district mentioned different evaluating
plans for their principals based on the district's indi-

dividualized instruction philosophy. Only one superintendent
strongly suggested that he dictated the entire evaluation
process.

The other fifteen superintendents clearly stated that
the development of the evaluation process was mutually agreed
upon between the principals and the superintendent.

Strengths and Weaknesses - All existing formal programs in-
dicated a prior conference or discussion regarding the evalu-
ation process before implementation. The superintendents
concentrated on being "up front" with the criteria. A large
percentage (83%) put comments or concerns in writing and
verbalized only informal or unimportant areas. The majority of districts with formal programs had a Board of Education policy. Superintendents indicated a willingness to change or modify their evaluation programs if the principals indicated a concern, provided they justified the change.

The weakness seems to be an absence of purpose other than the common "professional improvement" aspect. Since only one district confirms a stated compensation plan for principals based on performance, the other districts appear to implement the evaluation process without regard to any salary determination at their conclusion. Without a direct effect on performance the superintendent and the Board of Education may have a paper tiger.

Advantages and Disadvantages - It is critical to emphasize the ongoing process of the evaluation program and 82% of the superintendents made a direct comment regarding its importance. Continuous programs make principals' evaluations an every day process. Based on the superintendent's expressed views, there appears to be two major benefits of ongoing evaluation programs which are (1) direct feedback and (2) immediate clarification.

Every formal evaluation program has a definite beginning and end with prescribed criteria known by the superintendent and the principals.

The disadvantages of the evaluation program all stem from a lack of written or oral communication regarding the
process. Evaluation programs which are informal indicate a desire to keep the process as low keyed or less important as compared to a formal program.

Positive and Negative Effects - Evaluation can be a positive reward for the principals who are excelling at their job, however, the vast majority still feel as though its major purpose is to identify weak or poor performance areas. The entire study reflects a positive approach to the evaluation process. The superintendents, without exception, indicated a desire to help and foster professional growth in their principals.

As a matter of security, a formal evaluation program can assure the principal of a permanent personnel record which may also be utilized in applications for new positions. Under the present election set-up the majority of a Board of Education may change in two years. A written evaluation record provides the principal with safeguards which would be non-existent under an informal program.

The superintendents indicated there are very little negative effects of evaluation, with the exception of a poor or unacceptable rating, since (1) superintendents express a positive attitude toward helping principals, (2) the burden of monitoring a formal evaluation program is solely the responsibility of the superintendent and (3) the superintendent is faced with other priorities such as finance, enrollment and teacher organizations which diminish
the importance of the evaluation process from the standpoint of time.

Summary Comments - The results clearly support (1) existence of a format evaluation program, (2) the evaluation process is continuous and (3) the evaluation process is dependent upon performance expectations. Other questions such as the major purpose, the written evaluation instrument and performance objectives need further interpretation.

Through the interviews almost all superintendents revealed the "ideal purpose" for the evaluation of principals. Very few superintendents expressed a concern for rating or judging the principals in accordance with prescribed standards. This process, although not formal, seems to take place regardless of the format. The superintendent must complete this judgment process. The majority of superintendents, however, did not indicate it is the major purpose.

The written evaluation instrument only received 30% support as the major component of the total evaluation process. Many superintendents are exploring other aspects of evaluation which focus on either performance objectives or informal communication. Since the superintendent's role appears to be less dominant and direct in the evaluation process containing performance objectives or informal communication, input from the principals, procedures for disagreement, teacher contracts, and Board of Education policy may restrict their supervisory role.
While the ongoing communication, the self-assessment and the follow-up recommendations can be equally important, the written evaluation instrument should highlight the process. Some expressed the entire process was important to achieve the district goals and certain parts would only reflect a partial component.

Fifty-two (52) percent of the districts interviewed indicated the incorporation of performance objectives in the evaluation process. Of the twelve (12) districts which support this area, eight (8) have incorporated performance objectives into their program completely while four (4) have made a partial reference in the evaluation program. This area generally has the support of superintendents because of the mutual responsibility of establishing objectives and evaluation and is considered an acceptable process to motivate principals to improve as compared to a rating scale. Principals in effect can shape their own destiny. The disadvantage of performance objectives is the complicated or unstructured method to eliminate incompetent principals, since the accomplishment of certain objectives can be misleading. A high completion percentage of performance objectives may be totally irrelevant to the competence of the principal. Performance objectives usually deal with limited performance areas when compared to the overall administrative skills.

In summary, formal evaluation is evident in the ma-
jority of districts included in the interviews with the evaluation process described as ongoing and continuous. Performance expectations are clearly communicated by the superintendent to the principals. Performance objectives appear in a slight majority of districts although the trend toward this method seems to be growing among the superintendents.

**Summary of Data**

The data gleaned from the analysis of the written evaluation instruments of principals, the questionnaire and the superintendent interviews are structured in the following format to support or refute the hypothesis.

**Hypothesis I** - Formal evaluation of principals exists in a majority of elementary school districts.

(1) Response of 115 school districts contacted to forward their evaluation instruments of principals

- 80 returned
- 40 principal evaluation instruments
- 50% principal evaluation instruments returned

(2) Response from 115 school districts contacted in regard to the questionnaire (question one)

- 83 responses
- 66 confirmation of principal evaluation instrument
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17 no instrument

80% confirmation of principal evaluation instruments

(3) Response from superintendent interviews regarding the existence of formal evaluation programs

20 superintendent interviews

83% confirm existence of formal evaluation program

(4) Percentages averaged on one, two and three are 71%

Hypothesis II - The evaluation of principals is an ongoing, continuous process during the school year. Conclusions drawn from:

(1) Response from questions 3d, e and f in questionnaire sent to 115 school districts

84 total responses

38 responded to conference held before evaluation period begins

46 responded to conference held during the evaluation process

57 responded to conference held after evaluation is completed

56% average response

(2) Response from questions one, six and ten in interview format (See Appendix C)
20 superintendents interviewed
83% confirm the existence of a formal evaluation program
82% confirm the evaluation process is continuous

83% average response

(3) Percentages average in one and two are 70%

Hypothesis III - The major purpose of evaluation of principals is to assess present performance in accordance with prescribed standards. Conclusions drawn from:

(1) Response from question five of questionnaire sent to 115 school districts
84 total responses
24 assess performance in accordance with prescribed standards

29% assess performance in accordance with prescribed standards

(2) Response from questions eleven, twelve and thirteen in interview format (See Appendix C)
20 superintendents interviewed
18% confirmed the major purpose is to assess present performance in accordance with prescribed standards

(3) Response of 115 school districts regarding rating of prescribed scale only
Hypothesis IV - The written evaluation instrument of principals is the major component of the total evaluation process.

Conclusions drawn from:

(1) Response from 115 school districts contacted to forward their evaluation instrument of principals

80 returned
40 principal evaluation instruments

50% principal evaluation instruments returned

(2) Response from 115 school districts contacted in regard to the questionnaire

84 questionnaires returned
23 use a prescribed scale
35 use narrative comments
24 assess performance in accordance with prescribed standards

33% confirm the use of a written evaluation instrument

(3) Response from questions fourteen, fifteen, sixteen and seventeen in interview format (See
Appendix C)

20 superintendents interviewed
30% confirmed the written evaluation instrument is the major component of total evaluation process

(4) Percentage average in one, two and three is 38%

Hypothesis V - Performance objectives are integral components of the evaluation process in a majority of elementary school districts. Conclusions drawn from:

(1) Response from 115 school districts regarding performance standards vs. performance objectives

80 returned
40 principal evaluation instruments
9 use performance objectives

23% use performance objectives

(2) Response from question one of questionnaire sent to 115 schools

83 responses
18 use performance objectives

22% use performance objectives

(3) Response from questions eighteen, nineteen, twenty, twenty-one, twenty-two and twenty-three in interview format (See Appendix C)

20 superintendents interviewed
52% confirmed performance objectives are integral components of the evaluation process
Hypothesis VI - The process of evaluation of principals is dependent upon clear performance expectations as defined by the superintendent. Conclusions drawn from:

1. Response from question four of the questionnaire sent to 115 school districts
   - 84 responses
   - 69 communicate performance expectations through conferences
   - 32 communicate performance expectations through job description
   - 34 communicate performance expectations through evaluation instrument
   - 53% communicate performance expectations

2. Response from questions twenty-four, twenty-five, twenty-six, twenty-seven and twenty-eight in interview format (See Appendix C)
   - 20 superintendents interviewed
   - 81% confirmed the process of evaluation of principals is dependent upon clear performance expectations

3. Percentage average in one and two is 67%
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The evaluation process of elementary principals is as simple or complex as the superintendent or Board of Education designs the system. Programs are formulated to highlight the priorities or goals of the district. Within any school district the evaluation process is shaped from four major components (1) the standards, (2) monitoring program, (3) evaluation instrument and (4) evaluation conference. The increasing momentum of the evaluation process of elementary school principals has produced increased tensions, pressures and fears, yet the accountability factor far outweighs any negative force.

There is little disagreement about the importance of each school system providing the best educational program that its resources will afford. Within those resources lie the potential development of every principal who is defined by title and authority as the leader of the educational unit. The trend is toward evaluation programs as a means for making crucial personnel decisions.

An analysis of the results of the evaluation instrument, the questionnaires and the superintendent interviews tends to indicate that the Board of Education and its chief administrator are aware of the potential effects of the
evaluation process as related to the quality of their educational program. In general, old, established traditions which reflected little or no formal evaluation will no longer suffice. New, formal evaluation programs for elementary principals will continue to expand and focus on critical skills needed to accomplish the district goals. If the results fall short of expectations, necessary changes in personnel could be processed with frequent regularity.

Hypothesis I

Formal evaluation of principals exists in a majority of elementary school districts.

In light of the accumulated data this hypothesis can be accepted. Fifty percent (50%) of the evaluation instruments were returned from a total of eighty districts. In the questionnaire eighty percent (80%) of the districts contacted confirmed the existence of a principal evaluation instrument. The superintendent interviews reflected an eighty-three percent (83%) confirmation of existing formal principal evaluation programs. All three areas combined reflect a percentage of seventy-one percent (71%).

Formal evaluation programs are becoming more and more prominent in the Cook County area. The design of the formal program hinges on several factors, however, the common element includes a written instrument along with a verbal or written understanding of the evaluation process. Some districts related a relatively simple structure while
others included very specific information criteria, structure, weight factors, salary increments and an appeal process. The design is unimportant if the program works for the superintendent and the Board of Education.

Within limitations, evaluation programs should reflect the unique characteristics of each school district and refrain from stereotype performance responsibilities. More of an effort should be made to individualize evaluation programs for principals which would compensate for weaknesses in separate school programs. This thought, obviously, would be especially difficult since the trend is directed toward standardization of resources, expenditures and programs and equal educational opportunity awareness. Programs could be more effective if they were designed with the unique differences that obviously appear in all personnel including principals.

Hypothesis II

The evaluation of principals is an ongoing, continuous process during the school year.

In light of the accumulated data, this hypothesis can be accepted. As a result of the questionnaire fifty-six percent (56%) of the superintendents responded affirmatively to an ongoing continuous evaluation process. The interview format reflected a total of eighty-three percent (83%) of the superintendents indicated that their evaluation process was continuous in nature. The combined percentages
of the questionnaire and the interview were seventy percent (70%).

Almost every evaluation process if it is effective must be continuous. Superintendents revealed a variety of methods to keep in touch with their principals, however, the acceptable manner seems to be an informal conference every one or two months. It is difficult to imagine an evaluation process which begins in the fall and concludes in the spring without several contacts between the superintendent and principal. Whatever the motivation for such conferences they become invaluable for a monitoring process for the evaluation system.

Principals and superintendents are aware of the advantages of such monitoring programs, however, the superintendent bears the responsibility of initiating and implementing the evaluation contacts. If the superintendent fails to maintain a reasonable schedule the principal has every right to believe that all school operations are functioning according to the superintendent's standards.

Although it was not mentioned some monitoring systems can be paper orientated through progress reports or verbal communication via the telephone. Some of these areas are necessary, however, they cannot and should not be the important elements in the ongoing, continuous evaluation program.
Hypothesis III

The major purpose of evaluation of principals is to assess present performance in accordance with prescribed standards.

In light of the accumulated data, this hypothesis cannot be accepted. The response from question five indicated only twenty-nine percent (29%) rated performance in accordance with prescribed standards. During the superintendent interviews, eighteen percent (18%) of the superintendents stated their major purpose of evaluation as rating according to prescribed standards. Of the forty (40) instruments returned, eighteen (18) or forty-five percent (45%) had a prescribed scale as the format. All of the percentages combined revealed a percentage of thirty-one percent (31%).

The trend for the superintendent is to structure an evaluation program which will foster professional growth. Rating scales although prominently used in past years and today there is a hesitation to judge employees in accordance with a prescribed scale. Most principals feel the act of rating is demeaning to a professional who should be seeking to improve his skills through self-motivation and encouragement from his superior.

Rating scales tend to emphasize more negative elements and the superintendent is faced with the dilemma of completing a fair and honest evaluation as opposed to de-
stroying the confidence and motivation of the principal. Most superintendents would rather work with positive aspects of evaluation or programs which are basically designed to encourage success. Performance objectives generally are more acceptable to the principal and superintendent since they are positively orientated.

Other aspects, which discourage rating scales and their use in performance judgments is the difficulty in supporting various ratings and the increasing demands on the superintendent to gather enough information. Rating scales also tend to take a narrow view of one's performance as seen only by the evaluator. Our democratic ideals support other avenues of input.

**Hypothesis IV**

The written evaluation instrument of principals is the major component of the total evaluation process.

In light of the accumulated data, this hypothesis cannot be accepted. Fifty percent (50%) of the districts forwarded their evaluation instrument. In the questionnaire, superintendents indicated only thirty-three percent (33%) use some type of evaluation instrument. The interview format, revealed thirty percent (30%) of the superintendents confirmed the written evaluation instrument as the major component of the total evaluation process. The combined percentages average thirty-eight percent (38%).

The superintendents confirmed that the instrument
was important, however, other aspects such as daily communication, setting the standards, the evaluation conference at the conclusion and entire process was the major component of the total evaluation process. Although the instrument indicated the district's priorities, the factors mentioned previously became just as important.

Some superintendents commented on the daily contacts or the ongoing communication and referred to the written evaluation instrument as the item which initiated their thoughts or points of interest.

It appears as though the instrument becomes the "frame of reference" which both the principal and superintendent can work from a common ground. Without it the evaluation process tends to take many different paths or directions based on the superintendent's understanding or interpretation.

One important aspect which most superintendents made reference to was the avenue to communicate important or crucial items was done or completed in an informal setting and rarely done on the written evaluation instrument. The "off the record" communication was made in the interests of both parties concerned.

**Hypothesis V**

Performance objectives are integral components of the evaluation process in a majority of elementary school districts.
In light of the accumulated data this hypothesis cannot be accepted. The instrument collected from eighty (80) districts revealed only nine (9) of forty (40) formats or twenty-three percent (23%) had performance objectives included. The questionnaire indicated a total of twenty-two percent (22%) of the superintendents revealed their instrument as performance objectives. During the superintendent interviews, fifty-two percent (52%) confirmed that performance objectives are integral components of the evaluation process. The combined percentage for all three areas was thirty-two percent (32%).

Performance objectives seem to be on the rise in most school districts although the percentages failed to support this hypothesis. There were a number of districts which were either beginning their evaluation program or were into the process for a relatively short period of time, therefore, the existence of performance objectives would be more evident at a later date.

The superintendents who have performance objectives like the structure and the accountability which is dependent upon the principals to develop the objectives, select different methods and spell out the criteria for success. Much more responsibility is placed on the principals in this system and while the objectives became negotiable, it is relatively easy to reject any or all parts based on limited support or justification.
Two distinct disadvantages are prevalent with performance objectives. Rarely do principals select objectives which are difficult or prime concerns of the school district. Since the objectives are the "tools for the evaluation" it becomes imperative to select an objective which can be accomplished. Unlike the rating scale, the performance objectives become a difficult area to initiate serious discipline or areas of concern. They have a tendency to focus only on positive rewards. It would be apparent that performance objectives would have a difficult time if they were the only evaluation program used in a school system.

Hypothesis VI

The process of evaluation of principals is dependent upon clear performance expectations as defined by the superintendent.

In light of the accumulated data, this hypothesis can be accepted. The questionnaire revealed that fifty-three percent (53%) of the superintendents communicated their expectations through conferences, job description or the evaluation instrument. In the interviews, eighty-one percent (81%) of the superintendents confirmed the process of evaluation of principals is dependent upon clear performance expectations. The combined percentage was sixty-seven percent (67%).

Since the evaluation process in many school districts is an ongoing program it becomes the superintendent's
responsibility to communicate the aspects of the entire process to the principals. This communication is especially important when new principals are coming into a district or when a new school year starts.

The entire evaluation process becomes an act of communication. It encourages give and take from all parties involved but most important it defines the parameters which all administrators will be expected to adhere to in the coming school year.

Most of the superintendents select conventional methods of communicating the evaluation process, however, a vast majority indicated their preference for sitting down and having a face-to-face conversation. The superintendent's expectations are crucial to the existence of any evaluation process. Without them, only a superficial evaluation process will exist and its effectiveness is doubtful.

Recommendations

The Board of Education and the superintendent have the responsibility to implement an evaluation system which will promote and foster professional growth and accountability. The evaluation process is one avenue the superintendent can communicate significant areas of concern and suggestions which will improve the principal's skills. Principals and superintendent must work together to improve the total educational program. As a result of this study
the following recommendations are made:

(1) School districts should adopt written policies concerning the evaluation of principals.
(2) Superintendents should adopt written evaluation instruments as part of the evaluation process.
(3) Superintendents should adopt written procedures regarding the evaluation process.
(4) The evaluation process should be an ongoing, continuous program with specific conferences occurring every three months.
(5) Principals should participate in the design of the evaluation process.
(6) One of the primary functions of the evaluation process should be to determine the salary increments for principals.
(7) At the conclusion of the evaluation process, the superintendent should complete a written evaluation, schedule a conference and place the results in the principal's personnel file.

Suggestions for Further Study

The momentum of the evaluation of elementary principals in the schools, has placed increased demands upon the superintendent and Board of Education. Because educators are just now getting thoroughly involved in this process and based on the findings of this study, the following questions are offered for possible investigation:
(1) Will the evaluation process of elementary principals tend to pattern their format after those adopted in the private sector?

(2) Will the evaluation process of elementary principals weaken or strengthen the relationship that now exists between superintendent and principal?

(3) What legislation, if any, will affect the evaluation programs currently implemented?

(4) Should other individuals or groups (teachers or community) participate in the evaluation of elementary principals?

(5) What should the key element of good evaluation programs contain?

(6) What should the role of the Board of Education be in the evaluation process of elementary principals?

(7) What are the advantages and/or disadvantages to a superintendent if the district implements an informal evaluation process?

The impact of the evaluation process of elementary principals will be felt in various ways by school people. The trend is for increased pressure by the community for more accountability from all administrators. Today's public and tomorrow's public will continue to demand competent leadership from the principal position. In
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closing, the following quotation is appropriate.

The evaluation of school principals will undoubtedly bring long-term beneficial results to the profession. The studied analyses of the effects of different school administrative styles and behavior patterns could lead to new perspectives in administration. Encouragement and stimulation would be given to further research in the field of educational administration, to sounder role and relationship formulations, to improve school leadership competencies and practices, to new developments in the training and preparation of educators and to further professionalization of the principalship.67

67Rosenberg, op. cit., p. 214.
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TYPE A: Procedures that stress RATING. Administrators and supervisors are rated in accordance with established performance criteria which are organized in the form of a rating sheet. Evaluators may confer with the evaluatee prior to beginning the evaluation period; may make contacts (visitations) with him during the year; may confer with him at the close of the evaluation period; and may provide him with a copy of the ratings. Basically, however, the evaluator(s) make the assessment of his performance by rating him on a value scale that may have varying degrees of excellence. In short, the essential characteristics of this type of evaluation are: (a) pre-determined performance criteria; (b) an established rating form; (c) a value scale that provides for varying degrees of excellence; and (d) rating by the evaluator(s).

TYPE B: Procedures that emphasize the establishment of JOB TARGETS or performance objectives tailored to the needs of the evaluatee. This form of evaluation is less formalized than Type A. It is based upon the assumption that there are broad areas of responsibility which apply to all administrators and supervisors, e.g., organizational and management skill, public relations competence, professional and technical knowledge, effectiveness in decision making, etc. Each evaluatee, in consultation with his evaluator(s) determines his specific performance targets which become the goals toward which he strives during the evaluation period. The evaluator judges
the evaluatee's effectiveness in terms of how well the performance targets were achieved. Assessment may also be made of overall performance, but evaluation is focused primarily on the performance goals or targets. Self-evaluation is usually encouraged; an evaluation conference is an important part of the process. The evaluator regards his job as more of a "coach" than an "umpire." A rating scale, if used, is only a secondary factor in the evaluation process.
QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME ____________________________

DISTRICT NUMBER ________________

YEARS IN EDUCATION _______ YEARS AS SUPERINTENDENT _______

1. Which evaluation instrument of principals is used in your school system?
   ____ A. Performance Standards
   ____ B. Performance Objectives
   ____ C. Both
   ____ D. Neither

   If neither, please explain the type of evaluation you use:
   __________________________________________________________________________

2. How frequently does the evaluation of each principal occur during the school year?

   Circle One: 1 2 3 4

3. Which of the following practices are included in your evaluation process? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   ____ A. Use form which calls for rating in terms of a prescribed scale.
   ____ B. Use narrative form (providing space for evaluator's comments only.)
   ____ C. Self-evaluation is recommended.
   ____ D. Conference is held before evaluation period begins.
   ____ E. Informal evaluator-evaluatee "conferences" are held during the evaluation process.
   ____ F. Conference is held after evaluation is completed.
   ____ Other (please specify) ________________________________________________
QUESTNAIRE - Continued

4. What method is used to communicate the performance expectations of the principal?

   _____ Conference  _____ Evaluation Instrument
   _____ Job Description  _____ Other (please specify)

5. For what purpose do you evaluate principals? (In the list which follows, please check each purpose for which, in your experience, the evaluations have been actually applied in your school system - NOT the purpose for which evaluations ideally should be used.)

   _____ A. To assess evaluatee's present performance in accordance with prescribed standards.
   _____ B. To help the evaluatee establish relevant performance objectives and work systematically toward this achievement.
   _____ C. To identify areas in which improvement is needed.
   _____ D. To determine qualification for permanent status.
   _____ E. To have records of performance to determine qualifications for promotion.
   _____ F. Other, e.g., salary increments, compliance with board policy. (Please specify)

________________________________________________________________________________

Name of person completing questionnaire

Title

Please return to:

Tom P. Kostes
North Palos District 117
8425 West 95th Street
Hickory Hills, IL 60457
SUPERINTENDENT'S INTERVIEW FORMAT

Hypothesis I - Formal evaluation of principals exists in majority of elementary school districts.

Question: 1. Can you briefly describe your evaluation process?
2. What elements are the most important?
3. Are the priorities set for principals?
4. Do the principals participate in the development of the process?
5. What, if any, Board of Education policy exists regarding the evaluation process of principals?

Hypothesis II - The evaluation of principals is an ongoing, continuous process including three evaluatee and evaluator conferences during the school year.

Question: 6. How often do you evaluate the principals?
7. What specific help do you give a principal who receives a poor rating?
8. Are inservice programs provided for the principals?
9. Do the principals complete a self-assessment prior to their evaluation conference?
10. How many conferences are held during the entire evaluation process?

Hypothesis III - The major purpose of evaluation of principals is to assess present performance in accordance with prescribed standards.

Question: 11. What is the major purpose of your evaluation of principals?
12. What other purposes does it serve?
13. Is your evaluation process tailored to serve your purpose?
Hypothesis IV - The written evaluation instrument of principals is the major component of the total evaluation process.

Question: 14. Does your district have a written evaluation instrument of principals? If no, what substitute is used?

15. How does it relate to the total evaluation process?

16. How important is it to the total evaluation process?

17. What are the major components of your evaluation process? Please list them in priority order.

Hypothesis V - Performance objectives are integral components of the total evaluation process.

Question: 18. What format do you use to evaluate your principals?

19. Is there a written instrument? What type?

20. If performance objectives are used what timetable is used to insure implementation?

21. How are the performance objectives used?

22. Who selects or alters the performance objectives?

23. Is there a management by objective model?

Hypothesis VI - The process of evaluation of principals is dependent upon clear performance expectations as defined by the superintendent.

Question: 24. What priorities do you have for your principals?

25. Do you have a job description for the principals?

26. Are principals aware of their job expectations?
SUPERINTENDENT'S INTERVIEW FORMAT - Continued

27. What failures cannot be tolerated?

28. If a principal makes a mistake what process do you take to correct it?
APPENDIX D
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Palatine Community Consolidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Wheeling Community Consolidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Prospect Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Arlington Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>River Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Northbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Northbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sunset Ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Northbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>West Northfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Glenview Community Consolidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Glencoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Winnetka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Avoca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Kenilworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Wilmette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Schaumburg Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Mt. Prospect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Community Consolidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Des Plaines Community Consolidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>East Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Number</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Park Ridge Community Consolidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Evanston Community Consolidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Skokie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Skokie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Morton Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Niles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Fainview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>East Prairie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73½</td>
<td>Skokie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Lincolnwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Rosemont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Pennoyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Norridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Schiller Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Mannheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Franklin Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84½</td>
<td>Rhodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85½</td>
<td>River Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Union Ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Bellwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Maywood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Number</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>River Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Forest Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Lindop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92½</td>
<td>Westchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Hillside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Komarek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Brookfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Oak Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Berwyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Cicero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Berwyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Western Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>La Grange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Lyons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>La Grange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>La Grange Highlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Pleasantdale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**South Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Patton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Forest Ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Midlothian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143½</td>
<td>Posen-Robbins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Markham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Number</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Arbor Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Tinley Park Community Consolidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Harvey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Dolton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Dolton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>South Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>South Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Harvey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152½</td>
<td>Hazel Crest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Homewood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Thornton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154½</td>
<td>Burnham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Calumet City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Calumet City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Hoover-Schrum Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Lansing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Country Club Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Flossmoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Matteson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Park Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Brookwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Community Consolidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>East Chicago Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Number</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Chicago Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Sunnybrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Sandridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Steger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Willow Springs Consolidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Common School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Central Stickney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>South Stickney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Lemont Community Consolidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>North Palos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Palos Community Consolidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Ridgeland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Oak Lawn-Hometown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Evergreen Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Atwood Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Alsip, Hazelgreen and Oak Lawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127\frac{1}{2}</td>
<td>Chicago Ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Palos Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Blue Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Calumet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Orland Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Kirby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Southwest Area**
DEFINITION OF TERMS

Superintendent - the term used in this study applies to all men and women employed as the chief administrator of a public school district reporting directly to and being responsible to an elected Cook County Board of Education.

Principal - the term used in this study applies to all men and women employed as the building administrator of an elementary school, grades kindergarten through eight or any combination thereof.

Elementary School District - the term used in this study means a legal school district organized under law to operate grades one to eight.

Suburban Cook County School District - the term used in this study means a legal school district, recognized and under the jurisdiction of the Superintendent of Educational Service Region of Cook County and the Superintendent of the Illinois Office of Education.

Elementary Principal Evaluation Instrument - in this study the term applies to a written format designed to illustrate the conditions, ratings or objectives used in assessing the elementary principal.

Process of Evaluating Elementary School Principals - in this study the term applies to the entire evaluation program and includes all steps and procedures, both informal and formal, which directly relate to the evaluation of the principal.
DEFINITION OF TERMS - Continued

Formal Evaluation - in this study this term applies to an organized, structured program for the evaluation of the principal. It has a definite beginning and ending with specific procedures throughout the program.

Informal Evaluation - in this study this term applies to casual, loosely structured evaluation of the principal. There is no definite beginning or ending and the procedures vary according to the superintendent.