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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

... we've expected the administrator, particularly the elementary school administrator, to be all things. The high school administrator has been hedged with a framework of assistants to help him do the job. But the elementary school principal has been left on his own—even though his school may be just as big as the high school—with a whole range of chores that have to be done in order to keep the school both a going concern and an effective educational environment. The good Lord himself couldn't perform all the roles that have been expected of elementary school principals.1

Elementary principals, as educational leaders of their schools encounter a myriad of administrative responsibilities daily. When one asks, "What does a principal do?" he receives as many different answers as there are respondents. As Paul Houts stated in a 1975 article, "The principalship is just varied enough that like India, almost anything one says about it might be true."2

Keith Goldhammer emphasized the difficult role of elementary school principals but indicated that some principals were able to perform well. No one can intelligently administer a school in today's world without recognizing the difficult problem associated with the task. Some principals obviously are near the point of helplessness, other principals, however have found successful ways to meet their respon-


sibilities and thus they provide excellent leadership for their schools.1

Supervision of the instructional program is one dimension of the general practice of administration. Joseph Cobb noted that "More has been written and less is known about the interface of administration and supervision than about any other topic in the behavioral sciences."2 It is generally agreed that supervision is not an end in itself but involves developing strategies which stimulate others to perform more effectively.3 Supervision is that part of school administration which focuses on the achievement of instructional objectives.

Although there are many definitions of supervision, the following, taken from The Dictionary of Education was used in this study:

all efforts of designated school officials directed toward providing leadership to teachers and other educational workers in the improvement of instruction; involves the stimulation of professional growth and development of teachers, the selection and revision of educational objectives, materials of instruction, and methods of teaching; and the evaluation of instruction.4

Supervision co-existed with American education and evolved through a number of phases in the past three hundred years. Glen Eye and Lanore Netzer reviewed the history of supervision emphasizing the conceptual framework pervading each period.


From 1642 to 1875 supervisors were local religious leaders or layment who visited the school for the purpose of controlling standards. This period is referred to as "Administrative Inspection". The supervision provided in this period was autocratic. Supervisors were more interested in meeting the requirements of a prescribed curriculum than improvement of instruction.

The period from 1876 to 1936 is referred to as the period of "Efficiency Orientation". During this period there was a shift in the supervisory function from lay people to professional personnel. Head teachers and principals were appointed to assist with classroom visitations. New subjects were added to the curriculum and supervisors were appointed to demonstrate instruction in these new areas. Supervision during this period was still thought of as inspections with the supervisor having superior knowledge to impart.

From 1937 to 1959 the curriculum in the schools expanded rapidly, resulting in the need for supervision of instruction to be shared by principals, consultants, curriculum coordinators, and assistant superintendents of instruction. This period of "Cooperative Group Effort" was guided by democratic principles. Human relations supervision had its origin in this period.

As the federal and state governments became more involved in the support of education, more money became available for research. The period of "Research Orientation" from 1960 to approximately 1970 resulted in new positions, i.e., director of research, director of federal programs, and public relations specialist. The concept of supervision continued to be democratic leadership. Research focused on the role
perceptions of administrative and supervisory personnel. 

Reba Burnham commented in 1976 that the role and meaning of supervision needed to be reexamined:

Professional educators and recognized authors in the field of supervision are challenging us to examine new theoretical conceptualizations, new definitions of supervision, new alternatives to present practices and to exercise more dynamic leadership in the instructional improvement process.²

The role of the elementary school principal as a leader in instructional improvement is still heatedly debated.

Most of the intensity centers around the contention that principals ought to be "instructional leaders." The task of the instructional leader is the improvement of curriculum and teaching. It is also to lead faculty in making decisions about the learning that is to go on in the school. These decisions may concern everything from needed changes in curriculum to evaluation of faculty, from the writing of performance-based objectives for the school to organization of inservice programs for teachers.³

The principals in the early 19th century were able to fit all their duties into a reasonable time frame. The principal-teachers were able to handle their administrative and teaching responsibilities without being overburdened.⁴ Principals of today's large and complex schools are overwhelmed by administrative, supervisory, human relations, and discipline chores. Often the supervisory role of the elementary principal is overshadowed or neglected.

---


⁴Ibid.
Regardless of these major handicaps, however, it may be that the elementary school principal avoids performing some of the duties he claims he should be handling. For example, principals say they would like to have more time for the supervision of teachers; many principals, however, admit that they do not have the necessary skills to develop adequate supervisory programs within their buildings.¹

**Purpose of the Study**

During the 1970's, the role of the supervisor has become increasingly confused. . . . supervisory behavior . . . continues to evolve in response to a wide variety of forces which are both external and internal to the educational system.²

The confusion over the role of the elementary principal as a supervisor only served to emphasize the need to identify and analyze effective supervisory practices. This study responded to the need by identifying and analyzing supervisory techniques recommended in the literature as well as examining some of the internal and external factors which influence supervisory behavior of principals in the elementary school. Job descriptions and superintendents' expectations of principals were singled out in this study as modifiers of elementary principals' supervisory behavior.

Job descriptions can be a means of specifying the duties of elementary school principals. Although the existence of a job description is not mandatory in Illinois, many districts have at least a general description of principals' duties.

Whether or not a job description was available in a district, elementary school principals looked to their superintendents to enumerate and discuss the supervisory activities they (superintendents)

¹Goldhammer, p. 6.

expected principals to perform. "The principal must depend on the matters discussed with him or for which he feels he may be held accountable to obtain the cues as to what is expected of him."¹

Through a comparison of the ratings and rankings given by principals and superintendents to supervisory activities and through an analysis of job descriptions and interviews, the study answered five questions by examining the nature of the relationship among principals' supervisory activities, supervisory activities recommended in the literature, superintendents' expectations, and job descriptions. Principals' and superintendents' responses were compared using z and t tests and Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance. Responses on the questionnaires and in the interviews were analyzed with particular focus on problems, strengths, weaknesses, commonalities, differences, and trends.

The study answered the following questions:

1. Is there a relationship between the supervisory activities of elementary school principals and the supervisory activities recommended in the literature?

2. Is there a relationship between the supervisory activities specified in elementary school principals' job descriptions and the supervisory activities recommended in the literature?

3. Is there a relationship between the kind/frequency of supervisory activities of elementary school principals with job descriptions as compared to the kind/frequency of supervisory activities of elementary school principals without job descriptions?

¹Goldhammer, p. 4.
4. Is there a relationship between the supervisory expectations of the superintendent for elementary school principals and the supervisory activities recommended in the literature?
5. How do elementary school principals' valuations of supervisory activities compare to superintendents' expectations as measured by z and t tests?

Significance of the Study

Early in the history of American education, supervision was limited to inspectional visits but the supervisory activities of today are diverse and have a broader purpose. In general, it is agreed that the main purpose of supervision is instructional improvement (as is indicated in Chapter II); therefore, it is necessary to examine all supervisory activities which have as their end, the improvement of instruction.

George A. Goens and Ronald Lange stated that "Instructional leadership has been given much lip service over the past years. In practice, however, the concept of instructional leadership has taken a back seat to business management and paperwork." While supervision for instructional improvement has been a non-event in many schools, renewed interest in supervision is being fostered as a result of the public outcry over student non-achievement and the rapid changes in both the content and process of teaching.

... But more importantly the growing specialization of teaching and the rapidly developing knowledge base from which the content and process of teaching are derived will require more highly specialized and accessible expert assistance to help teachers to be

sensitive to changes, develop new skills, and implement appropriate innovations.¹

Taxpayers in some districts, disillusioned by poor student test scores refuse to spend additional public funds on education. Boards of education are holding superintendents, principals, and teachers accountable for children achieving. Future financing of our schools appears to be dependent on the ability of the educational system to produce a quality product.

In addition, many states are requiring children to achieve at minimum levels of proficiency as a prerequisite for graduation. "State legislatures, state boards of education, and state education departments have leaped forward in the basics/minimal competency movement."² In January, 1977, sixteen states had competencies established for graduation with many other states awaiting passage of bills.³ "Educators predicted that by 1984 nearly all the states will have incorporated minimal competency testing into promotion and graduation requirements."⁴

Fred C. Niedermeyer stressed that "Society is becoming more sensitive to how well schools carry out their primary responsibility of promoting public learning in a creditable way. Parents and the community are demanding evidence of learning."⁵

---

¹Wiles and Lovell, p. 294-295.
³Educational Leadership 35 (November 1977) cover.
⁴Brodinsky, p. 527.
The social and economic pressures affecting elementary school principals have changed through the years, but the purpose of supervision was and still is the improvement of instruction. It is crucial to anyone involved in supervision for instructional improvement to recognize the limitations of knowledge in this field. An exhaustive search of data and possible strategies should be an ongoing activity in an attempt to test the hypotheses on which supervisory actions are based.¹

In order to accomplish the purposes of this study the following methods and procedures were utilized:

**Methods and Procedures**

1. The population consisted of all the principals and superintendents of elementary districts in DuPage County, Illinois.

2. The sample selection consisted of principals and superintendents of elementary districts in DuPage County who met the following criterion: the superintendent was not the only principal in the district.

3. Reviewed the literature to determine the most frequently recommended supervisory activities.

4. A panel of thirty-three professors in Departments of School Administration in various universities in the United States was selected on an incidental sampling basis² to rank the value of the recommended supervisory activities for elemen-

¹Wiles and Lovell, p. 305.

tary principals based on their expertise and reading in the field. The names and affiliated universities of panel members appear in Appendix A. A self-addressed return envelope was enclosed with the request. Twenty-eight of the thirty-three professors responded. The purpose of presenting the six supervisory activities to the panel of professors was to establish an objective benchmark as this group acted as a control comparison group in ranking the supervisory activities. Later in the study principals and superintendents were asked to do the same ranking.

5. A letter was sent to all superintendents of elementary districts in DuPage County in October, 1977, requesting a copy of the principals' job description, if available. A self-addressed, stamped return envelope was enclosed in this mailing. Of the thirty districts which met the criterion for inclusion in the study, all thirty superintendents responded. Twenty-six superintendents sent a job description. Four superintendents responded that a job description was not available for principals in their districts.

6. A questionnaire was developed in January, 1978, for elementary principals based on the six supervisory activities recommended in the literature. This questionnaire included a fact sheet which asked for the number of teachers the principal supervised, enrollment, number of assistants as well as a review of the experience of the principal as a teacher and administrator. The fact sheet also required the princi-
pal to note his educational background, fields of study, and to rate the training he received which prepared him to deal with the supervisory problems faced as an elementary school principal. The principals were asked to rate each supervisory activity on a five point Likert scale, ranging from no importance to critical importance. Principals were also asked to note the percentage of school time spent in each supervisory activity. In addition, principals were to rank the six supervisory activities in order of importance.

7. A questionnaire was developed for superintendents in January, 1978, based on the six supervisory activities recommended in the literature. This questionnaire included a fact sheet which asked for the number of principals and teachers supervised, the number of schools, and the enrollment. The fact sheet required the superintendent to note his experience as a teacher, principal, and superintendent as well as his educational training. The superintendent was asked to rate the training he received in preparing him to direct elementary school principals in their supervisory role. The superintendents were also asked to rate each supervisory activity on a five point Likert scale, ranging from no importance to critical importance. Superintendents then noted the percentage of school time they expected principals to spend on each supervisory activity. In addition, superintendents were to rank the supervisory activities in order of importance.

8. The questionnaire for principals was validated by a mailing
in February, 1978, to six principals currently administering elementary schools and who were not eligible for inclusion in the study. A self-addressed, stamped return envelope was enclosed in the mailing. The principals were asked to read the purpose of the study and comment as to whether the questionnaire would assist in providing the information needed and to note any ambiguity or lack of clarity in the questionnaire. All six principals responded.

9. The questionnaire for superintendents was validated by a mailing in February, 1978, to six superintendents who currently administer districts with elementary schools and were not eligible for inclusion in the study. A self-addressed, stamped return envelope was enclosed in the mailing. The superintendents were asked to read the purpose of the study and comment as to whether the questionnaire would assist in providing the information needed and to note any ambiguity or lack of clarity in the questionnaire. Five of the six superintendents responded.

10. Based on the information and criticisms received from principals and superintendents validating the questionnaires, the instruments were modified; unclear and ambiguous language was removed.

11. The final questionnaire was mailed to 139 principals and thirty superintendents in the thirty qualified elementary districts of DuPage County, Illinois, early in March, 1978. A self-addressed return envelope was enclosed.
12. A follow-up mailing for non-respondents to the questionnaire was completed in mid-March. A self-addressed return envelope was enclosed in this mailing. One hundred four or seventy-five percent of the principals responded to the questionnaire. Twenty-six or eighty-seven percent of the superintendents responded to the questionnaire. Respondents to the questionnaire indicated a willingness to be interviewed at a later date.

13. The responses on the Likert scale portion of the questionnaire from all principals and all superintendents were compared utilizing z and t tests to determine if a significant relationship existed.

14. A portion of the questionnaire required respondents to rank the six supervisory activities according to relative value. The twenty-eight college professors performed the same ranking. The respondent groups were paired and responses analyzed using Kendall's Coefficient Concordance to determine level of agreement.

15. All four districts without a job description were included in the study.

16. Four districts with job descriptions were randomly selected so a more accurate comparison could be made with the four districts not having job descriptions. The selection was accomplished by including any elementary district with a job description in DuPage County whose superintendent and at least seventy-five percent of the principals responded
to the questionnaire. Fourteen districts met this criterion. The selection required randomly drawing four of fourteen cards which represented the identified qualifying districts with job descriptions.

17. A similar random drawing of names of two elementary principals within the eight sample districts followed. (In sample districts with two or less principals, these principals were included in the study.) In sample districts with more than two principals, the principals' names were noted on cards and two names from each district were randomly selected.

18. An interview schedule was developed for principals and superintendents in the sample which reflected the six supervisory activities covered in the questionnaire. The purpose of the interview schedule was to probe, clarify, and check the consistency of responses of principals and superintendents included in the sample.

19. Principals and superintendents in the sample were contacted by telephone and an interview date established.

20. Interviews with principals and superintendents in the sample were held during the months of March and April, 1978. Interviews lasted an average of one hour.

21. Letters of appreciation were sent to all superintendents and principals who participated in the study.

22. The data received from the questionnaires and interviews were tabulated.

23. The data were analyzed using appropriate statistical measures,
z tests, t tests, and Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance. In addition, the data were analyzed in narrative form focusing on problems, strengths, weaknesses, commonalities, differences, and trends. The purpose of the interview was to probe the rationale of principals' and superintendents' responses on the questionnaire. Since the data revealed inconsistencies among the subsections on the questionnaire, the interview was used to clarify the data. In addition, the interview was used to gain insights into the relationship between the principals and superintendents which were not available through independent analysis of the questionnaire.

24. Conclusions, recommendations, and implications were made.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study were those inherent in using a mailed questionnaire and personal interview.

The construct and content validity of the questionnaire was tested on a panel of superintendents and principals. Their suggestions were noted and necessary adjustments made to remove ambiguous and unclear wording.

A structured interview schedule was used to standardize the interview and to gain added depth from the responses of the subjects. Deobold Van Dalen supported the use of interviews. He noted that respondents are often more open in face-to-face discussion than when only written contact is made.¹ Lawrence S. Meyers and Neal E. Grossen pointed

out some limitations of interviews. They noted that securing information during an interview is limited by the bias, age, and sex of the interviewer as well as the environment where the interview is held.\footnote{Meyers and Grossen, p. 177.} The recording and analysis of data secured from an interview is also a limitation because they involve the subjective interpretation of the researcher.

Additional limitations of the study include:

1. Only elementary districts in DuPage County were used in the sample.

2. Only four districts in DuPage County reported having no job description.

3. To be eligible for inclusion in the study, response was necessary from the superintendent and seventy-five percent of the principals in the district.

4. Willingness of superintendents and principals to participate in the study.

5. The relationships which exist between superintendents and principals influence responses.

6. The honesty and candidness of responding subjects was assumed.

7. The study tested for frequency of use and value given to six supervisory activities--not the effectiveness of these activities.

**Definitions**

The following terms used in this study are defined as follows:
1. elementary district: a school district in which no provision is made for public school beyond the elementary grades.1

2. superintendent of schools: the chief executive and advisory officer charged with the direction of schools in a local school administrative unit, as in a district, . . . .2

3. supervisory role of superintendent: that aspect of the superintendent's behavior pattern directed toward providing leadership to teachers and other educational workers in the improvement of instruction.3

4. expectancy: a term descriptive of a predicted level of success, such as . . . an expectancy quality or level of performance as a teacher as predicted by some known qualifications of a candidate.4

5. building principal: a person designated as the administrative officer in charge of a particular school building.5

6. job description: a written statement of the various operations and duties, equipment, methods, working conditions and responsibilities, and other essential factors concerned in a job; also a job summary, usually based on a job analysis of detailed working conditions, promotional status, worker requirements, etc.; includes a summary of the education, experience, and training the worker must possess in order to qualify for employment.6

7. supervisory role of principal: that aspect of a principal's behavior pattern directed toward providing leadership to teachers and other educational workers in the improvement of instruction.7

8. tasks of supervision: an array of major goals or undertakings toward which the supervision program is directed; illustrative are developing curriculum, organizing for instruction, providing instructional materials, providing in-service education, and evaluating educational programs.8

9. class visitation: the practice of going to observe teachers at work teaching their classes; may be carried on . . . by

---

1Good, p. 192. 2 Ibid., p. 571. 3 Ibid., p. 572. 4 Ibid., p. 266. 5 Ibid., p. 437. 6 Ibid., p. 320. 7 Ibid., p. 437. 8 Ibid., p. 574.
supervisors, principals and superintendents as a supervisory practice.¹

10. supervisory conference: a conference among school workers to secure improvements in methods of teaching and in the devices and materials used, for example, a conference . . . between a principal and teacher.²

11. teacher evaluation: an estimate or measure of the quality of a person's teaching based on one or more criteria such as pupil achievement, pupil adjustment, pupil behavior, and the judgment of school officials, parents, pupils, or the teacher himself.³

12. in-service education: all efforts of administrative and supervisory officials to promote by appropriate means the professional growth and development of educational workers; . . . ⁴

13. curriculum development: a task of supervision directed toward designing or redesigning the guidelines for instruction; includes development of specifications indicating what is to be taught, by whom, when, where, and in what sequence and pattern.⁵

14. faculty meeting: a gathering of some or all of the educational staff members of a school for the purpose of discussing professional problems, hearing announcements, receiving instructions, planning studies or committee activities, planning the school's program, determining or recommending policies, or listening to reports or addresses.⁶

¹Ibid., p. 642. ²Ibid., p. 127. ³Ibid., p. 221. ⁴Ibid., 2nd ed., p. 288. ⁵Ibid., p. 158. ⁶Ibid., p. 158.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of the study was to determine if a relationship existed between superintendents' expectations and elementary principals' supervisory performance by examining the frequency of use, relative value, and rankings given to the most commonly recommended supervisory activities by superintendents and principals in districts with and without job descriptions for principals. The purpose of the study was accomplished by comparing the ratings and rankings given by principals and superintendents to supervisory activities and through an analysis of job descriptions and interviews. The study examined the nature of the relationship with particular focus on problems, strengths, weaknesses, similarities, dissimilarities, and trends.

In Chapter II, the literature in the field was reviewed to determine the most frequently recommended supervisory activities for principals. The review of literature revealed that six supervisory activities were most frequently recommended for elementary school principals for the improvement of instruction. The six supervisory activities were: classroom visitation, principal-teacher conferences, teacher evaluation, in-service education, curriculum development, and faculty meetings.

Literature related to each of the recommended supervisory activities for elementary school principals was reviewed to ascertain: the
purpose and importance of the practice as a supervisory activity, the role of the principal in the activity, recommendations for teacher involvement in the activity, and guidelines for successful management of the activity.

The review of literature did not attempt to present a chronological history of the evolution of supervisory techniques but rather to illustrate that the theory and functions of supervision have been relatively static with little change over the last several decades. Therefore, where appropriate, older quotes were intermingled with more recent statements to emphasize this fact.

**Recommended Supervisory Activities**

**Classroom Visitation**

The purpose of classroom visitation over the years gradually changed as the supervisory behavior system matured. William Lucio noted the kinds of supervisory behavior employed in supervisory visits from principals in the early periods of supervision.

Classroom situations were often evaluated as through the eyes of a psychoanalyst. Value judgments about teaching were common ('the teacher is warm and friendly'), judgments which frequently bore little relation to the goals of schooling or to teacher performance in changing pupil behavior. As a result, supervision tended to analyze the incidentals rather than the consequences of teaching, focused on personal attributes of teachers and pupils, described teacher behavior in terms of inference rather than in terms of observed effects on pupils, and tended to view effective teachers as those whose performance was congruent with some hypothetical model.¹

Because of these beginnings, teachers traditionally feared the

presence of the principal in the classroom when acting in a supervisory capacity. Burr, Coffield, Jenson, and Neagley commented on some principals' reactions to teachers' feelings about classroom visitations.

In too many instances principals, deciding that teachers have negative feelings about being observed in the classroom, make very little use of this supervisory technique. They may rationalize that today's teacher is a well educated professional who needs mainly to be left alone. Or they may explain that they simply have too many important duties in administering the school to permit them to spend an appreciable amount of time with children and teachers in the classroom.¹

Richard Saxe agreed. "One of the reasons supervision is a neglected task is that principals are well aware that teachers may become unhappy at the prospect of 'being supervised'."²

The first visitations bore little relationship to the perceived needs of teachers but were for the purpose of telling teachers their weak points and how to improve them.³

Ross Neagley and N. Dean Evans synopsized the literature on classroom visitations. They stated:

Early texts in supervision gave the supervisor a blueprint for entering the classroom and conducting the observation. Later texts advised against the use of this unpopular technique, and present-day writings emphasize that observations should be made only after the supervisor has established rapport with the teacher, . . . ⁴

Jacobson, Reavis, and Logsdon noted that "Classroom visitation

³Luther E. Bradfield, Supervision for Modern Elementary Schools, (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1964), p. 28.
⁴Neagley and Evans, Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction, p. 150.
is practiced more frequently than any other supervisory device."¹ Ben Harris concurred and added, "Observing classroom teaching is as much a part of supervision as any activity could possibly be."²

Literature on supervisory practices placed an emphasis on the importance of classroom supervision.

It is our position that the instructional leader of the school cannot do his job without allotting generous amounts of his time for observing and studying children and teachers at work, and for participating directly in the educational program.³

Doris G. Phipps noted that although classroom visitation is an important supervisory activity, "The technique is not easily described because there is no one single procedure. The teacher visited, the purpose of the visit, the type of activity observed, determine the procedure one uses."⁴ William Burton and Leo Brueckner agreed that, "The choice of procedures to use in a given situation depends on the purpose and the appropriateness of the method to conditions that prevail . . . ."⁵

George Kyte emphasized that, "Only carefully planned and conducted supervisory visits permit the discovery, analysis, and diagnosis of teaching practice."⁶

³Burr et al., p. 115.
of specific classroom problems and needs of teachers and pupils.¹

Mildred Swearingen emphasized the value of classroom visitations:

... classroom visits, constitute one of the most immediately fruitful and rewarding activities of supervision. One of the major purposes served especially well by this form of activity is the knowing firsthand about the learning situation for children.²

Ben Harris noted the role classroom visitation plays in providing a means to analyze teaching.

Much that is done effectively by supervisors involves analyzing what takes place in the classroom and getting individuals to do something to improve it. Observations and interviews are among the activities most frequently used for purposes of analyzing teaching.³

John T. Lovell suggested that supervisors critically analyze the assumptions they make of teacher behavior.

If the teacher is viewed as a dedicated and competent professional, then overseeing or monitoring notions based on either expertise or hierarchical authority would appear to be inappropriate instructional supervisory behavior. Rather, the function would be to initiate and maintain decision-making systems in which the greatest amount of professional competence could be brought to bear on a given decision or problem at a given time.⁴

James Curtin noted that:

The overriding purpose of supervisory visits today is to help teachers and children improve teaching and learning. The teacher today is viewed as an extremely significant person in fulfilling this purpose, and therefore, should help plan the observation.⁵


²Swearingen, p. 122.

³Harris, Supervisory Behavior in Education, p. 154.


John Bartky acknowledged that:

... the formal classroom visitation approach provides an excellent opportunity for exploration of teachers' needs—physical, social, and educational.¹

Jacobson, Reavis, and Logsdon emphasized the importance of teacher involvement in classroom visitations.

Classroom visitation can be of benefit to both the principal and the teacher when it is properly employed. In a planned program of supervision, particularly when teachers have helped to formulate the plan, the classroom visit fits logically into the picture.²

Richard Saxe noted that an effective classroom visitation required prior teacher involvement.

We begin in advance of the classroom observation, probably a day in advance. In this pre-observation conference the teacher tells the supervisor what changes in pupils should come about, and they agree on the focus of the visit. No longer does the supervisor have carte blanche to cast his knowing eye on everything that takes place and render a general impression.³

Ben Harris agreed that "... The observer should know his purpose for observing. The purpose should be known and accepted ... by the teacher ...."⁴

Eye, Netzer, and Krey stressed that cooperative pre-planning by the principal and teacher was essential to the success of classroom visitation. "Pre-planning is essential for ... success. ... A classroom visit for the sake of a classroom visit lacks professional direction in much the same way as showing a film that has not been previewed."⁵

²Jacobson, Reavis, and Logsdon, p. 100. ³Saxe, p. 654.
⁴Harris, Supervisory Behavior in Education, p. 156.
⁵Eye, Netzer, and Krey, p. 290.
By planning the observation together, the principal and teacher provide the necessary direction for a classroom visit. During the pre-
visitation conference the purpose of the observation would be estab-
lished and understood by both parties. The teacher, at this time,
shares with the principal the purpose of the lesson and the procedures
and materials to be used during the visitation. A discussion of the
ability differences in the class, the experiential background of the
children, living difficulties of individual children, and how this
lesson fits sequentially into the unit taught would provide appro-
priate readiness for classroom visitation.¹

Saxe explained that:

The purpose of the principal meeting with the teacher prior to
the observation is to have the teacher and principal in agreement
as to exactly what would be looked at, and for, when the observa-
tion took place.²

The question of whether or not a classroom visit by the princi-
al should be announced cannot be answered unequivocally because there
are occasions when an unannounced visit is necessary. But typical of
the current consensus in the literature, John Bartky noted that
announced visitations are preferred.

Thus announced visitation has an advantage which surprise visita-
tion does not have, for the added effort a teacher expends in the
preparation for the announced visitation is in itself a learning
experience.³

Eye, Netzer, and Krey suggested the following guidelines for
classroom visitation:

1. The teacher not only should know the purpose of the visit but
   also should have a part in planning the number of visits, the

¹Curtin, pp. 70-71. ²Saxe, p. 654. ³Bartky, p. 150.
time of the visits, the criteria to be used in observation, what is to be done with the criteria, and any resultant evaluation.

2. The criteria will vary from visit to visit depending upon the specific purpose. No one set of criteria or checklist is sufficient.

3. The number of visits will vary depending upon the purpose.

4. The visit should be used as a means to improve instruction through mutual efforts.†

Charles A. Reavis explained that, "Following the pre-observation conference, the supervisor observes the specific lesson previously discussed with the teacher."²

The observation itself is of course structured accordingly to the teacher's objective for pupil behavior and the focus agreed upon during the pre-observation conference.³

The method of reporting data from a classroom visitation has changed over the years.

In the past many different checklists, evaluative records, observation guides, and report sheets have been proposed. These, however, were planned for the purpose of inspecting or rating the teacher and have limited utility for supervisory personnel today.⁴

McKean and Mills noted a critical change in classroom observation—a change in focus—from teacher to learner. "If . . . the classroom observation is more directly concerned with the learning of the students than the performance of the teacher, more beneficial results are likely."⁵ Richard Saxe concurred and added:

---


3Saxe, p. 654.


5Ibid., p. 82.
Having opted for a focus on pupil behavior, we must specify in advance what sort of pupil behavior we are seeking to bring about in order to know if, or to what extent, we have made the desired change. This requires a persistent attempt to state objectives for each activity with some precision.¹

Principals have a responsibility for becoming acquainted with observational technology to help teachers become aware of their instructional performance patterns and children's response characteristics. Objective observational records can provide useful feedback on aspects of classroom instruction in which the teacher exhibits interest. Without question, objective observational records are more likely to be accepted by teachers than the opinions and ratings provided by a principal after a classroom visitation in the past. The precise accurate records provide an opportunity for the teacher and principal to assess the meaning of the data, analyze if too much or too little of some kinds of behavior were exhibited and develop instructional strategies to produce desirable behaviors.²

The data obtained from a classroom visitation should be detailed enough to permit systematic analysis. "... the central thrust is toward the greater and more intelligent use of observation in supervisory practice. ..."³

Jacobson, Reavis, and Logsdon discussed the purpose of taking notes or recording data during a visitation: "A record of each visit

¹Saxe, p. 653.


³Ibid., p. 79.
should be made in order that the principal may have pertinent data for subsequent conferences."¹ Nathan Stoller agreed and added:

The teacher should agree that the supervisor may take notes during the lesson. These notes will form one basis for a fruitful discussion during the follow-up conference. It would be desirable to have a more objective record of classroom activities. A tape recorder could be of use in many classrooms to provide a record of the oral interchanges between teacher and pupils. Far superior is a video tape recording in which both the sight and sound of the classroom may be objectively recorded.²

McKean and Mills discussed other means of securing data during a classroom visitation.

Other devices are sometimes used, such as tape recordings, discussion flow or participation charts, and time analysis of various activities. All such supervisory procedures must contribute to cooperative analysis of the problem and to constructive measures for subsequent improvement.³

The recommendations which result from a classroom observation must be based on analysis of objective data. Richard Saxe commented:

For most purposes I prefer to take copious notes . . . . The reason for this preference is the need to analyze and make recommendations based upon actual observations rather than general impressions. Any impression, any suggestion, must be tied to the specific data observed.⁴

Morris Cogan stressed the need for specific statements describing a classroom visitation which both teacher and supervisor could analyze.

In effect, both teacher and supervisor need to engage in analysis and interpretation of classroom events, and the data needed to

¹ Jacobson, Reavis, and Logsdon, p. 101.
³ McKean and Mills, p. 86.
⁴ Saxe, p. 654.
support analysis and interpretation must record the behavior of teacher and students as well as related classroom events.¹

Ben Harris noted the importance of conferring with the teacher after an observation.

Observations, to have any value, require some kind of follow-up activities. The purpose of the observation will determine the follow-up activities that are most useful. In general, follow-up activity involves some kind of recording of data observed, analysis of observation data, a plan for feedback to the teacher, . . . ²

McKean and Mills concurred and emphasized the cooperative attitude of principal and teacher in examining and interpreting the data from the visitation.

There should be a follow-up of every classroom visitation. The supervisor and teacher must cooperatively examine the results of the observation. This is best accomplished through a post-visitation conference.³

Richard Saxe stressed the importance of a post-observation conference by commenting:

An observation without a post-observation conference is no observation at all . . . .

The post-observation conference should follow the event as soon as possible. The more nearly it approaches an examination of data by peers, the more helpful it becomes.⁴

Harold J. McNally summarized the classroom visitation sequence.

Each observation should be both preceded and followed by a conference. In the first conference, the teacher and observer plan together those aspects of the teaching-learning situation on which the observation will be focused, and for what purpose. The postobservation conference then becomes an opportunity for analysis of the


²Harris, Supervisory Behavior in Education, p. 158.

³McKean and Mills, p. 85.

⁴Saxe, p. 654.
results of the evaluation and for planning whatever steps may next seem to be indicated. The entire procedure should be viewed as a cooperative undertaking of two professionals, both of whom are working at improving the learning experiences of a specific group of children.¹

George A. Goens and Ronald W. Lange considered pre-conferences, data-gathering and analysis, and post-conferences as generally recommended classroom visitation procedures for elementary school principals. In the pre-conference, the teacher and principal identify needs, objectives, and strategies. During data-gathering and analysis, the strategies are implemented by the teacher and the outcome of the strategies are assessed by the teacher and principal. In the post-conference, the teacher and principal examine the data analysis, develop conclusions, and define implications through mutual discussion.²

Brandt and Perkins emphasized that elementary principals use classroom visitations as a supervisory technique but realize there is no simple formula or "one correct way to teach."

... the classroom has been shown to be a highly complex matrix of many important and interacting variables. ... What the teacher does is important but far from sufficient to guarantee successful learning. Many other factors are important as well. Successful formulas, furthermore, may apply to many individuals or situations but seldom to all. Just as children learn in different ways, teachers teach differently and often with equal success.³

McKean and Mills concurred and emphasized the need for elementary principals to accept the diversity of teaching styles observed during classroom visitations.


³Brandt and Perkins, pp. 81-82.
There is no carefully defined set of classroom activities which has been demonstrated to work equally well for all. Effective and creative teachers are observed working in different ways according to personality differences, variation in educational goals and purposes, and different student groups.\(^1\)

Ralph L. Mosher and David Purpel discussed a recent addition to supervisory practices, clinical supervision. They reported it originated at the Harvard-Newton Summer Program, a laboratory school operated by Harvard's Master of Arts in Teaching Program and the Newton, Massachusetts, public school system.\(^2\)

Reavis explained that clinical supervision was developed by Morris Cogan over ten years ago and is a "procedure for observation in the clinic of the classroom."\(^3\)

Clinical supervision may . . . be defined as the rationale and practice designed to improve the teacher's classroom performance . . . (and) to improve the students' learning by improving the teachers' classroom behavior.\(^4\)

Cogan listed eight phases in the cycle of supervision:

1. Establishing the teacher-supervisor relationship
2. Planning with the teacher
3. Planning the strategy of observation
4. Observing instruction
5. Analyzing the teaching-learning processes
6. Planning the strategy of the conference
7. The conference
8. Renewed planning\(^5\)

Although various phases of the clinical supervision cycle have been adapted for use by the elementary principal in classroom visita-

\(^{1}\)McKean and Mills, p. 82.


\(^{3}\)Reavis, p. 360.

\(^{4}\)Cogan, Clinical Supervision, p. 9.

\(^{5}\)Ibid., pp. 10-12.
tions, Cogan does not view clinical supervision as a duty of the elementary principal. "Clinical supervision . . . (is) often mistakenly viewed by the principal as part of his responsibilities." This phase of supervision, according to Cogan is the task of individuals whose major responsibility is to provide supervision.¹

Summary

Classroom visitation is viewed by authors as one of the most valuable supervisory techniques available to elementary school principals to improve teaching and learning. Classroom visitation is a particularly valuable supervisory activity according to the literature because it demands the involvement of both principals and teachers. The emphasis on teacher involvement combined with goal orientation enables the teacher to have a voice in "determining his own professional destiny--an eminently professional thing to have happen."²

Principal-Teacher Conferences

The principal-teacher conference has been a supervisory technique since the early 1800's. Traditionally after a classroom visitation, the principal would meet with the teacher and remark on what was considered good and what was considered faulty. Today the principal


and teacher meet to create a mutual understanding of the teaching act and develop directions for the future. ¹

As the focus of the supervisory conference changed it became apparent that good rapport between the principal and teacher was essential for success of this activity. Wiles and Lovell stated that rapport is built into principal-teacher conferences when each participant is intent on putting the other person at ease.² When good rapport was established, the conference afforded an opportunity for both the principal and teacher to cooperatively analyze a problem, share interests, and really get to know one another.³

Curtin defined a conference as a "planned discussion between supervisor and teacher about some important aspect of the educational enterprise."⁴ Swearingen emphasized that "Individual conferences . . . constitute one of the most immediately fruitful and rewarding activities of supervision."⁵ Burton and Brueckner concurred by stating, "The individual conference is one of the best . . . methods of securing growth in service."⁶

The individual conference is probably the most important supervisory technique for use in the specific improvement of instruction. If correctly employed, it gives each teacher the special help he needs to become proficient in self-analysis, self-appraisal, and

³McKean and Mills, p. 90. ⁴Curtin, p. 90.
⁵Swearingen, p. 122. ⁶Burton and Brueckner, p. 169.
self-improvement. Being a form of personal interview, the individual conference provides an excellent opportunity for the two participants to define the subject to be discussed, to agree on the educational point of view, to recognize the need for improvement, and to solve the problem cooperatively.\(^1\)

The supervisory conference between principal and teacher exemplified what Berman and Usery referred to as:

\[\ldots\text{a transaction between two adult minds that culminates in new insights which have an effect upon children or youth. The effect may vary in its quality depending upon the goals inherent in the teaching situation and the type of response evoked from the supervisor-teacher interactive setting.}\]\(^2\)

Bradfield considered the supervisory conference an extremely valuable supervisory practice.

It offers opportunity for the supervisory leader to work with the teacher on an individual basis in dealing with personal and professional problems. Its usefulness as a technique of supervision depends largely on the attitude of the teacher and the skill of the supervisor. One important value of individual conferences is the opportunity they afford for promoting better understanding and rapport between teachers and supervisors.\(^3\)

Individual principal-teacher conferences afford both parties involved an opportunity to interact, share, and plan on a person-to-person basis. Unruh and Turner wrote, "Counseling teachers and working with them on a one-to-one ratio has long been cited as a most valuable means of assisting them."\(^4\) Hicks and Jameson stated, "\ldots\text{we feel that the conference with the individual teacher is indispensable to the principal}\)

\(^1\)Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops, p. 322.


\(^3\)Bradfield, p. 36.

in helping him guide his faculty into more effective instructional techniques."¹

The supervisory conference should be constructive and helpful. "Generally, the conference is positive and productive because it focuses on aspects of instruction previously identified as areas of concern by the teacher."²

The supervisory conference should provide an opportunity for the teacher to explore his conception about teaching and compare them to the thoughts of his supervisor.³

It is essential that the teacher's opinions and judgments be respected. Obviously the key to most instructional problems lies in the situation itself, and the teacher is the only trained person who possesses continuing and intimate experience in the particular learning-teaching situation.⁴

Curtin reported that principals use many indirect means of communicating to their faculties--letters, memorandums, public address system, bulletins, etc. The conference is an especially significant means of communicating because it is direct and firsthand contact with individual faculty members.⁵

... The more we are able to increase our direct, personal, face-to-face relationships with our teachers, the better our chances are of advising and counseling them about their teaching.⁶

Major changes in the thinking and feeling of an individual often come about through the impact of one person upon another. Although

²Reavis, p. 361.
³Bradfield, p. 37.
⁴McKean and Mills, p. 90.
⁵Curtin, p. 89.
⁶Hicks and Jameson, p. 61.
contacts between persons may be infrequent, the effects of such contacts should not be inconsequential, particularly within the educational enterprise.¹

The success of a principal often depends on his effectiveness in person-to-person conferences.² "The conference has the great advantage of providing for a direct and intimate interaction between supervisor and teacher, both of whom are interested in improving instruction."³ Supervisory conferences "attempt to reach a union of minds and purpose. It is a delicate procedure."⁴

Next to classroom visitation and observation, the supervisory conference is the most direct procedure to assist the individual teacher. Because conferences frequently precede and almost always follow all but general classroom observations, they are commonly thought of as companion techniques.⁵

Neagley and Evans commented that the primary reason for holding a principal-teacher conference is its importance as a technique to improve instruction. Classroom visitations of experienced and inexperienced teachers are of little value unless conferences are held to plan and/or implement a program for improvement.⁶

Doris G. Phipps noted the purpose of principal-teacher conferences in relation to classroom visitations:

Conferences must precede and/or follow a classroom visit . . . . In the person-to-person relationship, the supervisor is better able to stimulate change because the teacher has confidence to experiment when he knows someone is being supportive. Not only are ideas of change communicated in the conference, but the behavior problems of

¹Berman and Usery, p. 1. ²Wiles and Lovell, p. 107.
³McKean and Mills, p. 87. ⁴Wiles and Lovell, p. 109.
⁵Neagley and Evans, Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction, p. 170.
⁶Ibid., p. 171.
children are analyzed, new materials are found, school policies are interpreted, and the burden of a personal problem has been shared.¹

Luther Bradfield discussed the pre-conference in relation to the post-conference.

Ideally, a conference before a visit will pave the way for the observational visit to assist with a particular problem. The follow-up conference provides opportunity to discuss what was observed, analyze the situation, and plan for necessary changes in instructional technique. This conference offers an excellent opportunity for effective supervision.²

Conferences can also be held between principal and teacher, when a beginning teacher is employed, when a teacher requests a conference or when the principal wants to discuss a problem with a teacher, etc.³

Wiles and Lovell wrote that the purpose of the conference affects both participants. Therefore, when initiating a conference, the principal is expected to make the purpose known to the teacher.⁴

Teachers, however, should never be in doubt as to the purpose of a visit. A conference before the visit can pave the way for the observation. A follow-up conference gives the opportunity to discuss what happened, to analyze reasons for pupil reactions and behavior, and to plan for changes in the techniques of instruction.⁵

McKean stated that the purpose of the conference determines the frequency and length of the meetings.⁶ There is no definitive answer as to where a conference should be held, although a teacher is usually more secure in his own classroom rather than the principal's office.⁷

Arthur Blumberg and Edmund Amidon noted supervisory conferences could be more productive if at the beginning of the conference the supervisor and teacher discussed how the teacher perceived the teacher-supervisor relationship. They added that the supervisor would be wise to pay more attention to the inter-active nature of the conference and suggested an emphasis of indirect supervisory behavior rather than direct.¹

The principals may utilize the principal-teacher conferences for many purposes, i.e. "talking over mutual problems, asking for suggestions, seeking help in making decisions, explaining reasons for needed changes, and giving recognition, credit, and approval for work well done."² Formal conferences may be used before and/or after a classroom visitation.³ Burr et al. noted that informal conferences may be brief but are important for building morale, and giving answers to questions which need immediate attention.⁴

Whatever the reason given for initiation, individual conferences provided one of the most effective settings for supervisory work. In many conferences the teacher and principal met as equals focusing on instructional problems.⁵ "Individual conferences should constantly improve the problem-solving skills of the participants . . ."⁶

²Bradfield, p. 37.
³McKean, p. 87.
⁴Burr et al., p. 108.
⁵McKean and Mills, pp. 86-87.
⁶Burton and Brueckner, p. 168.
Bradfield emphasized that in order for conferences between the principal and teacher to have a purpose, they must be planned.  

Muriel Crosby commented:

Any individual who begins participation without adequate preliminary information regarding the nature of the problem to be attacked, or without conviction regarding the importance of the problem, will find that the experience is usually a wasteful one.

Burr et al. specified the preparation a principal needed to make prior to a supervisory conference:

As the principal plans for the conference with a teacher relative to instructional matters, he should: 1) review the teacher's cumulative folder, noting pertinent data including notes of previous conferences; 2) think about what he hopes to accomplish in the conference; 3) pre-plan agenda items with the teacher when appropriate and possible; 4) list problems and questions; 5) think through possible solutions; 6) note additional information needed; 7) locate needed data and materials; 8) consider changes in plans if conditions are different from what he anticipates; and 9) think about his own behavior in the forthcoming conference.

Modern supervisory programs focus on a cooperative planning effort between principal and teacher. "The conference method provides an opportunity for the supervisory leader to gain acceptance as a co-worker with teachers in the attempt to improve instruction."

McKean commented on the need for cooperative planning for a conference.

If the conference is to be a cooperative discussion of some mutually recognized problem, the conference requires preparation by both participants. Both should study available material which deals with the problem.

---

1 Bradfield, p. 37.


3 Burr et al., pp. 112-113.

4 Bradfield, p. 37.

5 McKean and Mills, p. 88.
The importance of teacher involvement in contributing to the success of a conference was emphasized by Burton and Brueckner.

An individual conference is (or should be) a meeting between two persons equally interested in improving a situation. The views and facts of each party are necessary to complete the picture. Exchange of facts and ideas is focused on problem-solving and not on one of the persons in the conference.¹

Jacobson, Reavis, and Logsdon noted that if a conference was to have value to the teacher, she needed to be encouraged by the principal to do most of the talking. By encouraging the teacher to analyze her teaching behavior, both strengths and weaknesses, she would be more receptive to change.²

The importance of including the teacher in the process of analyzing and prescribing must be emphasized. If the teacher and the supervising principal are to perform as a professional team, it is important that they share a common professional orientation. Additionally, the teacher and the supervising principal must jointly accept effective methods and techniques of objective analysis. Only then can the factors observed during the course of the supervisory visit be treated adequately; only then may the teacher and the supervisor be capable of professional consultation which may determine a program leading to improvement of instruction.³

Jacobson, Reavis, and Logsdon recommended having the teacher summarize what has been said or agreed upon before the conference ended.⁴ Because, "In the final analysis it is what the teacher decides to do day

¹Burton and Brueckner, p. 168.
²Jacobson, Reavis, and Logsdon, p. 102.
³Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops, p. 326.
⁴Jacobson, Reavis, and Logsdon, p. 103.
by day with students in the classroom that really matters and this
daily encounter needs to be the focus of change.¹

Swearingen suggested the principal keep a written record of
supervisory conferences.

Ideally some kind of record should be kept of all but the most
informal conferences. Such a procedure is time-consuming, and hence
is often neglected. . . . At a minimum, however, some record should
be made of:
  a) the date and place of the conference
  b) the general topics of discussion
  c) any agreements reached for action
  d) any specific commitments made by
    supervisor, principal, or teacher. . . .

Without such a record, even persons with vivid memories can lose
track of sincere promises, in the kaleidoscope of activity of a school
day.²

A supervisory conference could be a difficult activity to perform
due to the personal involvement necessary between the principal and
teacher participants who may have misgivings regardless of the exper­
fience either has had. Principals may wonder whether the teacher under­
stands their professional purposes. Teachers can be concerned over the
impression the principal has of their work.³

Many conferences in the past have failed because "The supervisor-
teacher conference has been since time immemorial a meeting between a
superior and an inferior officer in which the superior would aid or
help or guide the inferior, and at worst give orders to be followed."⁴


²Swearingen, pp. 126-127. ³Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops, p. 322.
⁴Burton and Brueckner, p. 168.
Edwin Reeder concurred and added:

But it must still be remembered that the whole technique is based on the false premise of the inevitable superiority of the principal by virtue of his position, and of his inherent right to tell teachers what to do. The whole process, therefore, is a denial of democratic ideals on which our culture is supposed to be based.

Wiles and Lovell acknowledged that barriers could be easily built by the principal so as to make the conference ineffective. Superiority can be displayed verbally and nonverbally and is fatal. The lack of formality is crucial to successful conferences.

A study by George Kyte in 1962 examined the organization of an effective supervisory conference. Kyte based his investigation on thirty sets of tape recordings of supervisory conferences. He concluded:

1. The conference should include four or five items.
2. The first item should establish rapport and be given minor stress.
3. The second and third items should be given major stress.
4. The fourth item should be given major or minor stress.
5. The fifth item should be given minor stress or passing mention.
6. The last point should be given minor stress or passing mention.
7. Some of the items in a conference should be related to each other.
8. Repetition of a major point in the discussion increases its effectiveness on teaching in the future.

Reeder analyzed the above technique and suggested:

... it seems obvious that if a principal habitually uses the outline suggested, any teacher who has the intelligence he ought to have to teach will very soon be aware of the sequence of points. .. As Professor Milo B. Hillegas used to say in his supervision

---


classes, 'If the course of a supervisory conference usually runs on the formula, "You did this, that was good, and that, that was good, BUT. . ." then any intelligent teacher remains tense, waiting for the "BUT".'

From the point when the word "but" is used to the end of the interview, it will tend to be conducted in an argumentative atmosphere of attack and defense. Little real good is likely to come from such a situation.¹

It was generally agreed that there was no set formula for a principal-teacher conference. Close adherence to any set of rules would tend to make the conference ineffective.²

Neagley and Evans acknowledged the uniqueness of each supervisory conference but suggested there were some general guidelines concerning supervisory conferences which could be adopted to fit the situation:

1. The individual supervisory conference should be looked upon as part of a problem-solving technique.
2. Conferences should be thoroughly prepared for by both the supervisor and the teacher.
3. The conference should be held as soon after the classroom observation as possible.
4. The conference should be held on school time, or within the teacher-day as defined by district policy.
5. The conference should be as informal as possible and held in a place where both the teacher and the supervisor feel at ease.
6. The discussion must be in light of a common, district-wide philosophy of education understood and accepted by both parties.
7. A plan of action should be drawn up in writing, including a summary of points agreed upon by both parties and the assignment of responsibilities.
8. A written summary should be kept of all conferences, and copies should be given to both participants.
9. The conference should be evaluated by both participants with the idea in mind of improving the conference technique.³

The principals who used supervisory conferences and displayed

¹ Reeder, pp. 100-101. ² Wiles and Lovell, p. 107.
³ Neagley and Evans, Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction, p. 172.
a sincere interest in effecting a positive and sharing atmosphere were rewarded by increased cooperation and enthusiasm from their staffs. Teachers responded positively when they were considered worth-while and contributing members of their school organization.¹

Summary

The literature highly recommends the use of principal-teacher conferences to increase the likelihood of both principals and teachers sharing common professional interests, objectives, and goals. Principal-teacher conferences enable both parties involved to meet, to exchange facts and to cooperatively focus on problem solving in an attempt to improve instruction.

Teacher Evaluation

Wherever there are human beings, there will be evaluation. Man is a valuing and a goal-seeking being. Even if he were to decide not to evaluate, he would end up evaluating how well he had succeeded in giving up evaluating.²

The elementary school principal has direct responsibility for evaluation of his teaching staff. The development of evaluation programs has been a concern of principals and teachers for many years. Burr et al. noted that those within and outside the profession voiced concern over evaluation of "competency", "staff performance", "teaching effectiveness", etc.³

Bradfield commented on the importance of evaluation:

¹Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops, p. 326.
³Burr et al., p. 346.
Evaluation is an essential activity, and it is a part of the teaching-learning process. In evaluation an attempt is made to determine the extent to which goals have been reached. Some kind of standards or criteria must be set up with which actual practice is measured or compared.¹

Neagley and Evans discussed evaluation of teachers as a pivotal supervisory activity, "Evaluation is an essential process in the improvement of the learning situation."² McKeen and Mills added, "The function of evaluation is basic to supervision. Improvement and progress have their beginnings in the appraisal of present conditions."³

Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg discussed teacher evaluation as a duty of the principal.

He is accountable to the community and to the board of education for the performance of each employee. By various devices, then, he keeps himself informed as to levels of performance, and deals with needs either on a staff-wide basis as part of the general in-service development program, or he deals with them individually as the situation demands.⁴

Harris listed "planning, organizing, and implementing activities for the evaluation of all facets of the educational process directly related to instruction," as one of the ten tasks of supervision.⁵

Robert B. Howsam defined evaluation as "a process that involves making judgments on the basis of evidence regarding the attainment of previously determined conditions or objectives."⁶ William Goldstein concurred and added "... evaluations assess the degree to which articulated goals are achieved."⁷

McNally wrote that the primary objective of a teacher evaluation program is the improvement of the school's program of teaching and learning.\(^1\) Howsam discussed the purpose of evaluation in terms of "goal achievement".

... The achievement of goals—broad expectations or purposes—or the achievement of objectives—more limited in scope and leading toward more specific goals—is the ultimate object of all evaluation.\(^2\) Thomas added, "Any evaluation program which does not produce better educational services to children is only a futile exercise."\(^3\)

Burr et al. provided a review of the purposes of teacher evaluation.

Thus the purposes for evaluating staff seem clear: (1) to obtain data and information about the staff person and his performance that may be helpful in improving instruction; (2) to gather information that may be helpful in planning in-service and growth experiences for staff members; (3) to provide tangible data for personnel practices related to retention, promotion, dismissal, upgrading and assignment of responsibilities; and (4) to provide data related to staff personnel that may be implemented and used for improving the teaching-learning environment for the child.\(^4\)

One quality which was repeated in the literature as crucial to the success of a teacher evaluation program was teacher involvement. Bradfield stated, "Whether the evaluation is of pupil progress, teaching, leadership, or the school curriculum, it should be planned as a cooperative enterprise."\(^5\) Wiles and Lovell concurred, "A basic tenet of the evaluation approach is that all persons involved in the situation being evaluated should have a part in establishing the criteria

\(^1\) McNally, p. 29.  \(^2\) Howsam, p. 14.


\(^4\) Burr et al., pp. 346-347.  \(^5\) Bradfield, p. 140.
by which the situation will be evaluated."¹ Bernard H. McKenna added, "School staffs should be involved in all aspects of performance evaluation: deciding on goals and criteria, selecting or developing evaluating systems, applying and analyzing the findings, and determining the resulting actions."²

Burr et al. discussed guidelines for evaluation of staff in these terms:

... the principles of involvement should be kept uppermost. Appraisal of staff persons should be something that is 'done with' rather than 'done to.' It is a cooperative venture with the staff person knowing the what, the why, and the how of the process; being in on the establishment of criteria, appreciating the goals and purposes, and understanding the process.³

The importance of cooperation between the supervisor and teacher was also emphasized by Lucio and McNeil:

Operationally, supervisor and teacher jointly define the objectives of instruction, specify the pertinent and necessary procedures required to accomplish these purposes, and determine in advance the evaluation measures to be applied.⁴

Donald Medley commented on the need for teacher participation in establishing the goals and criteria for evaluation. "... an agreement must be reached between the evaluator and evaluatee about what goal is appropriate for the teacher and how progress toward that goal is to be assessed."⁵

Robert L. Heichberger and James M. Young, Jr. stated, "Teachers

¹Wiles and Lovell, p. 231.
³Burr et al., p. 351. ⁴Lucio and McNeil, p. 249.
see the justification for supervision and evaluation programs. But they want to be a partner in the process."¹

Eye, Netzer, and Krey noted that full faculty involvement at every step is often unrealistic but suggested a possible solution in the use of faculty briefing sessions. "The involvement of as many staff members as possible can be a positive influence."²

Teacher involvement in evaluation was not recommended and rarely practiced in the early history of education. Teachers at that time were evaluated on their traits and attributes. Principals would rate teachers using lists enumerating traits considered essential to teacher effectiveness, i.e. enthusiasm, strong voice, cooperation, punctuality, pleasant appearance, etc.³

Thomas described evaluation based on "good traits" as:

```
... harmful rather than helpful; it treats educational personnel as stereotypes rather than individual men and women. It concentrates on peripheral items rather than important components of the teaching process.⁴
```

Years later, educational evaluation programs were effected by the Lewin, Lippitt, and White climate studies. Skills and competencies of the teacher as well as the climate in the classroom were the foci of evaluation methods. The principal played a crucial role in observing interactions between students and teacher in the classroom. Teachers were evaluated on ability to organize, democratic behavior, ability to listen, ability to prepare adequately, etc.⁵

³Thomas, p. 1.
⁴Ibid., pp. 2-3.
⁵Ibid., p. 3.
Herold E. Mitzel commented on the rating scales used to describe teaching behavior.

The various views, descriptions, and criteria of teaching behavior, used as bases for evaluation, have generally been assumed or inferred to relate to teaching effectiveness, and, ultimately to changes in pupil behavior.¹

Thomas repudiated the value of rating instruments.

"... there is no body of research, no convincing evidence that this kind of evaluation identifies good teaching. Nor is there any reason to believe that good teaching can be segmented and evaluated by a study of certain skills or the existence of certain classroom conditions."²

More recently evaluative methods imitated industry by emphasizing product evaluation. The focus of product evaluation was on student achievement, test scores, and other "objective data".³

Feyereisen, Fiorino, and Nowak reported that in modern supervision, "The trend is away from the use of self-reports and rating as useful sources of data. Measurement by a priori classification, behavioral observation, and objective instruments are preferred."⁴

Martha A. Cook and Herbert C. Richards reported a study in which 236 teachers were each independently rated by a principal and a supervisor for teaching effectiveness. The results of the study revealed that "the rating scales generated data that were more a reflection of


²Thomas, p. 4. ³Ibid., p. 4.

⁴Feyereisen, Fiorino, and Nowak, p. 249.
the rater's point of view than of a teacher's actual classroom behavior."\(^1\)

Wiles and Lovell discussed the weakness of rating scales.

Rating is unsatisfactory as an evaluation procedure. Although it produces a judgment that can be used by the administration, it prevents the teacher from asking for needed help and the supervisor from seeing a normal teaching situation; it eliminates any possibility for cooperative relations between the teacher and the status leader. Rating should be recognized as an administrative device used to establish a base for salary increases, promotion, or dismissal, and as a deterrent to improving instruction.\(^2\)

Curtin concurred and added:

If instructional improvement is being accomplished in districts with formal rating, it is probably not due to the rating. The weaknesses of rating scales in terms of reliability and validity are so glaring that one cannot place much confidence in their results.\(^3\)

Feyereisen, Fiorino, and Nowak discussed the demand that systems approaches would make on evaluation in the future.

Systems approaches will require more reliable knowledge of teacher competence and effectiveness because of the high value placed on goal achievement for the organization, on the one hand, and teacher satisfaction, on the other.\(^4\)

In reviewing the literature on teacher effectiveness, Bradfield reported that evaluating the effectiveness of teacher performance was a complete task. "This is one of the more controversial issues of all the areas of education. Much research has been done in the area of teacher evaluation."\(^5\)


\(^2\)Wiles and Lovell, p. 242. \(^3\)Curtin, p. 245.

\(^4\)Feyereisen, Fiorino, and Nowak, p. 249.

\(^5\)Bradfield, pp. 142-143.
Howsam discussed the results of research on teacher effectiveness.

For many years researchers have sought to identify the characteristics of the effective teacher; more recently, attention has turned to analysis of teacher behaviors. None of these efforts should obscure the fact that pupil learning and behavior are the purpose of the school and, therefore, must be the ultimate objects of evaluation.¹

McKenna also noted the lack of definitive results from research in this area:

... attempts to attribute differences in learning outcomes to different performances on the part of school staffs have been far less successful. In fact, they have produced so few definitive results to date that most researchers agree the results should not be used, in any broad sense, for selecting one kind of performance over another or for administrative decisions related to staff competence.²

Research studies on teacher effectiveness have included Ryan's study on teacher characteristics,³ Flanders' investigation of interaction analysis in the classroom,⁴ and Turner's study on teaching as problem solving behavior.⁵

Lucio and McNeil discussed the problems involved in teacher effectiveness studies.

¹Howsam, p. 14. ²McKenna, p. 21.
Methods of judging teacher effectiveness have been subject to several kinds of difficulties. First, the various methods which have been utilized yield results which do not correlate highly with each other; hence they do not measure the same aspects. Second, the methods which appear most valid have often been perceived as difficult to administer. Third, and most important, the determination of teacher effectiveness depends to a large extent on the criteria used. In essence, if different methods and different criteria are used in measuring the factors which contribute to teaching success, the results will inevitably differ.¹

Bruce J. Biddle and William J. Ellena in 1964 reviewed the results of teacher effectiveness studies:

Recent summaries have revealed that literally thousands of studies have been conducted on teacher excellence since the beginning of the twentieth century. Investigators have looked at teacher training, traits, behaviors, attitudes, values, abilities, sex, weight, voice quality, and many other characteristics. Teacher effects have been judged by investigators themselves, by administrators, and parents, by master teachers, by practice teachers, and by teachers themselves. The apparent results of teaching have been studied, including pupil learning, adjustment, classroom performance, sociometric status, attitudes, liking for school, and later achievement. And yet, with all this research activity, results have been modest and often contradictory. Few, if any, facts are now deemed established about teacher effectiveness, and many former 'findings' have been repudiated.²

Research has not provided definitive results as to what characteristics correlate highly with teacher excellence. Just as in 1964, "... no general agreement exists as to what constitutes effective teaching, and no standards of teacher effectiveness are commonly agreed upon."³

In education, as in other areas, there are two basic methods of

¹Lucio and McNeil, pp. 239-240.


³Thomas, p. 1.
evaluation, summative and formative. Summative or product evaluation occurs at the conclusion of the teaching-learning act. "... These evaluations are entered into records and are used as the basis of decisions."¹

McKenna reported that standardized achievement tests and other forms of measurement are not a sufficient basis for teacher evaluation. The use of these tests to evaluate teacher performance is not realistic. Homogeneously grouped classes give the teachers of brighter children an unfair advantage.²

Howsam described formative evaluation as:

... the use of data to make a process or operation effective as it goes along. This kind of evaluation is termed formative since its purpose is to continually fashion and refashion behavior in such a way as to achieve objectives.³

In formative or process evaluation as described by Medley the teacher and principal assess the value of the on-going teaching-learning activity. It provides for continual reassessment of goal attainment and allows the teacher to make necessary adjustments to reach the goals.⁴

Eye, Netzer, and Krey emphasized the important relationship between process and product.

The reluctance to differentiate sharply between process and product has led many supervisors to evaluate process without reference to product. A positive suggestion is that the evaluation of process may be more pertinent to the discovery of reasons for an unsatisfactory product rather than to stand as an evaluative end.⁵

¹Howsam, p. 13.
Medley concurred that process or formative evaluation should be the basis for teacher evaluation and instructional improvement.

I would like to defend the proposition that teacher evaluation should be based on assessment of the process of teaching rather than on the product. Because teacher evaluation is a means to an end, not an end in itself. The purpose is to improve instruction in order to make the schools more effective. Thus for the purpose of improving instruction, process evaluation is far superior to product evaluation.¹

Wiles acknowledged that in evaluating teachers the supervisor assumes each teacher will act in a professional manner to achieve his own personal goals and the goals of the school.

Therefore, it is suggested that each staff member should explicate the personal and organizational goals he hopes to achieve each year, the process he plans to utilize, and the effort he plans to make. These desires should be discussed in detail with his coordinator and they should reach agreement. During the course of the year evidence should be assembled to verify the actualization of the processes and the achieved outcomes by both the teacher and the coordinator in order to check for congruency between objectives agreed on and performance objectives reached.²

Goldstein referred a goal-oriented approach to teacher evaluation.

... goal-oriented supervision eliminates what today's young might call mickey mouse elements of standard observation and evaluation reports and says to experienced teachers that: (1) all performances can be improved, (2) let us agree on major areas of your performance wherein you will work on improvement, and (3) at the end of a year, let us meet to discuss, analyze, and evaluate the degree to which you achieved what you said you would do.³

Lucio and McNeil discussed the procedures to be used in an evaluation program.

The supervisor, then, in working out procedures for the evaluation of teacher performance, starts with the goal of committing

¹Medley, p. 33. ²Wiles and Lovell, p. 243. ³Goldstein, p. 393.
teachers to defined and measurable tasks and establishing the conditions by which the teacher can succeed. Accordingly, the supervisor places teachers in a situation where (1) teaching objectives are defined and there is every reasonable probability of achieving them, (2) every effort and resource is applied to help teachers succeed in accomplishing the defined objectives, and (3) the quality of performance is judged in terms of how well the defined and agreed-upon objectives are achieved.¹

Thomas stated more specifically what principals could do to establish an evaluation relationship with their teachers.

1. Confer with each teacher on an individual basis, reviewing their goals, objectives or standards. During the meeting the principal should put the teacher at ease, allow the teacher to do most of the talking, develop a written statement of objectives and note what assistance will be provided.

2. The teacher should be asked to develop a program which would assist in reaching the mutually-agreed on objectives. The principal is obligated to observe the teacher often and provide help if needed.

3. At the end of the year the principal should have sufficient data to validate whether the objectives were achieved. The type of assessment or measurement used would depend on the goals: student achievement, classroom environment, or teaching strategies.²

McNally summarized the desirable characteristics of a teacher evaluation program:

1. 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.

2. The policies and procedures of the program reflect knowledge of the extensive research related to teacher evaluation.

3. Teachers know and understand the criteria by which they are evaluated.

4. The evaluation program is cooperatively planned, carried out, and evaluated by teachers, supervisors, and administrators.

5. The evaluations are as valid and as reliable as possible.

6. Evaluations are more diagnostic than judgmental.

7. Self-evaluation is an important objective of the program.

8. The self-image and self-respect of teachers is maintained and enhanced.

9. The nature of the evaluations is such that it encourages teacher creativity and experimentation in planning and guiding the teaching-learning experiences provided children.

¹Lucio and McNeil, p. 249. ²Thomas, pp. 5-7.
10. The program makes ample provision for clear, personalized, constructive feedback.\(^1\)

Lucio and McNeil emphasized that in the past, teacher evaluations were performed in ways which bore little relation to the teachers' essential tasks.\(^2\) In addition, McKenna reported that performance evaluation threatened those evaluated and was an onerous task for the principal.\(^3\)

William Drummond commented on how some teachers view evaluation.

Whenever I see evaluation forms, I wonder why evaluation isn't more closely related to what the teacher is trying to do. I have yet to be asked ahead of time what my intentions were for teaching a particular class, and then be observed in relation to what I was trying to do. It would seem to me that the criteria should be jointly agreed on by the evaluator and the evaluatee every time.\(^4\)

McKenna discussed the way teacher evaluation is.

1. Evaluation is threatening to teacher
2. They see it as something that is done to them by someone else
3. It is used mostly for determining teacher status relative to dismissal, tenure, and promotion, even though instructional improvement is often advertised as its major purpose
4. Teachers often are unaware of the criteria used to judge them

He then discussed how it ought to be:

1. Evaluation should be something that teachers anticipate and want because it gives them insight into their own performance
2. It should be something in which teachers have a part along with students, parents, and administrators
3. Evaluation should be used to diagnose teachers' performances so they can strengthen their weaknesses through in-service education
4. Teachers should take part in developing or selecting evaluation instruments so that they know criteria against which they are judged.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) McNally, pp. 24-28  
\(^2\) Lucio and McNeil, p. 246.  
\(^3\) McKenna, Context, p. 23.  
\(^5\) McKenna, p. 55.
The success or failure of the school is determined to a great extent by what the teacher does in the classroom.\textsuperscript{1} Therefore, it is imperative that the elementary principal assumes his role as an instructional leader by "utilizing the results of evaluation for in-service education, the improvements of instruction, and the continued growth and development of effective staff workers."\textsuperscript{2}

Summary

Teacher evaluation is a highly regarded supervisory activity by authors in the field. Because there is little agreement in the literature as to the qualities of an effective teacher, the cooperative development and execution of teacher evaluation programs by principals and teachers is essential to the success of this activity.

Teacher In-service

In-service education has been part of the educational scene ever since new teachers entered the profession bearing their certificates from normal training centers. Years ago, teachers were better educated than the society in general and because the school curriculum was relatively stable an occasional teachers' institute or conference was considered appropriate in-service.\textsuperscript{3}

In reviewing in-service education today, Milbrey McLaughlin and Paul Berman pointed out that because of declining enrollments and decreased budgets, school staffs are becoming increasingly stable and

\textsuperscript{1}Thomas, p. 7. \textsuperscript{2}Burr et al., p. 357. 

\textsuperscript{3}Elizabeth A. Dillon, "Staff Development: Bright Hope or Empty Promise?", \textit{Educational Leadership} 34 (December 1976): 165.
stale. In addition, they noted increased spending is not a panacea for all educational ills. The best and most expensive educational products which are put in the hands of unskilled or unmotivated teachers are doomed to failure. Therefore principals are turning from educational products and machines to training and development of staff as a means of improving instruction.¹

Bradfield discussed the need for in-service for all teachers. It may be assumed that all teachers at one time or another have problems for which they need supervisory help. The principal must work with all teachers on whatever problems are most in need of attention in such a way as to further the growth and development of both new and experienced teachers.²

The beginning teacher has a particular need for in-service because pre-service preparation is often inadequate. "Preservice training alone, then, cannot produce great teaching."³

In addition, Rubin discussed that beginning teachers have only student teaching experience and course work to draw upon. "All in all such training begets teachers who have little choice but to learn at the expense of their first students."⁴

Discussing the experienced teacher, Adolph Unruh and Harold E. Turner noted, "The experienced teacher has the problem of keeping up


²Bradfield, p. 62.


⁴Ibid., p. 35.
with new developments which outrun his techniques and outdate his curriculum."¹

... Even the perfect practitioner for 1966 would be grossly imperfect for 1976. Times change, the pupils change, curriculums change, situations change, and so we must have dynamic professional growth programs if we are going to have anything approximating excellence in education, now or in the future.²

An effective program for teacher in-service today should provide for continuous growth and assistance to all teachers, from neophyte to mature. Unruh and Turner discussed the focus of such a program.

... The beginner needs assistance in getting under way. The teacher achieving security needs aid of a different type and much freedom. The maturing teacher needs additional challenges to keep up his interest and support and to retain his enthusiasm. He can provide invaluable service by helping the beginner or occasionally the experienced teacher solve a problem. The maturing teacher group represents the greatest resource the supervisor could possibly have--if a satisfactory working relationship is maintained.³

Spears noted that in-service training or staff development is a much more flattering concept than supervision to teachers because in-service implies everyone on the staff, teacher administrator, etc., can grow on the job.⁴

A review of the literature revealed a variety of definitions for in-service. John Bartky noted the relationship between supervision and in-service education:

By definition all supervision is inservice education, but the term 'inservice education' is usually applied only to that teacher training which is done in teacher groups under the direction of a

¹Unruh and Turner, p. 91.

²Ben M. Harris, "In-Service Growth--The Essential Requirement," Educational Leadership 24 (December 1966): 257.

³Unruh and Turner, pp. 100-101.

⁴Spears, p. 351.
supervisor or some other educational expert, in conjunction with the over-all supervision program.¹

James M. Lipham and James A. Hoeh had an equally broad view of in-service:

... in-service education includes all professional development activities in which one engages after initial certification and employment and does not conclude until there is a termination of services.²

Neagley and Evans defined in-service education simply.

In-service education has been defined as any planned program involving supervisors and teachers in the improvement of classroom instruction.³

Raymond E. Hendee's definition specified the many purposes of in-service education.

Staff development is the sum of all planned activities designed for the purpose of improving, expanding, and renewing the skills, knowledge, and abilities of participants.⁴

C. Glenn Haas' often quoted definition of in-service education was all encompassing. "Broadly conceived, in-service education includes all activities engaged in by the professional personnel during their service and designed to contribute to improvement on the job."⁵

N. Durward Cory offered a definition which encompassed outcomes:

¹Bartky, p. 292.


³Neagley and Evans, Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction, p. 225.


In-service education is assumed to be the sponsoring or pursuance of activities which will bring new insights, growth, understanding, cooperative practices, democratic procedures, and community understanding to the members of the staff and arouse them to action to improve the curriculum, to take additional training, and to improve themselves and their work in every possible manner.¹

Klopf noted that the principal as leader of the elementary school, is responsible for a staff development program. "The establishment of the climate and the involvement of persons and resources to support staff development is the responsibility of the principal."² James Huge also stressed the importance of the principal's role in staff development. "... if schools are going to do the job required and expected of them, not only today but in the years to come, the principal can and must play a large role in the area of staff development."³

Swearingen viewed staff development as a priority of supervisors.

Persons responsible for supervision must become sensitive to the interrelationships among curriculum improvement, professional growth, and personal development, and they must recognize that helping teachers take the next step in personal growth is often the most significant thing they can do.⁴


⁴Swearingen, p. 139.
Stephen P. Hencley, Lloyd E. McCleary, and J. H. McGrath focused in-service responsibility on the elementary school principal.

Whether district-wide or 'local' and whether teacher-directed or subject-matter directed, the success of in-service development will depend in part upon certain general considerations. The elementary school principal has the responsibility of ascertaining the appropriateness for his organization members, as their chief spokesman.1

David Turney acknowledged the value of staff development as a supervisory activity, "... we believe that the most critical area for concentration of supervisory effort is on the professional development of the teacher. ..."2 Harris agreed that "In human organizations such as schools, professional growth is the central leadership task of supervision and an essential requirement of each individual."3

Lucio and McNeil commented on the increasing need for in-service training as a result of programmatic and societal changes.4

James Curtin noted that as the goals of the organization change, "An in-service education program directed at improving instruction must provide activities and experiences that are in harmony with the objectives of the program."5

... Teacher education, then, is considered a most important means to goal accomplishment in educational organizations. Accordingly,


3Harris, "In-Service Growth--The Essential Requirement," p. 260.

4Lucio and McNeil, Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action, p. 117.

5Curtin, p. 143.
supervisory practices and strategies have evolved from the com-
pelling charge to improve instruction through teacher growth.¹

The role of the elementary school principal in in-service edu-
cation does not include making decisions for the classroom teacher but, rather "to enhance and broaden the experience of the teacher in order to allow for more effective decision making."² The involvement of teachers from planning to evaluation of the in-service program was emphasized by Ben M. Harris and Wailand Bessent. "Involvement is an important key to success."³

Jessie L. Colquit and Elmira Hendrix stressed that after an area of deficiency is defined, an in-service program should be cooperatively planned by the principal and teachers. Speaking to principals they noted:

... In developing your in-service program ... make a concerted effort to serve as a stimulus for change, to raise questions, and to stimulate teachers to talk about the strengths and weaknesses of the school; and help them identify and define problems in need of study.⁴

Lipham and Hoeh agreed:

... On occasion, an entire staff recognizes a common pre-service preparation deficiency or need to be up-dated concerning emerging theory and practice. In such instances, the involvement of the faculty in identifying, planning and conducting relevant programs is essential. The principal, as leader of the staff, assists in

¹Feyereisen, Fiorino, and Nowak, p. 243.


³Harris and Bessent, p. 9.

the identification of needs and the provision of programs to meet those needs.¹

"Developing a training program requires groups of teachers, specialists, the principal, and the leadership support team to identify the human resources in the school and available to it."² "When such planning is undertaken cooperatively, with those persons to be affected by the in-service program systematically involved in all stages of the planning, it is possible for personal needs to be recognized while systematic procedures for change are employed."³ "Growth can come only where opportunity for growth is present. Participation in working out solutions of problems which are vital to teachers is the food which can provide further growth."⁴

Cory emphasized that if teachers are given an opportunity to determine the objectives of an in-service program, they will work toward making the program a success.⁵

... For the administrator to set up a type of organization in which teachers have an opportunity to share experiences and to contribute to the solution of problems which are of direct concern to teachers is probably the most vital of all incentives in setting up a truly successful program of in-service education.⁶

Neagley and Evans stated, "... a cooperatively planned in-service program will attract the interest and participation of more staff members, ..."⁷ They continued, "Supervisors should work with

---

¹Lipham and Hoeh, p. 257. ²Klopf, p. 8.
³Harris, "In-Service Growth--The Essential Requirement," p. 260.
⁴Cory, p. 393. ⁵Ibid., p. 392.
⁶Ibid., p. 393.
⁷Neagley and Evans, Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction, p. 218.
teachers in planning, so that in-service activities will result in more real participation and lasting results.\textsuperscript{1}

In initiating an in-service program the elementary principal must "know and understand the ways in which successful democratic relationships are carried on between the faculty and the administration."\textsuperscript{2} "The selection of the training mode or strategy to be used will depend upon an appraisal of all of the dynamics of the setting, the objectives to be attained, and the resources available."\textsuperscript{3}

Neagley and Evans concurred that the kind of in-service used would be dependent on many factors.

... The list of possible in-service programs is almost infinite, since actual planning will be based on a number of factors, such as staff experience and training, nature of the pupil population and community, and the status of curriculum development in the district.\textsuperscript{4}

Klopf presented a thorough review of in-service activities and noted the following structures are available for staff development: conference (convention), institute, workshop, seminar, course, carousel, colloquium, symposium, and school study approach. Within these structures Klopf suggested using the following activities to present information: lectures, discussions, panel presentations, forums, hearings, meetings, printed materials, media presentations, exhibits, library and resource centers, and staff meetings.\textsuperscript{5}

Harris identified in-service activities and categorized them

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1}Ibid., p. 225.
  \item \textsuperscript{2}Cory, p. 395.
  \item \textsuperscript{3}Klopf, p. 5.
  \item \textsuperscript{4}Neagley and Evans, \textit{Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction}, pp. 216-217.
  \item \textsuperscript{5}Klopf, pp. 35-46.
\end{itemize}
according to purpose, group size, experience impact, and tasks. The activities were as follows: brainstorming, buzz sessions, committees, demonstrations, directed practice, discussions, exhibits, field trips, films, T.V., first-hand experience, group therapy, structured interviews, focused interviews, non-directed interviews, inter-visitations, laboratory, lectures, meetings, observations, panels, readings, socials, tape recordings, testing, and writing. ¹

Fred T. Wilhelms discussed new techniques used in staff development. He referred to audio and video tapings, minicourses, and microteaching as important developments in the field of in-service program development. ²

Providing time for teacher in-service has always been a problem. In former years, in-service was held after teachers had put in a full day at work. Today principals are asked to seek alternatives which will enable teachers to be in-serviced while they are fresh and productive. "Solving this particular problem may be the supervisor's most important achievement because of the far-reaching implications for the entire instructional program."³

In addition, Rubin suggested that "in-service education can be a vexation: teachers endure meetings which are trivial, impotent, or both, and administrators search vainly for programs that will make an authentic difference in the quality of teaching that goes on."⁴

¹Harris, Supervisory Behavior in Education, p. 80.
³Unruh and Turner, p. 119.
⁴Rubin, p. 38.
Harris emphasized that in-service programs must be dynamic to be effective. He noted:

... a large portion of the activities carried on under the banner of in-service education are really tractive in their effects. This is to say they are efforts to defend existing practice against change, to orient new staff members to standardized operating procedures, or to make existing practice more uniform.¹

In addition, Unruh and Turner pointed out the financial restrictions in implementing an in-service program.

Most solutions to in-service problems involve increased costs—pay for substitutes to release teachers or reimbursement to teachers for working other than during the regular school day. Supplies and materials are also necessary for a successful in-service program often in large quantities. With the normally tight instructional budget, these additional expenditures call for careful advance planning on the part of the supervisor.²

Recognizing and dealing effectively with the problems of in-service education should be faced squarely by both principal and staff. Rubin commented that the principal's role in an effective in-service program will:

... become a facilitating rather than directing role, teachers' motivation and commitment will become correspondingly more important, and the desire to grow and improve will, in turn, depend to a considerable extent on the degree of satisfaction teachers derive from their efforts.³

Cory summarized the recommendations made in the literature by offering ten elements for an effective program in staff development:

1. Teachers are made to feel that they are an integral part of the school administration
2. Opportunities exist for promoting teacher improvement
3. Curriculum planning is carried on cooperatively by teachers, administrators, and supervisors
4. Research and experimentation by teachers and teacher groups is encouraged

¹Harris, "In-Service Growth--The Essential Requirement," p. 257.
²Unruh and Turner, p. 120.
³Rubin, p. 49.
5. New teachers are well oriented to their positions
6. There is teacher-parent-community cooperation
7. Salary practices are adequate and recognize training and experience
8. Sufficient time is available to carry on group activities without injury to health and morale
9. The administrator is fair and open minded. Suggestions of teachers carry weight with him and are given careful consideration
10. All activities are carried on by administrators, supervisors, and teachers working as a team toward their fulfillment

Summary

Authors in the field of supervision view in-service training as an essential supervisory activity provided by principals to help teachers broaden and deepen their knowledge of children and subject matter. Principals use information gained from classroom visitations and principal-teacher conferences to assist in determining areas of need. Planning for in-service should be undertaken cooperatively by all those to be involved or affected, so as to provide the greatest opportunity for awareness and growth.

Curriculum Development

Hicks described the curriculum in early periods of history as "almost entirely prescribed by the state and enjoying an almost sacred status among the teachers in the schools of the state." In addition, Unruh and Turner commented that "The authoritarian supervisor of yesterday felt that things could best be altered by administrative (supervisory) directives to teachers."

---

1 Cory, p. 394.
3 Unruh and Turner, p. 186.
"The years have seen a shift toward the assumption of a greater degree of local responsibility for the nature of the instructional program."¹ Although there are common elements in district curriculum programs today, there is sufficient flexibility to allow for local innovation. Ronald Doll noted that this flexibility spotlights the importance of high quality leadership in schools of the 1970's. "Continuing studies, including those by foundations concerned with education, show that where leadership is weak or lacking in continuity, instructional programs are likely to fail."²

A review of the literature provided a variety of definitions of "curriculum". Swearingen noted "curriculum should be defined as including those experiences of children for which the school accepts responsibility."³

Mosher and Purpel's definition was more encompassing. "The curriculum, in simplest terms, is those experiences, materials, and techniques that constitute what the students are supposed to and/or actually learn."⁴

Neagley and Evans' definition focused on outcomes and abilities. "Curriculum should be defined as all of the planned experiences provided by the school to assist pupils in attaining the designated learning outcomes to the best of their abilities."⁵

¹Hicks, p. 223.
³Swearingen, p. 301.
⁴Mosher and Purpel, p. 5.

... In this book the planned curriculum is defined as broad goals and specific objectives, content, learning activities, use of instructional media, teaching strategies, and evaluation-stated, planned, and carried out by school personnel. The "hidden" curriculum includes learnings in cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains that are acquired concurrently with the planned curriculum but come about as a result of conditions or experiences not deliberately planned or set forth in advance.1

Curriculum development was defined simply by Ronald Brandt as "the planning of programs designed to enable people to learn."2

McNally and Passow discussed the definition of curriculum in relation to curriculum improvement.

When the curriculum is perceived as all those experiences which children and youth have under the school's jurisdiction, then curriculum improvement may involve any of the many dimensions of the educational process influencing the nature and quality of these experiences.3

Feyereisen, Fiorino, and Nowak succinctly stated the importance of curriculum development in relation to supervision. "The substance of supervision in educational organizations is curriculum improvement. That is, its main concern is with the design and operation of quality programs."4

4 Feyereisen, Fiorino, and Nowak, p. 115.
instruction, in-service education of staff, and supervision are complex aspects of the formulation of the total education program of the school.¹

Curtin pointed out that the curriculum was the setting for instructional improvement.

"... If supervisory activities are not reflected in curriculum practice, supervision does not exist. There is no other outlet for it except the curriculum, and, if this outlet is not utilized, supervisory programs, even the most elaborate and expensive, are worse than useless."²

"If one wishes to deal with improvement practices, he must be familiar with the strengths and weaknesses of the various types of curriculum and the influence of classroom organization."³

Hicks noted that curriculum improvement activities affect the quality and effectiveness of the entire school program. "... most educators feel that educational improvement begins with the improvement of the curriculum."⁴ McNally and Passow agreed that "Awareness and ability critically to appraise curriculum issues is an important part of the process of upgrading program quality."⁵

Hencley, McCleary, and McGrath described the role of the elementary school principal in relation to curriculum improvement.

"... the effectiveness of the school's program depends upon its curriculum--how it is conceived; how it is organized; how it is implemented; and how it is continuously developed. No other task is more important in the principalship, if the principal is to exercise educational leadership and enhance his role. Nothing could be more dangerous to education than for this task to be removed from the principal's purview or responsibility or for

¹Stephen P. Hencley, Lloyd E. McCleary, and J. H. McGrath, p. 155.

²Curtin, p. 161.

³Ibid., p. 183.

⁴Hicks, p. 220.

⁵McNally and Passow, p. 79.
it to be abdicated by him through a lack of understanding of its importance or the ability to perform in this phase of his role.¹

Swearingen emphasized that the principal is responsible for instructional leadership in the school.² A study conducted by the Department of Elementary School Principals in 1968 surveyed 2,292 principals and found that over fifty percent "modify and adapt" the general school system's curriculum program working in cooperation with the teachers of their schools.³

Huber M. Walsh also emphasized the importance of the principal as a curriculum-change engineer.

... Whether the proposed change involves the use of a commercial package program, a curriculum borrowed from another school system, or the building from the ground up of a new approach, the principal is the key person in the development, diffusion and adoption of the idea.⁴

Mosher and Purpel's comments reflected the consensus of the literature.

... when the supervisor serves as a curriculum developer, he organizes curriculum materials, involves teachers in their production and implementation and acts as a resource person for individual teachers. Clearly the development of curriculum is of prime importance to teaching and virtually all contemporary writers in the field argue that supervision should always include this function.⁵

Because the "real authority for the instructional program of the school has rested increasingly with the principal,"⁶ it is crucial

that the principal "exercise leadership in developing a strategy for the accomplishment of the task."\textsuperscript{1}

Burr et al., noted how the principal exerts leadership in curriculum development.

\ldots{} the principal \ldots{} provides the leadership and organization through which his faculty is encouraged to take the initiative in and to participate in curriculum endeavors, while at the same time fostering an experimental approach in curriculum. \ldots{}\textsuperscript{2}

Mark Chesler, Richard Schmuck, and Ronald Lippitt emphasized the role of the principal in facilitating curriculum invocation.

\ldots{} principals must act in ways that demonstrate their support of staff inventiveness. It is not enough that the principal be interested in staff innovativeness; his interest must be obvious to the staff. The principal who publicly supports new classroom practices is more likely to have innovative teachers than the one who does not.\textsuperscript{3}

Unruh and Turner discussed how a principal could be influential in initiating change.

The supervisor who takes on the leadership in fostering and initiating change has a complicated task. He has to set up committees and get them in operation. He must discover and develop leaders not only to take over these groups but to strike out in new directions themselves. Both structures and leaders need support systems, including community approval, administrative encouragement, financial backing, time to do the job, and clerical assistance.\textsuperscript{4}

Lucio and McNeil noted the following guidelines which an elementary school principal could follow to affect change.

\begin{itemize}
\item[1] Walsh, p. 258.
\item[2] Burr et al., Elementary School Administration, p. 449.
\item[4] Unruh and Turner, p. 188.
\end{itemize}
1. There must be clear evidence that the leadership is strongly supporting the new proposals for change. People are responsive to what their leaders want. No one should remain in doubt about how the principal feels about a change in the case of an individual school . . .
2. Individuals realize that their own future is intimately linked with the fortune of the schools and the proposed change
3. There is institutional resistance to forces which endeavor to change the character of the school
4. The behavior of individuals is affected by the actions of the group to which they belong
5. The success of any plan for change requires that individuals have opportunity to master new skills
6. The process of change is expedited if effective measuring devices are developed
7. Big changes are sometimes relatively easier to make than small ones

Robert Knoop and Robert O'Reilly wrote "It is a maxim in decision making that individuals who are affected by decisions should participate in making these decisions."

"Unless the teacher is involved and changed, there is little reason to believe that anything else that might be done could significantly improve instruction."

Ultimately, all changes in education—in instruction or in improvement of learning—take place in the classroom and are carried out by teachers. The teacher, then, is the crucial person in the situation, the base on which all programs are built. Therefore, the supervisor's first consideration is to develop a climate in which teachers accept the concept that better ways can be found and should be sought.

Unruh and Turner pointed out that "while the supervisor is an agent of change he does not himself order it."

1Lucio and McNeil, pp. 109-111.
3Henley, McCleary, and McGrath, p. 168.
4Unruh and Turner, p. 197.
5Ibid., p. 186.
Grobman commented that a principal's leadership style contributed to the receptivity of the staff to curricular change in elementary schools. "Teachers in elementary schools with democratic principals have significantly more favorable attitudes toward curriculum change than teachers with authoritarian principals."¹

Gordon N. MacKenzie referred to individuals who were responsible for curricular changes as internal and external participants in change.

Internal participants are those who had a direct connection with the legal or social system from which a particular description was taken. Because of this relationship, they had a greater potential than other participants for several kinds of direct action in respect to one or more of the determiners of the curriculum. External participants are those outside of the immediate social or legal system under consideration. Both groups of participants have a potential for indirect action (influence on those who have the power to take direct action).²

MacKenzie identified ten major groups of internal participants: "teachers, principals, supervisors, superintendents, boards of education, citizens in local communities, state legislatures, state boards or departments of education, and state and federal courts."³ He also identifies six (6) categories of external participants:

... "non-educationists (individuals and groups), foundations, academicians (individuals and groups), business and industry (including materials and facilities producers, and agents of the mass media), educationists (individuals, groups, and organizations such as teacher-educating institutions, accrediting agencies, and professional associations), and the national government (primarily the legislative and executive branches)."⁴


³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., pp. 413-414.
Doll recognized all the contributors to curriculum reorganization but noted the importance of the local district.

The individuals and organizations within local school districts who have special roles in improving the curriculum are teachers and their aides, pupils, administrators and supervisors, boards of education, and individual laymen and groups of laymen. Though outside agencies are affecting schools in important ways, the center of the improvement process remains with the American community.¹

"The school faculty, with parent and pupil participation at appropriate points, is responsible for planning a coherent, integrated program."² "Citizens, parents, teachers, and children all have appropriate contributions to make to genuine curriculum improvement."³

Conrad Toepfer noted, "It is critical that the means to curriculum development be undertaken with a commitment to the true representative interaction of professionals, students, and community citizens."⁴

Delma Della-Dora discussed why group involvement in curriculum development was essential.

"... In its simplest terms, when a group of people really works together for common goals in ways sanctioned by the group each one takes responsibility for everything that is decided. The group does not expect only the administrator or supervisor to follow up and 'monitor' or 'enforce' decisions. If truly made by the group, the decisions 'belong' to the group. Every person is simultaneously 'leader' and 'follower'."⁵

A review of the literature revealed agreement regarding the value of teacher involvement in curriculum development; teachers are

¹Doll, p. 269. ²Hencley, McCleary, and McGrath, pp. 156-157.
³Hicks, p. 222.
the first level of influence and their involvement is crucial to curriculum development and instructional improvement.

... Regardless of how sound the plan, or how enlightened the conceptualization of learning at other levels, it can only be facilitative of the processes initiated and carried out by the teacher with learners. The teacher makes many decisions and shapes the learning situation regardless of how detailed the plan or how carefully designed the materials might be.¹

George A. Beauchamp emphasized that the local school provides the perfect arena for curriculum development. In particular he noted the need to involve teachers in planning the curriculum because they (teachers) in turn would remain to implement and appraise the success of the program.²

Wiles and Lovell noted the importance of administrator and faculty cooperation in curriculum development. "The important principle involved is that the administrator should not make the decision without thorough consideration by the people who will be involved in its implementation."³ Hicks agreed by stating, "local administrators and teachers, involving community contributions whenever possible, have found it possible to bring about much needed change through organized curriculum study,"⁴ "... the more teachers have an opportunity to participate in the preparation of curriculum materials, the more likely these materials are to be used in classroom teaching and learning situation."⁵

¹Hencley, McCleary, and McGrath, p. 156.
³Wiles and Lovell, p. 134.
⁴Hicks, p. 223.
⁵Bradfield, pp. 105-106.
Harris pointed out that as teachers plan the curriculum they increase in professional skills.

Teachers, in turn, working individually or with others for the solution of a particular curriculum issue or problem, tend to gain a deeper understanding of what they are about. They tend to grow—to grow in professional skills, understandings and attitudes, for they are then working on problems or needs which they personally feel to be significant in their work with boys and girls. Definitely current curriculum improvement focuses its attention upon the professional growth and development of the individual teacher.¹

Dewar suggested certain criteria be present to ensure that teachers are able to participate meaningfully and effectively in curriculum development.

1. There must be time provided for the teachers to work effectively on curriculum improvement and revision
2. The teachers must receive encouragement from the administration to carry on curriculum work
3. The teachers must receive guidance from the administration in the progress of their curriculum planning
4. The work which the teachers do on curriculum must be recognized and considered by the administration
5. Effective and creative curriculum revision appropriate to the particular school district should be adopted and implemented by the administration
6. The teachers should feel free and be encouraged to conduct experimentation, either in their own classes or on a district wide basis²

"There are numerous ways of involving teachers in planning the curriculum . . . summer workshops, year round workshops, classroom research."³ But simply to announce that workshops have been formed or courses will be offered is not sufficient. McNally and Passow suggested machinery for initiating curriculum change must include provision for:

¹Harris, Supervisory Behavior in Education, p. 338.
³Ibid., p. 5.
1. Regular discussions for sharing common concerns to make significant problems visible and for exchanging ideas
2. Development of channels for communicating instructional problems to a central planning and coordinating group
3. New materials to be sent to individuals and groups, keeping them abreast of new developments
4. Opportunities for individuals and groups to have contact with new ideas and practices through conferences, meetings, and school visitations
5. Study of practices and procedures to gather pertinent information about the educational program
6. Encouragement and support of experimentation and research in the classroom by furnishing necessary aid (e.g., consultants, materials, and skill training)
7. Periodic evaluation of learning and teaching, and analysis of results for leads to improving program quality

Sufficient teacher time to accomplish curriculum development is pivotal to the success of the task.

Teachers cannot be expected to work productively for several hours in the late afternoon after a full day of teaching. Consequently, released time or extra calendar days should be provided for curriculum work. At the very minimum, five or six full days or their equivalent per school year are needed to carry out any significant project. At least ten days per year or weekly released time is recommended. Also, if teachers are to have time for needed reading and research between regularly scheduled curriculum days, teacher-pupil ratios and class loads must be reasonable.

Perhaps the most important implication for elementary school principals involves their responsibility to play active roles in initiating, planning, and evaluating curriculum development programs in the local school.

Principals and teachers who are in daily contact with children are most familiar with the needs of the learners. They are therefore in the best position to plan and effect curricular changes.

---

1 McNally and Passow, pp. 78-79.
2 Neagley and Evans, Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction, p. 228.
Planning and effecting change at the local-school level involves fewer persons than when changes are made district-wide. Communication lines are shorter and more direct. This serves to facilitate the process of curriculum development.¹

**Summary**

Although the literature reveals various definitions of "curriculum", authors in the field of supervision agree that curriculum development is essential to the improvement of instruction. Principals, teachers, parents, and students who work cooperatively have an opportunity to participate in program development and are more likely to support the resulting curriculum changes.

**Faculty Meetings**

Faculty meetings in the past were used primarily for administrative purposes. Principals would use faculty meetings to make announcements and distribute information.² As a result, faculty meetings have been characteristically dull and dry in many schools.³ "Nothing infuriates a school faculty more than a pointless, aimless, and unplanned meeting."⁴

Today, many schools use faculty meetings to discuss "school problems and their implications for program improvement."⁵ Faculty meetings set the stage for teacher-administrator relationships. "In these meetings the faculty learns what its role is to be in the operation of the school."⁶ "... a well-structured, well-planned staff

---

¹Walsh, p. 251. ²Hicks, p. 243. ³Bradfield, p. 41. ⁴Curtin, p. 120. ⁵Hicks, p. 243. ⁶Burr et al., p. 123.
meeting appears to be a source of great professional satisfaction to a school staff.\textsuperscript{1}

Faculty meetings have long been recommended as a supervisory practice in the literature.\textsuperscript{2} Bradfield noted the role of faculty meetings in the improvement of instruction. "Staff meetings are an essential part of a supervisory program and every effort should be made to utilize such meetings as a device for improving instruction."\textsuperscript{3} Harris concurred by stating, "The all-faculty meeting has long been used as one of the devices for securing improvements in instruction."\textsuperscript{4} Curtin discussed the importance of faculty meetings in terms of goal accomplishment. "In this vein staff meetings have a crucial role to play, for they can focus on what needs to be accomplished and then determine the best solution."\textsuperscript{5} Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops discussed the relationship of faculty meetings to the supervisory program. "Staff meetings play a crucial role in the success of a supervisory program by furnishing the means for communicating common understanding, workable techniques, and uniform purposes."\textsuperscript{6}

Faculty meetings are a vehicle for upgrading the instructional program of an elementary school.\textsuperscript{7} They provide a means whereby all the staff members can "share in the development of anticipated changes in policies and techniques."\textsuperscript{8}

\textsuperscript{1}Curtin, p. 120. \textsuperscript{2}Jacobson, Reavis, and Logsdon, p. 103. \textsuperscript{3}Bradfield, p. 41. \textsuperscript{4}Harris, \textit{Supervisory Behavior in Education}, p. 331. \textsuperscript{5}Curtin, p. 112. \textsuperscript{6}Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops, p. 341. \textsuperscript{7}Ibid. \textsuperscript{8}Bradfield, p. 43.
Kyte discussed three types of staff meetings: social meetings, administrative meetings, and supervisory meetings. Although the content of each kind of meeting is not mutually exclusive, faculty meetings do tend to have a particular emphasis.

Bradfield stated, "Faculty meetings are more valuable when each meeting has a central purpose. . . . Each meeting should contribute in some way to the improvement of instruction."

McKean and Mills noted the relationship between faculty meetings, instructional improvement, and teacher growth.

Teachers' meetings as a supervisory device are important to the growth of teachers and the improvement of learning and teaching. When well-handled and carefully planned, they may help satisfy the social needs of teachers, develop feelings of belonging and identification with the staff, and resolve differences among subgroups and individuals, as well as lead to the identification, analysis, and solution of significant instructional problems.

Spears presented additional purposes for faculty meetings.

Faculty meetings become the clearing house for instructional procedures. Instructional developments are germinated and evaluations of effort are reported there. Committees that work at the miscellaneous projects undertaken present their progress reports before the entire group.

Supervisory literature supported elementary principals' use of faculty meetings for many purposes. Faculty meetings . . . are described as opportunities for cooperative thinking, for staff planning, for the presentation of stimulating talks by resource people, for getting to know the total school, and for interchange of ideas--all of which result in growth for the staff member.

---


2Bradfield, p. 43.

3McKean and Mills, p. 73.

4Spears, p. 197.

5Wiles and Lovell, p. 223.
Curtin noted seven purposes for faculty meetings:

1. To aid in the identification of instructional problems
2. To formulate ways of dealing with instructional problems
3. To develop more dramatic and creative approaches to instruction
4. To pool the ideas and strengths of the staff
5. To develop an increased sense of "all-school" or "all-district" feeling
6. To evaluate certain elements of the supervisory program
7. To plan next steps on the basis of evaluation

McKean and Mills qualified the need of calling total faculty meetings using purpose as a criteria.

Teachers' meetings which bring together the entire faculty should deal with curriculum and instructional matters of broad and general import to the total program, while more specific matters involving a particular subject area or a single elementary grade should be handled in departmental or grade level meetings.

Curtin emphasized that faculty meetings are essential to a supervisory program because they aid in the improvement of instruction. Burr et al. added: "The vitality and efficiency of the meetings of the faculty determine to a considerable degree the success or failure of the group efforts devoted to instructional improvement."

There have been numerous criticisms of faculty meetings over the years. Edward F. DeRoche's 1972 study of 223 principals' attitudes and ideas on faculty meetings indicated that elementary school principals assume an authoritarian role in planning and conducting faculty meetings. Elementary principals choose the time, day, and agenda for the meetings as well as serve as discussion leaders.

---

1 Curtin, p. 113.  
2 McKean and Mills, p. 72.  
3 Curtin, pp. 112-113.  
4 Burr et al., p. 123.  
5 Edward F. DeRoche, "Elementary School Faculty Meetings: Research and Recommendations," National Elementary Principal 51 (January 1972): 43.
John E. Gray noted other criticisms of faculty meetings.

... Too much consideration of dry routine in general faculty meetings will kill the enthusiasm and fervor of all but the most consecrated, and attendance at general faculty meetings becomes a boring chore instead of the heartening professional experience which it should be.¹

McKean and Mills stated that teachers often have a negative reaction to staff meetings because of poor administrative leadership. Principals who read mimeographed announcements or bulletins or lecture at length to the staff contribute to teachers' distaste for staff meetings.²

Amidon and Blumberg's study of principal and teacher perceptions of faculty meetings in 1966 indicated that teachers viewed faculty meetings as a waste of time.³

Blumberg and Amidon also noted that a crucial factor to the success of faculty meetings was faculty involvement. They found teachers had a more positive attitude about faculty meetings when they were responsible for the meetings. Negative attitudes were related to faculty meetings which the principal called and controlled.⁴

Effective staff meetings provide an opportunity for those


²McKean and Mills, p. 71.


involved in implementation to have a part in the planning process. "The important consideration is that staff meetings, by achieving purposes perceived to be important by teachers, not only help to develop a sound improvement program, but also develop good attitudes about teaching and the profession." "Modern supervisory techniques place emphasis on more participation by the staff in the study of educational problems." Harris called for teacher participation through a faculty planning committee. "For maximum favorable results, the planning of faculty meetings should be a joint effort of the administrator and the teaching staff." Gray stated, "A faculty committee should be appointed to work with the administrative head in planning general faculty meetings which will be of most benefit to the teachers." Jacobson, Reavis, and Logsdon concurred, "A committee of teachers representative of the faculty may meet with the principal to plan a series of meetings in accord with the supervisory plan for the school." Edward F. DeRoche noted, "To make maximal use of democratic procedures and teacher involvement, the principal should ask the teachers to elect a faculty meeting plan-

---

1 Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops, p. 344.
2 Curtin, pp. 135-136.
3 Bradfield, p. 44.
4 Harris, *Supervisory Behavior in Education*, p. 331.
5 Gray, p. 243.
ning committee that will assist him in planning, conducting, and evaluating faculty meetings."¹

Meetings in which teachers take an active part are more beneficial and interesting for all concerned. Demonstrations, explanations, committee reports, study-group information, and resource presentations are examples of the individual methods by which teachers might take a meaningful, stimulating, and satisfying part in staff meetings. This participation should help to create staff meetings that reflect the efforts of a dynamic, harmonious working group.²

Wiles and Lovell stated, "The faculty meeting must be centered on something that the teachers consider important."³ Therefore, "The agenda for a faculty meeting should be developed by the total staff, with each member, on an equal basis, offering any problem that he considers important."⁴

Jacobson, Reavis, and Logsdon specified how the agenda for faculty meetings should be developed.

The preparation of an agenda for the meeting in duplicated form for distribution in advance has a salutary effect. Such an agenda should state the topic for consideration, include a number of provocative questions, and list the pertinent professional references which are available in the library of the office.⁵

Curtin viewed a cooperatively prepared agenda as a means to secure inclusion of items of importance to all present.

One way to insure the inclusion of only relevant matters in staff meetings is to share the agenda building with the staff. This can be simply handled by requesting items for the agenda, or it can range to a more elaborate structure of having a duly constituted committee to screen matters which are to come before the staff.⁶

¹DeRoche, p. 43. ²Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops, p. 247. ³Wiles and Lovell, p. 224. ⁴Ibid. ⁵Jacobson, Reavis, and Logsdon, p. 104. ⁶Curtin, pp. 121-122.
The role of the principal in faculty meetings was discussed by Spears.

... The faculty meeting is the principal's strategic coordination center. His meetings are democratically planned and carried out. The principal neither takes a back seat nor does he monopolize the speaker's stand. His influence is felt, but the meetings represent maximum participation.¹

McKean and Mills noted the principal's role in relation to the staff at a faculty meeting.

... The administrator does not necessarily withdraw from the group. He should remain, in the best democratic sense, a member of the group, for he may be an important resource in exploring and attempting to solve the problem. He should contribute when appropriate, but he should not dominate the discussion from the sidelines.²

Ralph Kimbrough emphasized the need for the principal to be a facilitator of group decision-making. "The faculty meeting provides an opportunity for the principal to express his leadership in cooperative decision-making."³

Joseph W. Licata, Elmer C. Ellis, and Charles M. Wilson acknowledged the principal as an effective change agent when initiating structure for innovation through committee formation. "The organization of a committee made up of teachers and administrators concerned with solving a school problem may be a common example of a school administrator's attempt to initiate structure for educational change in his building."⁴

DeRoche stated some duties of the principal at a teacher-

¹Spears, p. 197. ²McKean and Mills, p. 72.
oriented faculty meeting. "The principal exhibits a different kind of role in this democratic process. He leads the faculty in defining the problem, explaining and studying possible solutions, and evaluating final outcomes."\(^1\)

Burr et al. stressed the need for the principal to see himself as an active member of the group.

Our assumption in regard to faculty meetings is that the principal will want the total faculty to make decisions about instructional matters that affect the entire school program. We are assuming, further, that the principal will see himself as a member of the faculty who has active roles to play as stimulator, coordinator, consultant, and guide.\(^2\)

The frequency, time, place, and day of faculty meetings has not been a subject of much research.\(^3\)

How frequently a staff should meet is subject to such variables as the number of urgent problems that need attention, the involvement of the staff in system-wide in-service education, the length of meetings, the size of the staff, the involvement of teachers with committees and small groups, and the like.\(^4\)

Wiles and Lovell noted that a pleasant area with optional furniture arrangements should be chosen for a staff meeting.\(^5\) In addition, Hicks and Jameson suggested time be allowed for informal conversation over coffee and snacks prior to the meetings.\(^6\)

An important part of the planning for faculty development should be the arrangement for social activities that will help teachers get to know each other better and that will develop a feeling of unity that differences of opinion will not disrupt. Such activities build solid human relations on which the program can grow.\(^7\)

---

\(^1\)DeRoche, pp. 43-44.  
\(^2\)Burr et al., pp. 124-125.  
\(^3\)DeRoche, p. 41.  
\(^4\)Burr et al., p. 128.  
\(^5\)Wiles and Lovell, p. 226.  
\(^6\)Hicks and Jameson, p. 32.  
\(^7\)Wiles and Lovell, p. 226.
The time of day faculty meetings are held has been discussed often in the literature. Harl R. Douglass commented that "The types of teachers' meetings which are not popular are those which come at the end of a school day . . . ."\(^1\) Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops noted that "The trend is to hold faculty meetings as a part of the normal working day, early in the day, rather than to require members of the staff to work an additional number of hours because of necessary staff meetings."\(^2\) Jacobson, Reavis, and Logsdon discussed how some schools provided for meeting time. "Some schools have dismissed classes during the last hour before the close of the day to allow time for meetings during the school day."\(^3\) Wiles and Lovell pointed out that by using school time for meetings, the "feeling that faculty meetings were something beyond the regular job," was eliminated.\(^4\)

Neagley and Evans offered six guidelines for effective faculty meetings.

1. Teachers should be involved in planning the agenda and in preparing items for discussion
2. Leadership should be rotated in the group
3. A time limit must be set and adhered to strictly. Meetings of course are to be scheduled within the "teacher day" as defined by district policy
4. The contributions of all faculty members are viewed as worth of consideration. The principal and teachers need to understand and practice the basic principles of group dynamics and effective interaction
5. If the group members lack training and experience in real interaction, the principal might invite an expert from a nearby

\(^2\)Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops, pp. 345-346.
\(^3\)Jacobson, Reavis, and Logsdon, p. 104.
\(^4\)Wiles and Lovell, p. 225.
university to conduct several sessions on the techniques of working together, sharing leadership, respecting views of others, etc.

6. Topics of vital concern to the faculty, such as proposed new curriculums, nongrading in the high school, or summer workshop planning, should be given priority. Routine matters ought to be eliminated from the agenda; these can be handled by administrative bulletin. Daniel R. Davies and Kenneth F. Herrold noted that faculty meetings could be meaningful and effective supervisory tools when teacher involvement was secured in the planning process, when the topics dealt with ongoing and emergent problems of the staff, and when the teachers, as a committee, were allowed to review and revise the format and topics based on need. 

**Summary**

Faculty meetings provide opportunities for elementary principals to be facilitators of group decision-making. Faculty meetings are recommended by authors in the field of educational supervision as an important means to secure teacher involvement through input and feedback. Teachers should be afforded an opportunity to add items to the agendas and contribute to presentations. Relevant topics which are of vital concern to the faculty will promote the growth of all participants.

**General Summary**

Authors in the field of educational supervision recommended that elementary principals use six supervisory activities which have

---


the greatest potential for improving instruction: classroom visitation, principal-teacher conferences, teacher evaluation, teacher in-service, curriculum development and faculty meetings. The current emphasis is to involve teachers in the planning, development, and evaluation of each supervisory activity. The reason for this emphasis is the belief that the greatest opportunity for commitment to improve occurs when those individuals (teachers) who will be involved or affected by a supervisory activity have an opportunity to work cooperatively with the principal to plan and evaluate the effectiveness of the activity.
CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The main purposes of this study were: (1) to review the literature to determine the most commonly recommended supervisory activities for principals, (2) to determine the frequency of use and value given to these supervisory activities by selected elementary school principals, (3) to determine the value given to the supervisory activities by the principals' superintendents, (4) to determine the superintendents' expectations for principals' frequency of usage of the supervisory activities, (5) to determine if a relationship existed between the supervisory activities of elementary school principals and their superintendents' expectations, (6) to determine if a relationship existed between the kind/frequency of supervisory activities of elementary school principals with job descriptions as compared to the kind/frequency of supervisory activities of elementary principals without job descriptions, and (7) to determine if a relationship existed between the supervisory expectations of superintendents whose principals have job descriptions and the supervisory expectations of superintendents whose principals do not have job descriptions. The nature of the relationships were analyzed with particular focus on similarities, dissimilarities, strengths, weaknesses, problems, pitfalls, and trends.

To accomplish the purposes of the study related literature
was reviewed to determine the most commonly recommended supervisory activities for elementary school principals, of which there were six.

The study sample consisted of all elementary principals (139) and all superintendents (30) in DuPage County, Illinois, divided into two groups, districts with and without job descriptions for principals. Questionnaires using the Likert scale were validated and sent to all principals in DuPage County to determine the value given to supervisory activities and the frequency of their usage. One hundred four (104) elementary principals responded to the questionnaire. Questionnaires using the Likert scale were validated and sent to all superintendents in DuPage County to determine the value given to the supervisory activity by the superintendents and their expectations of principal usage. Twenty-six superintendents of elementary districts in DuPage County, Illinois, responded. Principals and superintendents in the population as well as a panel of professors were also asked to rank the six supervisory activities according to relative value.

Principals and superintendents in responding to the questionnaire of six supervisory skills were asked to rate the value of each activity using the following criteria:

1. no importance
2. minor importance
3. average importance
4. major importance
5. critical importance

In addition, principals, superintendents, and professors were asked to rank the value of each supervisory activity in relation to
the five others, one being the most important and six being the least important.

A random sample of four districts with job descriptions for principals was drawn for follow-up interviews of the superintendent and two principals from each district. All four districts without a job description were included in the study. Where there were more than two principals in the district, a random sample of principals was chosen. If there were two or less principals in a district, all principals were included in the study.

The responses on the Likert scale portion of the questionnaire from principals and superintendents were compared using z and t tests of significance as appropriate. The portion of the questionnaire which required principals, superintendents, and professors to rank the six supervisory activities according to relative value was analyzed using Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance to determine the level of agreement.

Chapter III is divided into nine sections. Within each section there is a presentation of data with an analysis of the data. While analysis sections are presented, some data sections also contain analysis for clarity and emphasis.

1. Principals and superintendents in DuPage County, Illinois
   A. Comparison of questionnaire responses
   B. Analysis of questionnaire responses
   C. Analysis of rankings of professors, principals, and superintendents

2. Principals and superintendents with and without job
descriptions in DuPage County, Illinois
A. Comparison of questionnaire responses
B. Analysis of questionnaire responses

3. Superintendents with job descriptions for principals and superintendents without job descriptions for principals
A. Comparison of questionnaire responses
B. Analysis of questionnaire responses

4. Principals with job descriptions and superintendents with job descriptions for principals
A. Comparison of questionnaire responses
B. Analysis of questionnaire responses

5. Principals without job descriptions and superintendents without job descriptions for principals
A. Comparison of questionnaire responses
B. Analysis of questionnaire responses

6. Seven principals and four superintendents in districts without job descriptions for principals
A. Comparison and analysis of questionnaire and interview responses

7. Eight principals and four superintendents in districts with job descriptions for principals
A. Comparison and analysis of questionnaire and interview responses

8. Analysis of interviews

9. Analysis of job descriptions
Questionnaire Responses of Participating Principals and Superintendents in DuPage County, Illinois

Classroom Visitation

Item P-la for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place on classroom visitation as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? A parallel question for superintendents was item S-la: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on classroom visitation as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level there was a significant difference ($z = 2.530; p < .05$). Superintendents' mean scores on classroom visitation as a supervisory activity was $4.423$; principals was $4.106$ (see Table 1).

Principals' responses on item P-la were then compared to principals' responses on item P-lc applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level. Item P-lc was: How much importance do you think your superintendent places on classroom visitation as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? When P-la was compared to P-lc no significant difference was observed ($z = 1.553; p > .05$). The mean score of P-la was $4.106$ the mean score of P-lc was $3.921$ (see Table 1).

In applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level comparing principals' responses on P-lc to superintendents' responses on S-la, a significant difference was noted ($z = 3.820; p < .05$). The mean score of P-lc was $3.931$; the mean score of S-la was $4.423$ (see Table 1).

The majority of principals responding to P-la anticipated
TABLE 1

DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OR UNIMPORTANCE GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO CLASSROOM VISITATION AS A SUPERVISORY ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>P-la to S-la</th>
<th>P-la to P-lc</th>
<th>P-lc to S-la</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-la</td>
<td>P-lc</td>
<td>S-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-la How much importance do you, as principal, place on classroom visitation as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

P-lc How much importance do you think your superintendent places on classroom visitation as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

S-la How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on classroom visitation as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?
their superintendents would have a view similar to their own on classroom visitation. All superintendents (one hundred percent) rated classroom visitation of major or critical importance. Eighty-one percent of the principals rated classroom visitation of major or critical importance. Nineteen percent of the principals viewed classroom visitation of minor or average importance in improving instruction (see Table 2).

Principals were asked in P-1b: What percent of your school time is spent on classroom visitations to improve instruction? Superintendents were asked a parallel question S-1b: What percent of an elementary principal's school time is spent on classroom visitations to improve instruction? Superintendents were asked a parallel question S-1b: What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent in classroom visitation for the purpose of instructional improvement? Seventy-two percent of the principals reported they spent an average of ten percent of their school time on classroom visitation. Seventy-seven percent of the superintendents reported they expected principals to spend an average of twenty percent of their school time on classroom visitation.

Principal-Teacher Conferences

Item P-2a for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? A parallel question for superintendents was item S-2a: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a z test for significant difference
TABLE 2

DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OR UNIMPORTANCE GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS TO
CLASSROOM VISITATION AS A SUPERVISORY ACTIVITY COMPARED
TO THE DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OR UNIMPORTANCE
PRINCIPALS THOUGHT THEIR SUPERINTENDENTS
HAD GIVEN THE ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-1c Responses</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - no importance
2 - minor importance
3 - average importance
4 - major importance
5 - critical importance

Total 104

P-1a How much importance do you, as principal, place on classroom visitation as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

P-1c How much importance do you think your superintendent places on classroom visitation as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?
at the .05 level, there was not a significant difference (z = .3; p > .05). Superintendents' mean score on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity was 4.461, principals' was 4.5. So both superintendents and principals attribute a similar value to principal-teacher conferences. The mean scores indicate a high level of value (see Table 3).

        Principals' responses on item P-2a were then compared to principals' responses on item P-2c applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level. Item P-2c was: How much importance do you think your superintendent places on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? When P-3a was compared to P-3c a significant difference was observed (z = 4.335; p < .05). The mean score of P-2a was 4.5; the mean score of P-2c was 4.058 (see Table 3).

        In applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level comparing principals' responses on P-2c to superintendents' responses on S-2a, a significant difference was noted (z = .4981; p < .05). The mean score on P-2c was 4.058; the mean score of S-2a was 4.461 (see Table 3).

        Thirty-six percent of the principals responding to P-2a viewed their superintendents valuing principal-teacher conferences less than themselves (principals). Sixty-three percent of the principals viewed their superintendents valuing principal-teacher conferences as they (principals) did (see Table 4).

        Principals were asked in P-2b: What percent of your school time is spent on principal-teacher conferences for the purpose of
TABLE 3
DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OR UNIMPORTANCE GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO PRINCIPAL-TEACHER CONFERENCES AS A SUPERVISORY ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>P-2a</th>
<th>P-2c</th>
<th>S-2a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 104 104 26
Mean = 4.5 4.058 4.461
Base = (104) (102) (26)

S = .6385 .8062 .5817
S^2 = .4077 .6499 .3384

P-2a How much importance do you, as principal, place on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?
P-2c How much importance do you think your superintendent places on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?
S-2a How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-2a to S-2a</th>
<th>P-2a to P-2c</th>
<th>P-2c to S-2a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>z score</td>
<td>p value</td>
<td>z score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>4.355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4

DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OR UNIMPORTANCE GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS TO PRINCIPAL-TEACHER CONFERENCES AS A SUPERVISORY ACTIVITY COMPARED TO THE DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OR UNIMPORTANCE PRINCIPALS THOUGHT THEIR SUPERINTENDENTS HAD GIVEN THE ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-2a Responses</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 104

P-2a How much importance do you, as principal, place on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

P-2c How much importance do you think your superintendent places on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

1 - no importance
2 - minor importance
3 - average importance
4 - major importance
5 - critical importance
instructional improvement? Superintendents were asked a parallel question S-2b: What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on principal-teacher conferences for the purpose of instructional improvement? Seventy-one percent of the principals reported they spent an average of ten percent of their school time on principal-teacher conferences. Eighty-three percent of the superintendents reported they expected principals to spend an average of ten percent of their school time on principal-teacher conferences. There was a high level of agreement in the amount of time spent and expected to be spent in this activity.

Both superintendents and principals placed a high value on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity. Ninety-four percent of the principals and ninety-six percent of the superintendents rated principal-teacher conferences of major or critical importance. Yet principals did not view their superintendents valuing this activity so highly.

Faculty Meetings

Item P-3a for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place on general faculty meetings as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? A parallel question for superintendents was item S-3a: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on general faculty meetings as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a z test for significant difference \( z = .401; p > .05 \). Superintendents' mean score on faculty meetings as a supervisory activity was 2.653, principals was 2.721 (see Table 5). Notice how low the mean score was even though there was basic agreement. This would
### TABLE 5

DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OR UNIMPORTANCE GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO FACULTY MEETINGS AS A SUPERVISORY ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>P-3a</th>
<th>P-3c</th>
<th>S-3a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **P-3a**: How much importance do you, as principal, place on general faculty meetings as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?
- **P-3c**: How much importance do you think your superintendent places on general faculty meetings as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?
- **S-3a**: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on general faculty meetings as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

**Mean**
- P-3a: 2.721
- P-3c: 2.989
- S-3a: 2.653

**Base**
- P-3a: 104
- P-3c: 99
- S-3a: 26

**S**
- P-3a: .8753
- P-3c: .9312
- S-3a: .7452

**S^2**
- P-3a: .7661
- P-3c: .8672
- S-3a: .5553

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P-3a to S-3a</th>
<th>P-3a to P-3c</th>
<th>P-3c to S-3a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>z score</td>
<td>p value</td>
<td>z score</td>
<td>p value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-3a to S-3a</td>
<td>.401 &gt; .05</td>
<td>2.105 &lt; .05</td>
<td>1.933 &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-3a to P-3c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-3c to S-3a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
indicate that both superintendents and principals saw faculty meetings as not being a valuable supervisory activity, therefore, these meetings were probably administrative in nature rather than supervisory.

Principals' responses on item P-3a were then compared to principals' responses on item P-3c applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level. Item P-3c was: How much importance do you think your superintendent places on faculty meetings as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? When P-3a was compared to P-3c, a significant difference was observed \((z = 2.105; p < .05)\). The mean score on P-3a was 2.721; the mean score on P-3c was 2.989 (see Table 5).

In applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level comparing principals' responses on P-3c to superintendents' responses on S-3a, no significant difference was noted \((z = 1.933; p > .05)\). The mean score on P-3c was 2.989; the mean score on S-3a was 2.653 (see Table 5). Eighty-four percent of the principals held faculty meetings to be of no, minor, or average importance; ninety-two percent of the superintendents gave it similar ratings. Of the 104 responding principals, thirty-two percent viewed their superintendents as giving faculty meetings a higher rating, ten percent a lower rating, and fifty-eight percent the same rating as themselves (principals) (see Table 6).

Principals were asked in P-3b: What percent of your school time is spent on faculty meetings for the purpose of instructional improvement? Superintendents were asked a parallel question S-3b: What percentage of an elementary principal's time do you expect to be spent on faculty meetings for the purpose of instructional
TABLE 6

DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OR UNIMPORTANCE GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS TO FACULTY
MEETINGS AS A SUPERVISORY ACTIVITY COMPARED TO THE
DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OR UNIMPORTANCE PRINCIPALS
THOUGHT THEIR SUPERINTENDENTS HAD GIVEN
THE ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-3a Responses</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - no importance
2 - minor importance
3 - average importance
4 - major importance
5 - critical importance

Total 104

P-3a How much importance do you, as principal, place on general faculty meetings as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

P-3c How much importance do you think your superintendent places on general faculty meetings as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?
improvement? Fifty-two percent of the principals reported they spent an average of five percent of their time on faculty meetings. Ninety-six percent of the superintendents reported they expected principals to spend an average of five percent of their school time on faculty meetings to improve instruction.

Teacher Evaluation

Item P-4a for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place on evaluation of teachers as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? A parallel question for superintendents was item S-4a: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on evaluation of teachers as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level there was no significant difference \((z = .6231; p > .05)\). Superintendents' mean score on teacher evaluation as a supervisory activity was 4.346; principals' was 4.086. Again note the high mean rating (see Table 7).

Principals' responses on item P-4a were then compared to principals' responses on item P-4c applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level. Item P-4c was: How much importance do you think your superintendent places on evaluation of teachers as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? When P-4a was compared to P-4c no significant difference was observed \((z = 1.942; p > .05)\). The mean score was 4.086; the mean score on P-4c was 4.297 (see Table 7).

In applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level comparing principals' responses on P-4c to superintendents' responses on S-4a, no significant difference was noted \((z = .4142; \)
### TABLE 7

**DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OR UNIMPORTANCE GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO TEACHER EVALUATION AS A SUPERVISORY ACTIVITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>P-4a</th>
<th>P-4c</th>
<th>S-4a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** = 104  
**Mean** = 4.086  
**Base** = (104)  
**S** = .8488  
**S² =** .7205

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-4a to S-4a</th>
<th>P-4a to P-4c</th>
<th>P-4c to S-4a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>z score</td>
<td>p value</td>
<td>z score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6231</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>1.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean score on P-4c was 4.297; the mean score on S-4a was 4.346 (see Table 7).

Principals viewed their superintendents valuing teacher evaluation as much or more than they (principals) did. Sixty-seven percent of the principals viewed their superintendents giving the same value to teacher evaluation as themselves, twenty-four percent higher, and nine percent lower (see Table 8).

Principals were asked in P-4b: What percent of your school time is spent on teacher evaluations for the purpose of instructional improvement? Superintendents were asked parallel question S-2b: What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on teacher evaluations for the purpose of instructional improvement? Eighty-five percent of the principals reported they expected principals to spend an average of fifteen percent of their school time on teacher evaluation. There was a high level of agreement in the amount of time spent (principals) and expected to be spent (superintendents) in this activity.

Teacher In-Service

Item P-5a for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place in teacher in-service as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? A parallel question for superintendents was item S-5a: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on teacher in-service as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a z test for significant differences at the .05 level there was not a significant difference ($z = 1.390; p > .05$). Superintendents
TABLE 8

DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OR UNIMPORTANCE GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS TO TEACHER
EVALUATION AS A SUPERVISORY ACTIVITY COMPARED TO THE DEGREE
OF IMPORTANCE OR UNIMPORTANCE PRINCIPALS THOUGHT
THEIR SUPERINTENDENTS HAD GIVEN THE ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-4a Responses</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - no importance
2 - minor importance
3 - average importance
4 - major importance
5 - critical importance

Total 104

P-4a How much importance do you, as principal, place on evaluation of teachers as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

P-4c How much importance do you think your superintendent places on evaluation of teachers as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?
mean value for teacher in-service as a supervisory activity was 3.461; principals was 3.721 (see Table 9).

Principals' responses on item P-5a were then compared to principals' responses on item P-5c applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level. Item P-5c was: How much importance do you think your superintendent places on teacher in-service as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? When P-5a was compared to P-5c a significant difference was observed ($z = 2.008; p < .05$). The mean for P-5a was 3.721; the mean for P-5c was 3.480 (see Table 9).

In applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level comparing principals' responses on P-5c to superintendents' responses on S-5a, no significant difference was noted ($z = .0998; p > .05$). The mean score of P-5c was 3.480; the mean score of S-5a was 3.461 (see Table 9).

Twenty-nine percent of the principals viewed their superintendent valuing teacher in-service less than themselves (principals). Fifty-seven percent of the principals viewed their superintendent valuing teacher in-service as they (principals) did. Fourteen percent of the principals viewed their superintendent valuing teacher in-service more than they (principals) did (see Table 10).

Principals were asked in P-5b: What percent of your school time is spent in teacher in-service (outside of general faculty meetings)? Superintendents were asked a parallel question S-5b: What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on teacher in-service (outside of general faculty meetings)? Eighty-two percent of the principals reported they spent an average of five
### Table 9

Degree of Importance or Unimportance Given by Principals and Superintendents to Teacher In-service as a Supervisory Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>P-5a</th>
<th>P-5c</th>
<th>S-5a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 104
Mean = 3.721, 3.48, 3.461
Base = (104), (100), (26)

- **P-5a**: How much importance do you, as principal, place on teacher in-service as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?
- **P-5c**: How much importance do you think your superintendent places on teacher in-service as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?
- **S-5a**: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on teacher in-service as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P-5a to S-5a</th>
<th>P-5a to P-5c</th>
<th>P-5c to S-5a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>z score</td>
<td>p value</td>
<td>z score</td>
<td>p value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.390</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>2.008</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10

DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OR UNIMPORTANCE GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS TO TEACHER IN-SERVICE AS A SUPERVISORY ACTIVITY COMPARED TO THE DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OR UNIMPORTANCE PRINCIPALS THOUGHT THEIR SUPERINTENDENTS HAD GIVEN THE ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-5a Responses</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 104

1 - no importance
2 - minor importance
3 - average importance
4 - major importance
5 - critical importance

P-5a How much importance do you, as principal, place on teacher in-service as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

P-5c How much importance do you think your superintendent places on teacher in-service as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?
percent of their school time on teacher in-service. One hundred percent of the superintendents reported they expected principals to spend an average of five percent of their school time on teacher in-service.

Curriculum Development

Item P-6a for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place on faculty involvement in curriculum development as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? A parallel question for superintendents was item S-6a: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on faculty involvement in curriculum development as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level there was no significant difference ($z = .6068; p > .05$). Superintendents' mean score on curriculum development as a supervisory activity was 4.0; principals' was 4.127 (see Table 11).

Principals' responses on item P-6a were then compared to principals' responses on P-6c applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level. Item P-6c was: How much importance do you think your superintendent places on faculty involvement in curriculum development as one of your supervisory activities to improve instruction? When P-6a was compared to P-6c a significant difference was observed ($z = 3.228; p < .05$). The mean score on P-6a was 4.127; the mean score on P-6c was 3.7 (see Table 11).

In applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level comparing principals' responses on P-6c to superintendents' responses on S-6a no significant difference was noted ($z = 1.382; p > .05$; see Table 11). Thirty-one percent of the principals viewed
TABLE 11

DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OR UNIMPORTANCE GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AS A SUPERVISORY ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>P-6a</th>
<th>P-6c</th>
<th>S-6a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 104 104 26
Mean = 4.127 3.7 4.0
Base = (102) (100) (25)
S = .8521 1.0200 .9574
S² = .7261 1.0404 .9166

P-6a How much importance do you, as principal, place on faculty involvement in curriculum development as a supervisory activity?

P-6c How much importance do you think your superintendent places on curriculum development as one of your supervisory activity?

S-6a How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on faculty involvement in curriculum development as a supervisory activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-6a to S-6a</th>
<th>P-6a to P-6c</th>
<th>P-6c to S-6a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>z score</td>
<td>p value</td>
<td>z score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6068</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>3.228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
their superintendents valuing curriculum development less than themselves (principals). Fifty-eight percent of the principals viewed their superintendents valuing curriculum as they (principals) did (see Table 12).

Principals were asked in P-6b: What percent of your school time is spent on curriculum development? Superintendents were asked a parallel question S-6b: What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on curriculum development? Eighty-eight percent of the principals reported they spent an average of ten percent of their school time on curriculum development. Eighty-four percent of the superintendents reported they expected principals to spend an average of ten percent of their school time on curriculum development.

Analysis of Data Comparing Questionnaire Responses of Participating Principals and Superintendents in DuPage County Illinois

The data from the questionnaire revealed that in one of the six supervisory areas, classroom visitations, there was a significant difference between the responses of the principals and superintendents in DuPage County, Illinois (see Table 13).

The data revealed that although principals viewed their superintendents as having similar value of classroom visitation as themselves (principals), in reality there was a significantly higher value placed on classroom visitation by superintendents. Interviews revealed that principals were not informed of the superintendents valuation of
TABLE 12

DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OR UNIMPORTANCE GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS TO CURRICULUM
DEVELOPMENT AS A SUPERVISORY ACTIVITY COMPARED TO THE DEGREE OF
IMPORTANCE OR UNIMPORTANCE PRINCIPALS THOUGHT THEIR
SUPERINTENDENTS HAD GIVEN THE ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-6a Responses</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - no importance
2 - minor importance
3 - average importance
4 - major importance
5 - critical importance

Total 104

P-6a How much importance do you, as principal, place on faculty involvement in curriculum development as a supervisory activity?

P-6c How much importance do you think your superintendent places on curriculum development as one of your supervisory activities?
classroom visitation except as specified in a negotiated agreement with a teachers union or in following a specified district evaluation procedures which might include classroom visitation.

Most principals noted in the interviews that their superinten-dents had not specified, either at individual or group principal meet-ings, their (superintendents') preference for classroom visitation as a supervisory activity. Although superintendents gave a significantly higher value to classroom visitation compared to the value given by principals, it did not appear as a priority supervisory activity at principal meetings, in the development of principals' yearly goals or in principals' job descriptions.
While superintendents placed a greater value on classroom visitation than principals, they (superintendents) expected principals to spend twenty percent of their school time on classroom visitation (instead of the principals ten percent), and while superintendents indicated a high degree of expectancy for principals to perform this activity, the superintendents did not communicate the value of this activity to the principals. This disparity between superintendents' and principals' valuation of classroom visitation could be the result of superintendents stating ideals they thought the researcher wanted to hear. If superintendents truly valued classroom visitation as a supervisory activity, then in-service workshops for principals would be provided by superintendents to increase principals' awareness of the value given to classroom visitations and to increase principals' skills in the use of this activity.

Many principals and superintendents found it difficult to report percent of time expected to be spent (or spent) in supervisory activities. Some principals and superintendents commented that the time spent in classroom visitation could not be separated from the time spent in principal-teacher conferences and in evaluation. Because many administrators saw an overlap in these supervisory activities, a true picture in time spent (or expected to be spent) could not always be definitively reported. However, a ten percent discrepancy was noted which was consistent with z scores.

In comparing the value given the six supervisory activities by principals to the value the principals thought their superintendents had given to these activities, there was a significant difference in
four activities: principal-teacher conferences, faculty meetings, teacher in-service, and curriculum development (see Table 14).

TABLE 14
Z SCORES CONVERTED TO P VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Activities</th>
<th>P_a z score</th>
<th>P_c p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Visitation</td>
<td>1.553</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal-Teacher Conferences</td>
<td>4.355</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Meetings</td>
<td>2.105</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Evaluation</td>
<td>1.942</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher In-Service</td>
<td>2.008</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>3.228</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each of the four activities principals thought their superintendents valued the activity significantly lower than they (principals) did. In addition, the data revealed there was a consistency between the value given to principal-teacher conferences, faculty meetings, teacher in-service and curriculum development by both principals and superintendents and the amount of time spent (by principals) or expected to be spent (by superintendents) on these activities. Most principals were not cognizant of their superintendents' expectations,
and although principals viewed superintendents giving a significantly lower value to these four supervisory activities, principals valued and performed (frequency) these activities as expected by their superintendents. Since principals viewed their superintendents not placing as high a value on principal-teacher conferences, faculty meetings, teacher in-service, and curriculum development and yet in reality the values given to these activities by both principals and superintendents were similar, it follows that principals performed these activities to the degree the principals valued the activities.

The data revealed that superintendents had not informed their principals of how valuable they thought principal-teacher conferences, faculty meetings, teacher in-service, and curriculum development were as supervisory activities. Most principals reported in interviews that they were allowed by their superintendents to function in a supervisory capacity with a minimum of suggestions from the superintendent. This lack of specificity on the part of the superintendent sometimes had the principal responding, "I don't know" to a question regarding how much a superintendent valued a supervisory activity. If principals are given the impression, through lack of communication and definition from the superintendent, that they (principals) have some autonomy in performing supervisory activities, they (principals) then run the risk of discovering (after a problem develops) that their autonomy existed only as long as their performance reflected the expectations of the superintendents. In addition, without a clear understanding of the supervisory performance expected of them (principals), the yearly evaluation of the principal by the superintendent is jeopardized.
Most principals used principal-teacher conferences to build rapport and to discuss evaluation of a classroom visitation. A few principals used structured periodic conferences with teachers to develop individual objectives and goals for the year. Although in most districts the need for conferences was agreed upon by both principal and superintendent, no in-service for principals was provided which would establish it as a priority supervisory activity for the principal. The principals interviewed had not received training in conducting effective conferences, nor were time strategies reviewed so that principals could effectively manage to incorporate planned conferences into their school day. Even though both principals and superintendents agreed on the importance of principal-teacher conferences, the process as seen by both, could vary and cause possible conflicts.

Principals' and superintendents' responses on time allotment given to faculty meetings corresponded to their typically low valuation of it as a supervisory activity. Responses of principals and superintendents indicated little value for faculty meetings in improving instruction. Most principals and superintendents referred to district in-service or institute days as providing similar (substitute) means to improve instruction.

Interviews revealed that instructional needs in an individual school were not likely to be addressed at a faculty meeting. Several factors contributed to faculty meetings not being used to improve the instructional program of a school: (1) faculty dissatisfaction in attending general faculty meetings, (2) lack of sufficient time to
address an instructional problem before and/or after school, (3) principals' lack of expertise in leading the group in problem resolution, (4) principals' lack of knowledge and/or expertise in the area of need, and (5) lack of district resource staff to assist in the area of need.

If principals are unable to provide leadership at faculty meetings intended to improve instruction, and if no resource people are available at the local or district level, faculty meetings become administrative and procedural in nature and avoid areas and topics which could have impact on instructional improvement.

The interviews revealed that with decreased student enrollment and the closing of schools, superintendents were emphasizing the importance of teacher evaluation as a primary supervisory activity of principals. Principals were made aware of procedures required for evaluations through collective bargaining contracts and board policy. A few district evaluation programs were not directly tied to classroom observations, but most districts required an annual evaluation of teachers which included a classroom visitation and a principal-teacher conference.

Teacher evaluation as a tool to improve teacher performance was criticized by some principals who expressed that they liked to deal with teachers in a "positive" way. These principals had a more informal approach to supervision, expressing that teachers were professionals and did not need a great deal of supervision on the part of the principal. It would appear from these remarks that some principals did not understand the theory of evaluation and that it can be a "positive" approach to improving teaching skills.
The majority of superintendents and principals, though, were supportive of structured district policies which required completion of evaluation forms, requiring teachers' in-put (at times) and teachers' signatures. In many cases copies of the evaluation forms were sent to the office of the superintendent to be reviewed by the superintendent or his assistant.

The data revealed a consistently high value given to teacher evaluation as a supervisory activity by superintendents and principals. The large number of direct references to the principals' responsibility to evaluate teachers in job descriptions as well as superintendents' verbal acknowledgements of the value of this activity, helped make principals aware that this was a supervisory activity they were expected to perform. Principals were devoting a sizable amount of time (fifteen percent) to this activity since they valued it highly and thought their superintendents valued it highly. It only follows that one will engage in activities that one thinks his superior values highly.

Because teacher evaluation is highly procedural in relation to dismissal or non-renewal of teachers' contracts and because declining student enrollment is forcing administrators to look critically at the instructional performance of the staff, more emphasis is being placed on this activity. Although a few principals were uncomfortable in their role as evaluators and viewed evaluation as a negative approach to improving instruction, most principals and superintendents viewed evaluation as a highly desirable means to improve instruction.

The interviews revealed that although principals and superin-
tendents valued teacher in-service and curriculum development, these activities were most frequently handled at a district level. Usually both administrators and teachers had input into the topics covered at district in-services; the topics were general so as to have broad appeal, but maybe too general to have much impact or importance. Principals and teacher representatives were involved in textbook selection, which was synonymous with curriculum development. Books chosen by the curriculum committees were used by all schools in the district.

Principals' involvement in in-service programs generally centered on developing programs for teachers new to their schools and in being actively involved in in-service committee work on the district level. Principals were typically members of in-service committees which met with teacher representatives from each building in the district to establish in-service topics and agendas.

In-service days and institutes were synonymous in most districts. Many districts claimed to have five in-service half-days; four of these half-days were used for parent-teacher conferences and the fifth was used to prepare for the conferences.

The reasons for the lack of local in-service programs were similar to those expressed for the lack of faculty meetings: (1) the principals' lack of expertise in curriculum areas, (2) lack of resource people at the district level to assist in planning and presentation, and (3) disinterest of faculty members in spending time listening to presentations which do not relate specifically to their needs.

Many schools have instructional problems and needs which are
not shared with other schools and are not addressed at district in-service meetings. If principals are unable to provide for instructional improvement at the local school level through faculty meetings and/or teacher in-service, then the vital component of staff development which allows for local teacher in-put, feedback, and problem solving is missing from their (principals') supervisory programs.

Demographics and Classifications

One variable, adequacy of training for both principals and superintendents, was examined on a fact sheet which was included with the questionnaire. The question for principals was: How adequate was your training in preparing you to deal with the supervisory problems you face as an elementary school principal? A parallel question for superintendents was: How adequate was your training in preparing you to direct elementary school principals in their supervisory roles? These questions used a six point Likert scale, requiring the respondents to specify:

1. Extremely inadequate
2. Very inadequate
3. Inadequate
4. Adequate
5. Very adequate
6. Extremely adequate

Thirty-one percent of the one hundred four elementary principals responding noted that their supervisory abilities ranged from inadequate to extremely inadequate. Thirty-nine percent of the twenty-six superintendents stated their ability to direct elementary princ-
pals in their (principals') supervisory role ranged from inadequate to extremely inadequate.

A masters degree was the highest degree awarded to thirty-five percent of the superintendents. Eighty-five percent of the superintendents had their masters conferred prior to 1970. Seventy-three percent of all superintendents majored in educational administration and supervision.

A masters degree was the highest degree awarded to eighty-two percent of the principals. Sixty-six percent of the principals majored in educational administration and supervision.

If almost a third of the principals and more than a third of the superintendents rated their supervisory training as inadequate, then the need for staff development in supervisory skills for both (superintendents and principals) is obvious. Principals rely on guidance and direction from superintendents by discussing the supervisory tasks for which the principals will be held accountable. If superintendents are unable to in-service principals on supervisory skills, and if the void is not filled by district resource staff, then the principal is left on his own initiative to increase his skills--still not aware of his superintendent's expectations of principals' performance.

In addition, since more than half of the principals and a third of the superintendents had their degrees conferred prior to 1970, the need for in-service of superintendents and principals in supervisory skills is even more evident. Clinical supervision, with its emphasis on pre-conferences, setting objectives, classroom
visitations and post conferences was not introduced until 1970. If a conflict exists between the emphasis or lack of emphasis of supervisory activities established in local schools or school districts, then principals and superintendents need a forum (staff development program) for discussing these disparities in a non-threatening situation.

Additional variables were examined by requesting classification and demographic information from principals and superintendents. The data on superintendents revealed that almost half of the superintendents had less than six years experience as an elementary school teacher and almost half the superintendents had less than six years experience as an elementary school principal. This data was then compared to the principals' information. Approximately one third of the principals had been a classroom teacher for one to five years and one fourth of the principals had been an elementary school principal for one to five years.

Superintendents with limited experience as elementary school teachers and/or principals would find being a leader in advancing the supervisory skills of elementary school principals a difficult task. Likewise, elementary school principals with limited classroom and/or administrative experience would be faced with difficult problems supervising teachers. The literature reported that supervision is as much an art as it is a science. Therefore, a textbook understanding of supervisory practices, without the benefit of on-the-job experience limits superintendents and principals in the performance of their supervisory duties. The ability of a principal to help a teacher
improve her skills is limited if his (principal's) classroom experiences has been minimal. So too, a superintendent's ability to in-service principals on a variety of skills needed to perform supervisory tasks is limited if his (superintendent's) experience as a principal has been negligible.

Principals rely on verbal and written communications from their superintendents to delineate their (superintendents') expectations. Principals in DuPage County formally met with their superintendents on an average of once a month to review district concerns. In addition, superintendents visited schools and conferred individually with principals. Rarely were supervisory activities, other than teacher evaluation, discussed at district meetings or during visits with the superintendent. The superintendents' lack of communication on the subject caused the principals to be unaware of the superintendents' expectations of the principals' supervisory role.

Rankings of Supervisory Activities

The six supervisory activities were ranked according to value from most valued (one) to least valued (six) by twenty-eight professors of administration and supervision, ninety-four principals with job descriptions, eight principals without job descriptions, twenty-two superintendents with job descriptions, and four superintendents without job descriptions.

Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance was used to determine the degree of association among the groups. \((W = .8354; p = .001)\). Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance, \(W\), expresses the average agreement, on a scale from .00 to 1.00 between the ranks. \(P\) expresses the
probability or likelihood of obtaining a value as extreme or more extreme than the value (see Table 15). One can conclude with considerable assurance that the agreement among principals, superintendents, and professors in ranking the six supervisory activities was higher than it would have been by chance.

Classroom visitation was ranked highest in value, principal-teacher conferences were the second most highly valued activity, teacher evaluation was third, curriculum development was fourth, teacher in-service was fifth, and faculty meetings was sixth.

Interviews with principals revealed that although classroom visitations were at times used without evaluations, the time spent in the classroom by the principal (in what was called an informal visitation) averaged only five minutes. Because principals did not usually write up, or confer with teachers after informal visits, the visits did not tend to improve the quality of instruction.

Principals spoke highly of classroom visitations and principal-teacher conferences in the interviews. Some principals stated they made an effort to spend a few minutes in each classroom, each day. Other principals made it a policy to meet with each teacher twice a year to set and review objectives for the year. Almost all principals concluded a formal classroom visitation with a teacher conference.

Most principals followed district policies on teacher evaluation. District evaluation policies usually required the principal to visit and confer with the teacher. As a result, classroom visitations, principal-teacher conferences and teacher evaluation were considered as one process by superintendents and principals making it difficult to value the activities or note time allotted to each.
TABLE 15
KENDALL'S COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE
RANKING OF SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Classroom Visitation</th>
<th>Principal-Teacher Conference</th>
<th>Faculty Meetings</th>
<th>Teacher Evaluation</th>
<th>Teacher In-Service</th>
<th>Curriculum Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals With Job</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals Without</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Descriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents With</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Descriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Job Descriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ K = 5 \]
\[ W = .8354 \]
\[ N = 6 \]
\[ P < .001 \]
Superintendents and principals tended to emphasize the need to complete the paperwork necessary to satisfy statutory requirements for teacher evaluation. This emphasis primarily resulted from greater teacher awareness of due process rights through teachers' unions.

Although curriculum development was ranked fourth in value, interviews revealed that little curriculum development, outside of textbook selection, was intended. The curriculum was relatively static in most districts. No efforts were made to acquire parent or student participation in curriculum projects. Textbook selection, being synonymous with curriculum in most districts, was accomplished at the district office with only teachers and administrators giving input through representatives.

The in-service arm of supervisory practices was practically non-existent in the elementary schools sampled. In-service education for teachers was synonymous in most districts with institute days sponsored by the district. It was a rare occasion when a principal in a local elementary school arranged for in-service of his school staff based on a known local school instructional need.

The reasons for the lack of local in-service could be many: lack of principal expertise in a particular area of the curriculum, lack of principal leadership in providing resource people, disinterest of teachers in attending in-service meetings, and lack of district resource staff to assist with instructional needs.

Faculty meetings were the least valued and least used supervisory activity; yet staff meetings are one of the most readily accessible means of securing faculty input into school needs and
receiving feedback on programs. The reasons for the infrequent use of faculty meetings were similar to those of in-service meetings.

If in-service meetings and faculty meetings are not highly valued and are only infrequently used for the improvement of instruction at the local school, a vital component of a complete supervisory program is missing. As principals observe in classrooms, review student progress, and interact with the faculty, they become aware of instructional needs which because of limited time cannot be dealt with on one-to-one or small group basis. Teacher in-service and faculty meetings can provide the vital component of staff development which is needed in any supervisory program intended to improve instruction.

Questionnaire Responses of Participating Principals and Superintendents With Job Descriptions and Without Job Descriptions In DuPage County, Illinois

Responses of Principals With Job Descriptions Compared to Responses of Principals Without Job Descriptions

Of the 104 responding principals, ninety-six principals were from districts which had job descriptions for principals, eight principals were from districts which did not have job descriptions for principals.

Classroom Visitation

Item P-1a for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place on classroom visitation as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a z test for significant difference at
the .05 level there was no significant difference ($z = .6881; p > .05$; see Table 16). The mean score of principals with job descriptions was 4.094. The mean score of principals without job descriptions was 4.25.

In reviewing principals' descriptions for twenty-six elementary school districts in DuPage County, Illinois, classroom visitation was specifically mentioned in five (nineteen percent) of the job descriptions.

References to classroom visitations in principals' descriptions were as follows:

1. To visit each teacher in his/her classroom on a regular and frequent basis for the purpose of observing the program and conferring with the teacher on needed improvements
2. Observe and evaluate at frequent intervals the teaching performance of certified personnel assigned to his building
3. Observe teaching
4. Being in the learning areas as a doing person using this opportunity for upgrading instruction and evaluation
5. Assume responsibility for the improvement of instruction and revision of instructional programs through classroom visitations...

The expectation for an elementary principal to visit classrooms in the twenty-two remaining job descriptions was either absent or couched in general performance responsibilities:

1. Supervises the schools teaching process
2. To assist teachers in their endeavors to improve instruction
3. Develop, implement, and improve the educational program through cooperative and ongoing endeavors in supervision of instruction and evaluation of learning
### TABLE 16

Z AND T SCORES COMPARING THE MEAN VALUE GIVEN TO SIX SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals With To Principals Without</th>
<th></th>
<th>Principals With To Superintendents Without</th>
<th></th>
<th>Principals With To Superintendents With</th>
<th></th>
<th>Principals Without To Superintendents Without</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>z score</td>
<td>p value</td>
<td>t score</td>
<td>p value</td>
<td>z score</td>
<td>p value</td>
<td>t score</td>
<td>p value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Visitation</td>
<td>.6881</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>2.089</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal-Teacher</td>
<td>.6985</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>4.291</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
<td>.3922</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>3.415</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Meetings</td>
<td>1.074</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>- .268</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>.3197</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Evaluation</td>
<td>1.1618</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>3.822</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
<td>2.4910</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
<td>2.049</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher In-Service</td>
<td>.0795</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>1.888</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>.6909</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>2.506</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>.9687</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>.2454</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>1.628</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy</td>
<td>.2394</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>.4011</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>-.472</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Supervise the instructional staff in the development and implementation of curriculum

Principals were asked in P-1b: What percent of your school time is spent on classroom visitations to improve instruction? Seventy percent of the principals with job descriptions spent ten percent of their school time on classroom visitations. Seventy-four percent of the principals without job descriptions spent ten percent of their school time on classroom visitations. The existence of a job description did not affect the amount of time principals spent in this activity. Possible explanation lies in the fact that only a small percentage of job descriptions (nineteen) specified classroom visitation (albeit, generally) and the fact that most principals did not separate classroom visitation from teacher evaluation and therefore principals with and without job descriptions simply complied with written district policies on the number of classroom visitations (teacher evaluations) required each year.

**Principal-Teacher Conferences**

Item P-2a for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level there was no significant difference \((z = .6985; p > .05)\). The mean score of principals with job descriptions was 4.489. The mean score for principals without job descriptions was 4.625.

In reviewing principals' job descriptions for twenty-six elementary school districts in DuPage County, Illinois, principal-teacher
conferences were specifically mentioned in six (twenty-three percent) of the job descriptions:

1. Conferring regularly with teachers regarding instruction
2. Counsels with teachers . . . in solving immediate problems
3. To meet with teachers as often as necessary, . . . and discuss methods of . . . improving instruction
4. He shall meet with teachers in conference to discuss their performance, current trends of instruction, new materials, etc.
5. Conducting regular teacher evaluations, followed by a conference. . .
6. Assume responsibility for the improvement of instruction and revision of instructional programs through classroom visitation, conferences. . . .

Principal-teacher conferences were not specifically mentioned in twenty or seventy-seven percent of the remaining job descriptions. A partial explanation for this may lie in the fact that in some districts conferences were considered to be a part of the evaluation process which also included classroom visitation.

Principals were asked in P-2b: What percent of your school time is spent on principal-teacher conferences to improve instruction? Seventy-eight percent of the principals with job descriptions spent ten percent of their school time on principal-teacher conferences. Sixty-eight percent of the principals without job descriptions spent fifteen percent of their school time on principal-teacher conferences. The existence of a job description had little impact on the amount of time principals spent in this activity. Again, possible explanation lies in the fact that only a small percentage of job descriptions (twenty-three) specified teacher conferences, and the fact that most principals did not
separate teacher conferences from teacher evaluation and therefore principals with and without job descriptions simply complied with written district policies on the number of teacher evaluations (followed by a conference) required each year.

Faculty Meetings

Item P-3a for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place on general faculty meetings as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a z test for significance at the .05 level there was no significant difference \( z = 1.074; p > .05 \). The mean score of principals with job descriptions was 2.697. The mean score for principals without job descriptions was 3.0. The mean score given to faculty meetings by principals was the lowest given to any of the six supervisory activities.

In reviewing principals' job descriptions for the twenty-six elementary school districts in DuPage County, Illinois, it was interesting to note that twelve (forty-six percent) of the job descriptions mentioned holding faculty meetings specifically as a responsibility of the principal. There was a disparity between the professed value given to faculty meetings by principals and superintendents and the number of references to faculty meetings in job descriptions. Examples of references were as follows:

1. Conducts meetings of the staff as necessary for the proper functioning of the school
2. Conducts staff meetings to keep members informed of policy changes, new programs and the like
3. Principals are expected to provide local schools with professional leadership in all curriculum programs and decisions and enthusiasm and support for curriculum building
and implementation. It implies also regular staff meetings to implement a cohesiveness in attaining goals.

4. Meet with teachers as a group--once weekly

Principals were asked in P-3b: What percent of your general faculty meetings are used for the purpose of instructional improvement? Fifty-three percent of the principals with job descriptions spent five percent of their school time on faculty meetings to improve instruction. Fifty-one percent of the principals without job descriptions spent five percent of their school time on faculty meetings to improve instruction. Since districts without job descriptions for principals were typically small (average of two principals), a family atmosphere prevailed in the districts and in the local schools. It was apparent from the interviews that principals in districts without job descriptions used faculty meetings more for social and procedural matters than for instructional improvement.

Teacher Evaluation

Item P-4a for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place on evaluation of teachers as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level there was no significant difference (z = 1.1618; p>.05). The mean score of principals with job descriptions was 4.062. The mean score for principals without job descriptions was 4.375.

In reviewing principals' job descriptions for twenty-six elementary school districts in DuPage County, Illinois, teacher evaluation was mentioned in twenty-four (ninety-two percent) of the job descriptions.
Examples of the references are as follows:

1. He shall evaluate the efficiency of each member of his instructional staff in accordance with the established plan and shall report his evaluation to the Assistant Superintendent as required.

2. Evaluate personnel in keeping with district's teacher evaluation procedure.

3. To evaluate the effectiveness of each member of the staff of his school and report his opinion to the Superintendent. Such evaluation may be made by periodic conferences, but a written report must be made at least once a year.

4. Evaluates and discusses with staff means they may utilize to improve their teaching.

Of all the supervisory activities noted in principals' job descriptions, teacher evaluation was the most specifically mentioned. For example:

Make periodic visits to classrooms, evaluate and make recommendations for the improvement of instruction and file the guide for the improvement of instruction with the superintendent of schools for all probationary teachers before December 1st and March 1st and for all tenured teachers before March 1st each year.

Principals were asked in P-4b: What percent of your school time is spent on teacher evaluation to improve instruction? Eighty-six percent of the principals with job descriptions spent ten percent of their school time on teacher evaluations to improve instruction. Eighty-four percent of the principals without job descriptions spent ten percent of their school time on teacher evaluations to improve instruction.

**Teacher In-Service**

Item P-5a for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place on teacher in-service as a supervisory activity to
improve instruction? Applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level there was no significant difference \((z = .0795; p > .05)\). The mean score of principals with job descriptions was 3.729. The mean score of principals without job descriptions was 3.75.

In reviewing principals' job descriptions for twenty-six elementary school districts in DuPage County, Illinois, teacher in-service was specifically mentioned in fifteen (fifty-eight percent) of the job descriptions. Examples of references were as follows:

1. Orient newly assigned staff members and assists in their development as appropriate
2. Provide opportunities for the orientation of new staff members and for the maximum growth of both inexperienced and experienced staff members
3. Conducting in-service and orientation faculty meetings
4. To follow-up evaluative activities with in-service and other activities designed to help each employee improve the quality of his/her performance

Principals were asked in P-5b: What percent of your school time is spent on teacher in-service (outside of general faculty meetings)? Eighty-four percent of the principals with job descriptions spent five percent of their school time on teacher in-service. Eighty percent of the principals without job descriptions spent five percent of their school time on teacher in-service.

Curriculum Development

Item P-6a for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place on faculty involvement in curriculum development as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level there was no significant
difference ($z = .9687; p > .05$). The mean score of principals with job descriptions was 4.106. The mean score of principals without job descriptions was 4.375.

In reviewing principals' job descriptions for twenty-six elementary school districts in DuPage County, Illinois, curriculum development was specifically mentioned in ten (thirty-eight percent) of the job descriptions.

References to curriculum development in principals' job descriptions were as follows:

1. To work closely with the faculty and with program directors to develop exemplary and innovative programs within the school, to provide leadership and inspiration for faculty members, and to assure adequate evaluation of new as well as ongoing programs

2. Provides the leadership for the development, revision and evaluation of the curriculum

3. In cooperation with the District Superintendent, he shall participate in curriculum study, in the development of curriculum materials, and in the evaluation and selection of new materials. He shall also provide opportunities for teachers and other members of his staff to participate in these activities

Principals were asked in P-6b: What percent of your school time is spent on curriculum development? Eighty-eight percent of the principals with job descriptions spent ten percent of their school time on curriculum development. Eighty-four percent of the principals without job descriptions spent ten percent of their school time on curriculum development.
The data from the questionnaire revealed agreement in value and frequency of use of the six supervisory activities by principals with job descriptions and principals without job descriptions.

Although most principals could respond as to whether a principals' job description was available in their district many principals where job descriptions were available had not referred to it in recent years.

The frequency with which a supervisory activity was noted in job descriptions did not relate to the value given to the activity by principals with job descriptions (see Table 17). For example, even though classroom visitations were specifically mentioned in only nineteen percent of the job descriptions, the mean value given to this activity by principals with job descriptions was 4.094. Principal-teacher conferences were specifically mentioned in twenty-three percent of principals' job descriptions. The mean value given to principal-teacher conferences by principals with job descriptions was 4.489. Faculty meetings, although specifically mentioned in forty-six percent of principals' job descriptions were given a mean value of 2.697 by principals with job descriptions. Teacher evaluation was the most frequently mentioned supervisory activity in principals' job descriptions. Teacher evaluation was mentioned in ninety-two percent of the job descriptions while principals with job descriptions gave it a mean value of 4.062. Teacher in-service was specifically mentioned in fifty-eight percent of the job descriptions. The mean value given to
### TABLE 17

**FREQUENCY OF REFERENCE TO SIX SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES IN PRINCIPALS' JOB DESCRIPTIONS COMPARED TO PRINCIPALS' WITH JOB DESCRIPTIONS MEAN SCORES (VALUES) FOR EACH SUPERVISORY ACTIVITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Activity</th>
<th>Frequency of Reference In Principals' Job Description</th>
<th>Principals' With Job Descriptions Mean Score (Value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Visitation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal-Teacher Conferences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Meetings</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Evaluation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher In-Service</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

teacher in-service by principals with job descriptions was 3.729. Curriculum development was specifically mentioned in thirty-eight percent of principals' job descriptions. The mean value given to curriculum development by principals with job descriptions was 4.106.

The disparity between the value principals gave to supervisory activities and the frequency to which the supervisory activities were referred in job descriptions, gave evidence to an impending source of conflict with the principals' superiors (if, in fact, the superintendent expected principals to adhere to the job descriptions' specifications).
Most of the twenty-six job descriptions from districts in DuPage were worded in general terms. Some were in outline form and were not clear. For example:

I. Improvement of Instruction
   A. Students - Guidance - Honor Roll
   B. Teachers - Evaluations - Plan Books
   C. Parents - Public Relations

It was obvious from the data that available job descriptions had little effect on the value and frequency of performance of the six supervisory activities by principals with job descriptions.

In addition to job descriptions, principals rely on their superintendents to provide information and in-service on the kind and frequency of supervisory activities expected of elementary school principals. With the exception of teacher evaluation, principals reported superintendents made few references to supervisory duties required of principals. Teacher evaluation was a focus of many superintendents, therefore the topic had been discussed at individual and group principals' meetings. Because classroom visitation and principal-teacher conferences were considered components of teacher evaluation in some districts, principals were aware of their responsibility to perform these activities.

Other than periodic mention of principals' need to evaluate teachers, little direction or in-service was provided by the superintendent to principals in order to increase their awareness of their (principals') supervisory responsibilities. Principals described their superintendents as having a "problem-oriented approach" to supervision. That is, when a problem regarding the principal's
supervisory practices arose, the principal would receive an emergency phone call from the superintendent to express his (superintendent's) opinion on the matter. Of course, by the, the principal was quite vulnerable because although he performed his supervisory activities in a manner he thought appropriate, there were seldom district guidelines to support his (principal's) position.

The fact that principals with and principals without job descriptions were in agreement in valuing the six supervisory activities indicates the lack of effectiveness of the present job descriptions. The job descriptions did not specifically state the supervisory responsibilities of principals. This lack of specificity in job descriptions left principals with literally no description of their supervisory duties. It was clear that no significant difference could be observed between the responses of principals with and principals without job descriptions because those principals with a written job description were equally unaware of the supervisory duties expected of them as were the principals without job descriptions.

If direction is not provided or requirements are not clearly stated for principals to perform specific supervisory activities on a consistent basis then principals must use their best judgment to determine the frequency and type of supervisory activities to be used.

When principals perform a supervisory function on which they will be evaluated but for which there are no guidelines by which performance can be judged, the effectiveness of that performance becomes subjective and lies wholly in the hands of their (principals') supervisors.
Responses of Superintendents With Job Descriptions for Principals Compared to Responses of Superintendents Without Job Descriptions for Principals

Of the twenty-six responding superintendents, twenty-two were from districts which had job descriptions for principals, four superintendents were from districts which did not have job descriptions for principals.

Classroom Visitation

Item S-1a for superintendents was: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on classroom visitation as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a t test for significant difference at the .05 level, there was no significant difference (t = .736; df = 24; p > .05). The mean score of superintendents with job descriptions for principals was 4.454. The mean score of superintendents without job descriptions for principals was 4.25. The mean values given to classroom visitation by superintendents with and without job descriptions for principals indicates that both groups considered this activity to be of major importance.

Superintendents were asked in S1b: What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on classroom visitations for the purpose of instructional improvement? Seventy-five percent of the superintendents with job descriptions for principals expected principals to spend twenty percent of their school time on classroom visitations. Seventy-six percent of the superintendents without job descriptions for principals expected principals to spend ten percent of their school time on classroom visitations.
Principal-Teacher Conferences

Item S-2a for superintendents was: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a t test for significant difference at the .05 level, there was a significant difference. \( t = 4.291; \) df = 21; \( p < .05 \). The mean score of superintendents with job descriptions for principals was 4.545. The mean score of superintendents without job descriptions for principals was 4.0.

Superintendents were asked in S-2b: What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on principal-teacher conferences for the purpose of instructional improvement? Eighty percent of the superintendents with job descriptions for principals expected principals to spend ten percent of their school time on principal-teacher conferences. Sixty-one percent of the superintendents without job descriptions for principals expected principals to spend ten percent of their school time on principal-teacher conferences.

Faculty Meetings

Item S-3a for superintendents was: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on general faculty meetings as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a t test for significant difference at the .05 level, there was no significant difference \( t = -.268; \) df = 24; \( p > .05 \). The mean score for superintendents with job descriptions for principals was 2.636. The mean score of superintendents without job descriptions for principals was 2.75. The mean score given to
faculty meetings by superintendents was the lowest given by superintendents to any of the six supervisory activities.

Superintendents were asked in S-3b: What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on general faculty meetings for the purpose of instructional improvement? Ninety-five percent of the superintendents with job descriptions for principals expected principals to spend five percent of their school time on faculty meetings. Ninety-seven percent of the superintendents without job descriptions for principals expected principals to spend five percent of their school time on faculty meetings.

Teacher Evaluation

Item S-4a for superintendents was: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on evaluation of teachers as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a t test for significant difference at the .05 level, there was a significant difference \( t = 3.822; \text{df} = 21; p < .05 \). The mean score of superintendents with job descriptions for principals was 4.409. The mean score of superintendents without job descriptions for principals was 4.0.

Superintendents were asked in S-4b: What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on teacher evaluations for the purpose of instructional improvement? Eighty percent of the superintendents with job descriptions for principals expected principals to spend fifteen percent of their school time on teacher evaluations. Seventy-six percent of the superintendents without job descriptions for principals expected principals to spend fifteen percent of their school time on teacher evaluations.
**Teacher In-Service**

Item S-5a for superintendents was: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on teacher in-service as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a t test for significant difference at the .05 level, there was no significant difference (t = 1.888; df = 24; p > .05). The mean score of superintendents with job descriptions for principals was 3.590. The mean score of superintendents without job descriptions for principals was 2.75.

Superintendents were asked in S-5b: What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on teacher in-service outside of general faculty meetings? One hundred percent of the superintendents with and without job descriptions for principals expected principals to spend five percent of their school time on faculty meetings to improve instruction.

**Curriculum Development**

Item S-6a for superintendents was: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on faculty involvement in curriculum development as a supervisory activity for the improvement of instruction? Applying a t test for significant difference at the .05 level, there was no significant difference (t = .561; df = 24; p > .05). The mean score of superintendents with job descriptions for principals was 4.047. The mean score of superintendents without job descriptions for principals was 3.75.

Superintendents were asked in S-6b: What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on curriculum development? Eighty-six percent of the superintendents with job
descriptions for principals expected principals to spend ten percent of
their school time on curriculum development. Eighty-two percent of
the superintendents without job descriptions for principals expected
principals to spend ten percent of their time on curriculum develop-
ment.

Analysis of Data Comparing Responses of
Superintendents With Job Descriptions for
Principals to Responses of Superintendents
Without Job Descriptions for Principals

The data from the questionnaires revealed the mean scores of
superintendents without job descriptions for principals were lower on
five out of six supervisory activities as compared to the mean scores
of superintendents with job descriptions for principals. Superinten-
dents without job descriptions for principals, with only one exception,
did not rate any of the six supervisory activities of critical impor-
tance. (One superintendent without a job description for principals
rated one activity, classroom visitation of critical importance.)

In addition, superintendents without job descriptions for prin-
cipals expected less time to be spent in four of the six supervisory
activities. For example, seventy-six percent of the superintendents
without job descriptions expected principals to spend ten percent of
their school time in classroom visitations, whereas seventy-five per-
cent of the superintendents with job descriptions for principals ex-
pected principals to spend twenty percent of their school time in
classroom visitations.

If superintendents without job descriptions consistently place
less value on the six supervisory activities and expect less frequency
of use of these activities as compared to superintendents with job descriptions for principals then one could conclude that superintendents without job descriptions are not as aware and/or as appreciative of the supervisory activities recommended in the literature. As a result, principals who already operate without a job description would also not be provided with the direction and motivation from their superintendents to perform the kind/amount of supervisory activities suggested in the literature.

Demographic and classification data were examined but provided little insight into the ratings given by the superintendents. Specifically, years of experience as a teacher, years of experience as a principal, number of principals supervised, and year of graduation were not variables influencing responses of superintendents.

The data from the questionnaires of superintendents with and without job descriptions for principals revealed a significant difference in valuing two of the six supervisory practices, namely principal-teacher conferences and teacher evaluation. Superintendents with job descriptions for their principals valued both principal-teacher conferences and teacher evaluation significantly higher than superintendents without job descriptions for their principals.

The high priority that superintendents with job descriptions for principals placed on teacher evaluation was supported by the number of references to teacher evaluation in job descriptions. Ninety-two percent of the twenty-six job descriptions specified that principals were responsible for teacher evaluation. Many superintendents commented in the interview that they found it difficult to separate
teacher evaluation from what they viewed as components of the evaluation process that is, classroom visitation and principal-teacher conferences. Although only twenty-three percent of the job descriptions specified that the principal should hold principal-teacher conferences this activity was often an accepted component of teacher evaluation.

Superintendents can use job descriptions to specify the supervisory responsibilities for which elementary principals are held accountable. In addition, principals rely on written and verbal information given them by their superintendents. If the emphasis to perform supervisory tasks is clearly stated in a job description (an reinforced by the superintendent) then there is a greater likelihood of the principal performing this supervisory activity.

The frequency with which a supervisory activity was noted in job descriptions did not necessarily relate to the value given to the activity by superintendents with job descriptions for principals (see Table 18).

For example, even though classroom visitations were specifically mentioned in only nineteen percent of the principals' job descriptions, the mean score given to this activity by superintendents with job descriptions for principals was 4.454. Principal-teacher conferences were specifically mentioned in twenty-three percent of principals' job descriptions. The mean value given to principal-teacher conferences by superintendents with job descriptions for principals was 4.545. Faculty meetings, although specifically mentioned in forty-six percent of principals' job descriptions, were given a mean value of 2.636 by superintendents with job descriptions
for principals. Teacher evaluation was the most frequently mentioned supervisory activity in principals' job descriptions; teacher evaluation was mentioned in ninety-two percent of the job descriptions. Superintendents with job descriptions for principals gave teacher evaluation a mean value of 4.375. Teacher in-service was specifically mentioned in fifty-eight percent of the job descriptions. The mean value given to teacher in-service by superintendents with job descriptions for principals was 3.590. Curriculum development was specifically mentioned in thirty-eight percent of principals' job descriptions.

### Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Activity</th>
<th>Frequency of Reference in Principals' Job Descriptions</th>
<th>Superintendents With Job Descriptions for Principals Mean Score Rank (Value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Score      Percent Rank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Visitation</td>
<td>5 19 6</td>
<td>4.454 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal-Teacher Conferences</td>
<td>6 23 5</td>
<td>4.545 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Meetings</td>
<td>12 46 3</td>
<td>2.636 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Evaluation</td>
<td>24 92 1</td>
<td>4.375 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher In-Service</td>
<td>15 58 2</td>
<td>3.590 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>10 38 4</td>
<td>4.047 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean value given to curriculum development by principals with job descriptions was 4.047.

The lack of correspondence between the value superintendents gave to supervisory activities and the frequency to which it was referred in job descriptions pointed out the inconsistency with which the elementary principal must deal. Most job descriptions did not specifically mention classroom visitation, principal-teacher conferences or curriculum development, yet superintendents valued these activities of major importance.

If the lack of specificity in principals' job descriptions is not clarified through other forms of communication between the superintendent and principal, then the principal will not know on which of the six supervisory responsibilities the superintendent wishes him (the principal) to focus and therefore the principal may be viewed (and evaluated) by the superintendent as inefficient and/or ineffective in performing supervisory tasks.

If job descriptions were non-existent or lacked specificity in a district or if principals were unaware of the specifications noted in their job descriptions (as interviews suggested) or if superintendents were reluctant to be specific in their valuing of supervisory activities, then principals were left to their own discretion to perform the kinds of supervisory practices (at the appropriate frequency) for which they would be held accountable and on which they would be evaluated.

Although there was agreement in value given to four out of six supervisory practices between superintendents with and without
a job description for principals, there would be no way for a prin-
cipal to determine if his superintendent highly valued one or more of
the activities unless that principal had been informed either through
a job description, conference with the superintendent, or in-service
provided by the superintendent.

Because of the general terms used in developing job descrip-
tions, (for example, "provides leadership and supervision in the
school's educational program") and because of the reluctance of
superintendents to provide in-service for principals on supervisory
skills, principals approach their supervisory tasks relying on their
(principals') educational background and limited teaching expertise
to provide needed direction. Therefore, the significant difference
found between the scores of superintendents with and without job
descriptions for principals is particularly crucial to those prin-
cipals who will be held accountable for performance of the super-
visory tasks in question. Even where no significant difference
exists, superintendents are obligated to discuss with principals
the performance level of supervisory activities for which the super-
intendent will hold the principal accountable.

In most districts principals were at least partially evaluated
by their superintendents on their performance of supervisory activities
and this evaluation determined the amount (if any) of salary increment
for the following year.

The fact that superintendents do not agree on the value of each
supervisory activity is important to the individual principal, who in
performing his supervisory tasks will be evaluated by his superinten-
dent's value system which may or may not be consistent with his own. Therefore, it is possible that principals, not knowing how highly superintendents value a supervisory activity, will run the risk of inadvertently causing their evaluations and thereby a salary increment to be lower than anticipated.

Responses of Principals With Job Descriptions Compared to Responses of Superintendents With Job Descriptions for Principals

The responses of ninety-six principals with job descriptions were compared to the twenty-two responses of superintendents with job descriptions for principals.

Classroom Visitation

Item P-la for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place on classroom visitation as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? A parallel question for superintendents was item S-la: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on classroom visitation as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level, there was a significant difference ($z = 2.089; p < .05$). The mean score of superintendents with job descriptions for principals on classroom visitation as a supervisory activity was 4.454; the mean score of principals with job descriptions on classroom visitation as a supervisory activity was 4.094.

Principals with job descriptions were asked in P-lb: What percent of your school time is spent on classroom visitations to improve instruction? Superintendents with job descriptions for
principals were asked a parallel question S-1b: What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent in classroom visitation for the purpose of instructional improvement? Seventy percent of the principals with job descriptions reported they spent an average of ten percent of their school time on classroom visitation. Seventy-five percent of the superintendents with job descriptions for principals reported they expected principals to spend an average of twenty percent of their school time on classroom visitation.

**Principal-Teacher Conferences**

Item P-2a for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? A parallel question for superintendents was item S-2a: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level, there was not a significant difference (z = .3922; p > .05). The mean score of superintendents with job descriptions for principals on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity was 4.545; the mean score of principals with job descriptions on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity was 4.489.

Principals with job descriptions were asked in P-2b: What percent of your school time is spent on principal-teacher conferences for the purpose of instructional improvement? Superintendents with job descriptions for principals were asked a parallel question S-2b: What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on principal-teacher conferences for the purpose of
instructional improvement? Seventy-eight percent of the principals with job descriptions reported they spent an average of ten percent of their school time on principal-teacher conferences. Eighty percent of the superintendents with job descriptions for principals reported they expected principals to spend an average of five percent of their school time on principal-teacher conferences.

Faculty Meetings

Item P-3a for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place on general faculty meetings as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? A parallel question for superintendents was item S-3a: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on general faculty meetings as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level, there was not a significant difference (z = .3197; p > .05). The mean score of superintendents with job descriptions for principals on faculty meetings as a supervisory activity was 2.636; the mean score for principals with job descriptions on faculty meetings as a supervisory activity was 2.697. The mean score given to faculty meetings by superintendents and principals (with job descriptions for principals) was the lowest given to any of the six supervisory activities.

Principals with job descriptions were asked in P-3b: What percentage of your general faculty meetings are used for the purpose of instructional improvement? Superintendents with job descriptions for principals were asked a parallel question S-3b: What percentage of an elementary principal's time do you expect to be spent on faculty meetings for the purpose of instructional improvement? Fifty-three
percent of the principals with job descriptions reported they spent an average of five percent of their time on faculty meetings. Ninety-five percent of the superintendents with job descriptions for principals reported they expected principals to spend an average of five percent of their school time on faculty meetings to improve instruction.

Teacher Evaluation

Item P-4a for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place on evaluation of teachers as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? A parallel question for superintendents was item S-4a: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on evaluation of teachers as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level a significant difference was found (z = 2.4910; p < .05). The mean score of superintendents with job descriptions for principals on teacher evaluation as a supervisory activity was 4.409; the mean score for principals with job descriptions on teacher evaluation as a supervisory activity was 4.062.

Principals with job descriptions were asked in P-4b: What percent of your school time is spent on teacher evaluations for the purpose of instructional improvement? Superintendents with job descriptions for principals were asked a parallel question S-2b: What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on teacher evaluations for the purpose of instructional improvement? Eighty-six percent of the principals with job descriptions reported they spent an average of ten percent of their school time on teacher evaluation. Eight percent of the superintendents
with job descriptions for principals reported they expected principals to spend an average of ten percent of their school time on teacher evaluation.

**Teacher In-Service**

Item P-5a for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place on teacher in-service as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? A parallel question for superintendents was item S-5a: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on teacher in-service as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level there was not a significant difference ($z = .6909; p > .05$). The mean score of superintendents with job descriptions for principals on teacher in-service as a supervisory activity was 3.590; the mean score of principals with job descriptions on teacher in-service as a supervisory activity was 3.729.

Principals with job descriptions for principals were asked in P-5b: What percent of your school time is spent in teacher in-service (outside of general faculty meetings)? Superintendents with job descriptions for principals were asked a parallel question S-5b: What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on teacher in-service (outside of general faculty meetings)? Eighty-four percent of the principals with job descriptions reported they spent an average of five percent of their school time on teacher in-service. One hundred percent of the superintendents with job descriptions for principals reported they expected principals to spend an average of five percent of their school time on teacher in-service.
Curriculum Development

Item P-6a for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place on faculty involvement in curriculum development as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? A parallel question for superintendents was item S-6a: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on faculty involvement in curriculum development as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a z test for significant difference at the .05 level there was no significant difference (z = .2454; p > .05). The mean score for superintendents with job descriptions for principals on curriculum development as a supervisory activity was 4.047; the mean score for principals with job descriptions on curriculum development as a supervisory activity was 4.106.

Principals with job descriptions were asked in P-6b: What percent of your school time is spent on curriculum development? Superintendents with job descriptions for principals were asked a parallel question S-6b: What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on curriculum development? Eighty-eight percent of the principals with job descriptions reported they spent an average of ten percent of their school time on curriculum development. Eighty-six percent of the superintendents with job descriptions reported they expected principals to spend an average of ten percent of their school time on curriculum development.
Analysis of Data Comparing Responses of Principals With Job Descriptions to Responses of Superintendents With Job Descriptions for Principals

The data from the questionnaires of principals with job descriptions and superintendents with job descriptions for principals revealed a significant difference in responses on valuing two of the six supervisory activities. Superintendents with job descriptions for principals gave a significantly higher value than principals with job descriptions to classroom visitation and teacher evaluation.

Many principals and superintendents during interviews discussed that they viewed classroom visitation as a component of teacher evaluation. The mean scores of principals on classroom visitation (4.094) and teacher evaluation (4.062) were similar as were the mean scores of the superintendents on classroom visitation (4.454) and teacher evaluation (4.409).

The significant difference between the value superintendents and principals with job descriptions gave to classroom visitation and teacher evaluation indicated a lack of communication to the principals of the value given to these supervisory activities by the superintendents. Classroom visitation and teacher evaluation are two pivotal supervisory activities which every elementary principal should perform. The lack of agreement on the value the principal and superintendent give to the same supervisory activity leaves the principal accountable for performance of an activity which his superior (superintendent) rates more highly than himself (principal). Conflicts and lower principal ratings could result from this lack of agreement be-
between principals' and superintendents' valuations of classroom visitation and teacher evaluation.

If an activity is highly valued it will be performed (or expected to be performed) more often. Seventy percent of the principals with job descriptions reported they visited classrooms ten percent of their school time. Seventy-five percent of the superintendents with job descriptions for principals expected principals to spend twenty percent (or fifty percent more time) of their time visiting classrooms. A similar discrepancy in amount of time spent was observed in teacher evaluation. Eighty-six percent of the principals with job descriptions reported they spent ten percent of their school time on teacher evaluation. Eighty percent of the superintendents with job descriptions for principals reported they expected principals to spend fifteen percent of their time on teacher evaluation.

If superintendents expect a higher frequency of performance of supervisory activities by principals than principals are currently executing, then superintendents seem obligated to inform principals of their (superintendents') expectations of principals' performance. Communication of superintendents' expectations is almost as crucial in districts with job descriptions for principals as those without because of the lack of specificity found in the majority of available job descriptions.

In addition, if principals are performing supervisory activities without knowledge and/or consideration of the superintendents' value for this activity, it follows that principals will be held accountable for a level of performance which they (principals) are
not aware. Any difference between superintendents' and principals' values of the importance or frequency of use (or expected use) of supervisory activities deserves note, but a significant difference is crucial because principals' effectiveness will be evaluated on the performance of these activities by the superintendent.

It is interesting to note that although superintendents with job descriptions ranked classroom visitation as the most important supervisory activity, principals with job descriptions ranked it second in importance. The value given to classroom visitation by the principal can affect his performance in all other supervisory areas. Principals often use a principal-teacher conference before and/or after visitation, evaluations often result from classroom visitation; faculty meetings, in-service activities, and curriculum development are often influenced by the needs of the teachers observed by the principal during a classroom visitation. If a principal does not value classroom visitation highly and thereby performs it less frequently than is expected of him, it follows that the five other supervisory activities will be negatively affected also.

Demographics and classification were analyzed to determine if other variables influenced responses. No relationship was observed in years of experience as a teacher, years of experience as an elementary school principal and number of teachers supervised by principals.

Year of graduation of superintendents was plotted with no results. Year of graduation for principals revealed that the later a principal received his degree the more likely he was to place a higher value on classroom visitation and teacher evaluation.
Principals who had their degrees conferred after 1970 gave a noticeably higher value to classroom visitation and teacher evaluation. One explanation might be that the literature in the seventies focused on clinical supervision and its supervisory components of conference, visitation, and analysis.

If principals who graduated after 1970 value supervisory activities to a greater degree than principals who graduated before 1970, and if superintendents wish to increase principals' valuation and awareness of supervisory techniques and strategies, then there is a need for superintendents to provide in-service on supervisory activities to the earlier graduates.

Interviews of superintendents and principals revealed a reluctance on the part of superintendents to address themselves to specific supervisory activities. In addition, most superintendents did not have a support staff which could readily supply this in-service. Therefore, the disparity between the value given to supervisory activities by the superintendent and principal was not remediated due at least in part to lack of expertise of the superintendent.

Principals' job descriptions, although potentially able to specifically state principals' supervisory tasks, contained on the whole, general statements alluding to principals' supervisory performance. If principals were not recently trained at the university or if they did not have a specific job description, little additional communication was afforded principals by superintendents to increase the principals' awareness of supervisory techniques which the superintendent valued.
A discrepancy between the value given by superintendents and principals to supervisory activities combined with a lack of communication of expectations by the superintendents and lack of expertise by superintendents in providing for principals' in-service could eventually result in principals suffering low evaluations and loss of employment.

Responses of Principals Without Job Descriptions Compared to Responses of Superintendents Without Job Descriptions for Principals

The questionnaire responses of eight principals without job descriptions were compared to the four responses of superintendents without job descriptions for principals.

Classroom Visitation

Item P-1a for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place on classroom visitation as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? A parallel question for superintendents was item S-1a: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on classroom visitation as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a t test for significant difference at the .05 level there was not a significant difference (t = 0; df = 10; p > .05). The mean score of superintendents without job descriptions for principals on classroom visitation as a supervisory activity was 4.25; the mean score of principals without job descriptions on classroom visitation as a supervisory activity was 4.25.

Principals without job descriptions were asked in P-1b: What percent of your school time is spent on classroom visitations to
improve instruction? Superintendents without job descriptions for principals were asked a parallel question S-1b: What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent in classroom visitation for the purpose of instructional improvement? Seventy-four percent of the principals without job descriptions reported they spent an average of ten percent of their school time on classroom visitation. Seventy-six percent of the superintendents without job descriptions for principals reported they spent an average of ten percent of their school time on classroom visitation.

Principal-Teacher Conferences

Item P-2a for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? A parallel question for superintendents was item S-2a: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a t test for significant difference at the .05 level there was a significant difference ($t = 3.415; df = 7; p < .05$). The mean score of superintendents without job descriptions for principals on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity was 4.0; the mean score of principals without job descriptions on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity was 4.625.

Principals without job descriptions were asked in P-2b: What percent of your school time is spent on principal-teacher conferences for the purpose of instructional improvement? Superintendents without job descriptions for principals were asked a parallel question S-2b:
What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on principal-teacher conferences for the purpose of instructional improvement? Sixty-eight percent of the principals without job descriptions reported they spent an average of fifteen percent of their school time on principal-teacher conferences. Sixty-one percent of the superintendents without job descriptions for principals reported they expected principals to spend an average of five percent of their school time on principal-teacher conferences.

Faculty Meetings

Item P-3a for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place on general faculty meetings as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? A parallel question for superintendents was item S-3a: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on general faculty meetings as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a t test for significant difference at the .05 level there was not a significant difference (t = .762; df = 10; p > .05).

The mean score of superintendents without job descriptions for principals on faculty meetings as a supervisory activity was 2.75; the mean score of principals without job descriptions on faculty meetings was 3.0.

Principals without job descriptions were asked in P-3b: What percentage of your general faculty meetings are used for the purpose of instructional improvement? Superintendents without job descriptions for principals were asked a parallel question S-3b: What percentage of an elementary principal's time do you expect to be spent on faculty meetings for the purpose of instructional improvement?
Fifty-one percent of the principals without job descriptions reported they spent an average of five percent of their time on faculty meetings. Ninety-seven percent of the superintendents without job descriptions for principals reported they expected principals to spend an average of five percent of their school time on faculty meetings to improve instruction.

Teacher Evaluation

Item P-4a for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place on evaluation of teachers as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? A parallel question for superintendents was item S-4a: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on evaluation of teachers as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a t test for significant difference at the .05 level there was not a significant difference (t = 2.049; df = 7; p > .05).

The mean score of superintendents without job descriptions for principals on teacher evaluation as a supervisory activity was 4.0; the mean score of principals without job descriptions on teacher evaluation was 4.375.

Principals without job descriptions were asked in P-4b: What percent of your school time is spent on teacher evaluations for the purpose of instructional improvement? Superintendents without job descriptions for principals were asked a parallel question S-2b: What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on teacher evaluations for the purpose of instructional improvement? Eighty-four percent of the principals without job descriptions reported they spent an average of ten percent of their school time on teacher evaluation. Seventy-six percent of the superintendents without
job descriptions for principals reported they expected principals to spend an average of ten percent of their school time on teacher evaluation.

Teacher In-Service

Item P-5a for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place in teacher in-service as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? A parallel question for superintendents was item S-5a: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on teacher in-service as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a t test for significant difference at the .05 level there was a significant difference (t = 2.506; df = 10; p < .05). The mean score of superintendents without job descriptions for principals on teacher in-service as a supervisory activity was 2.75; the mean score of principals without job descriptions on teacher in-service was 3.75.

Principals without job descriptions for principals were asked in P-5b: What percent of your school time is spent in teacher in-service (outside of general faculty meetings)? Superintendents without job descriptions for principals were asked a parallel question S-5b: What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on teacher in-service (outside of general faculty meetings)? Eighty percent of the principals without job descriptions reported they spent an average of five percent of their school time on teacher in-service. One hundred percent of the superintendents without job descriptions for principals reported they expected principals to spend an average of five percent of their school time on teacher in-service.
Curriculum Development

Item P-6a for principals was: How much importance do you, as principal, place on faculty involvement in curriculum development as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? A parallel question for superintendents was item S-6a: How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on faculty involvement in curriculum development as a supervisory activity to improve instruction? Applying a t test for significant difference at the .05 level there was not a significant difference ($t = 1.628; df = 10; p > .05$). The mean score of superintendents without job descriptions for principals on curriculum development as a supervisory activity was 3.75; the mean score of principals without job descriptions on curriculum development was 4.375.

Principals without job descriptions were asked in P-6b: What percent of your school time is spent on curriculum development? Superintendents without job descriptions for principals were asked a parallel question S-6b: What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on curriculum development? Eighty-four percent of the principals without job descriptions reported they spent ten percent of their school time on curriculum development. Eighty-two percent of the superintendents without job descriptions for principals reported they expected principals to spend an average of ten percent of their school time on curriculum development.
Analysis of Data Comparing Responses of Principals Without Job Descriptions to Responses of Superintendents Without Job Descriptions for Principals

The data from questionnaires of principals without job descriptions and superintendents without job descriptions for principals indicated that superintendents valued two of the supervisory activities, principal-teacher conferences and teacher in-service, significantly lower than did principals without job descriptions.

Without a job description, a principal's performance of supervisory tasks is more dependent on communication from the superintendent in order to set supervisory standards for performance of these activities. It is evident from the disparity between superintendents' and principals' valuation of principal-teacher conferences and teacher in-service found in the data, that superintendents without job descriptions for their principals are not communicating to the principals the value they (superintendents) attribute to these supervisory activities or the expected frequency of performance. Without specific information from job descriptions or from the superintendents during principals' in-service, the principals are left to infer the priorities of the superintendent.

Demographic and classification data were examined; specifically, years of experience as a teacher, years of experience as a superintendent and number of teachers supervised by principals were not found to be variables influencing responses.

Because principals without job descriptions in the sample placed a significantly higher value on principal-teacher conferences and teacher
in-service than superintendents without job descriptions for principals, it follows that principals without job descriptions would spend more time on activities which their superintendents did not value as they (principals) did. Principals were asked in P-2b: What percent of your school time is spent on principal-teacher conferences for the purpose of instructional improvement? Superintendents were asked a parallel question S-2b: What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on principal-teacher conferences for the purpose of instructional improvement? Sixty-eight percent of the principals said they spent fifteen percent of their time on principal-teacher conferences; sixty-one percent of the superintendents said they expected principals to spend ten percent of their time on this activity. A disparity was also noted when asking principals and superintendents about time spent in teacher in-service. Eighty percent of the principals said they spent five percent of their school time on teacher in-service; one hundred percent of the superintendents said they expected principals to spend five percent of their time on this activity.

The fact that principals without job descriptions place a greater value and spend more school time on supervisory activities than superintendents without job descriptions for principals expect may indicate that principals view the superintendent as having similar priorities, or that since there were no supervisory guidelines established (written or verbal) the principals established their own priorities based on local need. Since the supervisory function of the principal is intrinsically tied into improvement of instruction, student achievement, teacher accountability, and administrative accountability, the
principals rely on superintendents to disseminate specific information concerning the performance of supervisory activities.

Without supervisory guidelines from the superintendents, supervision by crisis can result. In interviews many principals reported no communication with superintendents on supervisory activities, until a crisis arose. If a parent or teacher brought a problem situation to the superintendent's attention, the principal would receive a phone call which would explain the superintendent's position in the matter.

When a principal does not know the priorities of the superintendent while performing supervisory duties, but learns of them in a crisis situation after a decision is made, it leaves the principal in the vulnerable position of being responsible for performance of supervisory activities, being accountable to and evaluated by the superintendent, yet not knowing the criteria by which his performance will be measured.

Questionnaire and Interview Responses of Eight Principals and Four Superintendents With Job Descriptions for Principals and Seven Principals and Four Superintendents Without Job Descriptions for Principals in DuPage County, Illinois

Of the twenty-six responding superintendents and one hundred four responding principals, a group of eight superintendents and fifteen principals (two for each superintendent, where possible) was randomly chosen for in-depth, follow-up interviews. Since only four superintendents in DuPage County responded that job descriptions were not available for their districts, all four superintendents were included.
A random selection of two principals from each district without job descriptions provided seven principals (one superintendent had only one principal). In districts with only two principals, both were included.

Questionnaire and Interview Responses of Seven Principals and Four Superintendents in Districts Without Job Descriptions for Principals

Follow-up interviews were held with four superintendents and seven principals in districts without job descriptions for principals. The superintendents were referred to by letters A, B, C, and D. The two principals reporting to superintendent A were referred to as A-1 and A-2, the two principals reporting to superintendent B were referred to as B-1 and B-2, and so forth. The purpose of the interviews was to probe for reasons for questionnaire responses focusing on similarities, dissimilarities, problems, strengths, weaknesses, and trends.

District A

District A included five schools (five principals), 140 teachers and 2500 students. Principal A-1 administered a junior high school which had forty-two teachers and 753 students. Principal A-2 administered a kindergarten through fifth grade school with twenty-four teachers and 491 students.

Superintendent A had six years experience as a classroom teacher (grades seven and eight) and two years of experience as an elementary principal prior to becoming superintendent. Superintendent A's fifteen years of experience as a superintendent were confined to his current
Superintendent A received a doctorate in educational administration in 1973.

Principal A-1 had four years of experience as a classroom teacher (grades six through ten) and five years of experience as an elementary principal. All five years of experience as an elementary principal were at his current school. Principal A-1 received a masters in educational administration in 1971.

Principal A-2 had six years of experience as a teacher (grades seven and eight). This year was Principal A-2's first year as a principal. He had no past administrative experience. Principal A-2 received a masters in educational administration in 1975.

Table 19 indicates there was minimal agreement between the valuation, ranking, and frequency of time spent (or expected to be spent) in the six supervisory activities, by superintendent A and principals A-1 and A-2.

Principal A-1 consistently rated the supervisory activities as important or more important than the superintendent. Only on two of the supervisory activities, teacher in-service and curriculum development, did principal A-1 accurately estimate his superintendent's opinion of importance. In the interview, principal A-1 expressed a self-confidence in his supervisory role in the district. Principal A-1 stated he began as a science teacher in the district, was promoted to assistant principal, then principal. Since all principal A-1's experiences were under superintendent A, they (past experiences) provided principal A-1 with a broad base of information with which to handle supervisory tasks.
TABLE 19

VALUATION AND FREQUENCY OF TIME SPENT OR EXPECTED TO BE SPENT ON SIX SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES BY SUPERINTENDENT A AND PRINCIPAL A-1 AND PRINCIPAL A-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Importance Given by A to Activity</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Expected by A</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity by A</th>
<th>Importance Given by A-1 to Activity</th>
<th>Importance Expected by A-1 of A</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Spent by A-1</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity by A-1</th>
<th>Importance Given by A-2 to Activity</th>
<th>Importance Expected by A-2 of A</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Spent by A-2</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity by A-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Visitation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal-Teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Meetings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher In-Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Superintendent in DuPage County, Illinois, without a job description for principals A-1 and A-2 = Principals in DuPage County, Illinois, without job descriptions
Principal A-2 consistently rated all six supervisory activities of major importance (number four). Only in two supervisory activities, principal-teacher conferences and curriculum development, did principal A-2 accurately estimate his superintendent's ratings. In the interview, principal A-2 reported that, this being his first year as principal, he found the supervisory tasks time consuming and difficult. Principal A-2 received little information regarding supervisory strategies directly from the superintendent; most of this information came from fellow principals in the district. If new administrators in a district are not provided with in-service training to familiarize them with the goals of the district and the acceptable means of achieving the goals, then principals will be forced to interact on an informal basis with their peers, with no assurance of receiving accurate information. This lack of information would be likely to have a negative impact on the principal's job performance.

It was interesting to note that superintendent A rate curriculum development as the most important supervisory activity; whereas principal A-1 ranked it fourth and principal A-2 ranked it second. The disparity in ranking given to curriculum development by the superintendent in comparison to the ranking given by principal A-1 (who had been principal in the district for five years) shows that the superintendent had not clearly indicated his priorities to this principal. It also pointed out a principal's vulnerability if he (principal) operates under the presumption that the superintendent values the supervisory activity in a manner similar to himself (principal). Any disparity in rankings, for example, the small disparity
between superintendent A's and principal A-2's ranking of curriculum development, can cause conflict resulting in a possible low evaluation of the principal by the superintendent.

Superintendent A expected his principals to spend approximately forty-six percent of their school time on supervisory activities. Both principal A-1 and principal A-2 stated they spent seventy percent of their time on the six supervisory activities. The percentages were approximations but they revealed that superintendent A was inconsistent in viewing curriculum development as most important, while expecting principals to spend only three percent of their (principals') time in this activity. Principal A-1 was equally inconsistent when he reported that teacher evaluation was most important, yet he spent only five percent of his time on this activity. Principal A-2's reporting of time spent on each activity showed a greater consistency with the value he had given each activity. The lack of consistency in reporting time spent and value of supervisory activities probably resulted from the principals and superintendent reporting values for some activities which they thought would be acceptable to the researcher.

The interview with superintendent A revealed that the superintendent expected eight to ten classroom visitations per year of non-tenured teachers and four or five of tenured teachers by his principals. Superintendent A expected the principal to spend thirty minutes in a classroom visitation. Superintendent A also expected visits to be announced.

The district policy stated two visits, for a full period, were to be made to non-tenured teachers for the purpose of evaluation; one
visit, for a full period, was to be made to tenured teachers for the purpose of evaluation. Principal A-1 and principal A-2 were aware and complied with district policy in regard to visitations and conferences for evaluation. If, in district A, principals' responsibilities in all supervisory areas were as well known as they were in teacher evaluation, then principals could establish goals and measure their supervisory performance against known district criteria.

District A had a teacher evaluation form which was to be completed by the principal after a formal visitation (for the purpose of evaluation). The evaluation form was developed by teachers and approved by administrators. The principal was to note, in narrative form, the strengths and weaknesses of the teacher in two areas: instruction and program management. After a formal visitation, principals conferred with teachers and reviewed results. A teacher's signature was required on the evaluation to denote that a conference had been held.

A classroom observation form had not been developed on the district or local level. The teacher evaluation form was very general and did not require the principal to specify in writing suggestions for improvement. Unless guidelines are available to teachers and principals as to what is to be observed in a classroom visitation, the principal can cause serious faculty morale problems by evaluating teachers on qualities of performance which are unknown or unacceptable to the faculty.

Principal A-2 revealed in the interview that he felt very uncomfortable in evaluating teachers and in providing teacher in-service. He stated that all his teaching experience (six years) was in grades
seven and eight. Now, as principal of a kindergarten through fifth grade school, he thought he lacked a knowledge of curriculum, child development, and discipline for younger children. Principal A-2 found it difficult to observe in a primary room and offer suggestions to the teacher for improving her teaching skills. If a neophyte principal is to succeed, he should be provided with specific in-service which discusses the priorities of the district concerning supervisory practices. If no district resource person is available to provide this in-service, a "buddy-system", could be considered wherein an experienced principal would be available to answer the new principal's questions and "show him the ropes". Without proper in-servicing of principals on crucial supervisory skills, the superintendent runs the risk of either having morale problems on faculty due to inappropriate action, or a lack of instructional improvement due to principal inaction, or perhaps both.

Although superintendent A ranked curriculum development his first priority as a supervisory activity, the interview gave little evidence to support this valuation. The only involvement required of each principal in curriculum development was to attend a meeting four times a year to choose textbooks for the following school year. If a superintendent places a high value on a supervisory activity, he is obligated to make this known to his principals and to provide a framework through which achievement of the priority can be attained.

District B

District B included three schools (two principals), fifty-six teachers and 1111 students. Principal B-1 administered a grade two through grade eight school which had thirty-two teachers and 650
students. Principal B-2 administered two schools; one school had 280 children and included kindergarten through grade one, the other building housed 185 children in grades one through four. A total of twenty-five teachers were supervised by principal B-2.

Superintendent B had four years of experience as a classroom teacher (grade six) and four years of experience as an elementary school principal. Superintendent B had six years of experience as a superintendent, two of which were in his current district. Superintendent B received a doctorate in educational administration in 1971.

Principal B-1 had nine years of experience as a classroom teacher (grades four through eight) and four years of experience as a principal, three of which were at his current school. Principal B-1 had a masters degree in educational administration conferred in 1971.

Principal B-2 had seven years of experience as an elementary physical education teacher and six years of experience as an elementary school principal at his current school. Principal B-2 had a masters in educational administration conferred in 1969.

Table 20 indicates that superintendent B did not view any of the six supervisory activities as critically important. All supervisory activities were viewed as of major importance by superintendent B except for faculty meetings and teacher in-service which were of minor importance. Superintendent B ranked principal-teacher conferences and classroom visitations as the most valued supervisory activities and faculty meetings and teacher in-service as the least valued supervisory activities. Superintendent B's valuation of activities were consistent with his rankings.
### TABLE 20

VALUATION AND FREQUENCY OF TIME SPENT OR EXPECTED TO BE SPENT ON SIX SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES BY SUPERINTENDENT B AND PRINCIPAL B-1 AND PRINCIPAL B-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Importance Given by B to Activity</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Expected by B</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity by B</th>
<th>Importance Given by B-1 to Activity</th>
<th>Importance Expected Activity Expected by B-1 of B</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Spent by B-1</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity by B-1</th>
<th>Importance Given by B-2 to Activity</th>
<th>Importance Expected Activity Expected by B-2 of B</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Spent by B-2</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity by B-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Visitation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal-Teacher Conferences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Meetings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher In-Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B = Superintendent in DuPage County, Illinois, without a job description for principals
B-1 and B-2 = Principals in DuPage County, Illinois, without job descriptions
Principal B-1 viewed all supervisory activities of major or critical importance. Although principal B-1 ranked classroom visitations as first, or the most valued supervisory activity, he rated it of major, not critical importance. In addition, principal B-1 ranked curriculum development as the least valued supervisory activity and also said it was of critical importance. Principal B-1's rankings of value were therefore not consistent with his ratings of importance. It is doubtful whether the questionnaire was responded to by principal B-1 in a thoughtful and/or truthful manner.

In addition, principal B-1 viewed superintendent B as valuing all six supervisory activities of critical importance. Principal B-1 said in the interview that he really did not know how much importance superintendent B placed on the six supervisory activities. My interview with principal B-1 provided more accurate information than an isolated analysis of the questionnaire data could have afforded. It was clear that either the questionnaire had been completed in a hurried manner with little consideration for accurate reporting by principal B-1 or he was reporting information he thought the researcher wanted.

Principal B-2 viewed three supervisory activities of critical importance: classroom visitation, teacher evaluation, and principal-teacher conferences. All three activities were ranked by principal B-2 as the three most valued supervisory activities. Principal B-2 was consistent in ranking these three activities according to relative value and importance. Some inconsistency was observed in ranking curriculum development as the least valued supervisory activity, yet saying it was of major importance. In addition, principal B-2
ranked faculty meetings fourth in value (higher than curriculum development) yet said it was of average importance.

Superintendent B in the questionnaire expected his principals to spend seventy-nine percent of their school time on the six supervisory activities. Principal B-1 reported 160 percent and principal B-2, 115 percent of school time was spent on the supervisory activities. Some of the confusion over time spent in each activity was clarified in the interviews with superintendent B and principal B-1 and B-2. Both principals and superintendent saw a great deal of overlap between classroom visitation, principal-teacher conferences, and teacher evaluation as supervisory activities, therefore the percentage of time spent in each activity could not easily be separated.

The interview revealed that superintendent B expected twenty percent of a principal's average school week to be spent in supervisory activities. Principal B-1 said he spent twenty-five percent of his time and principal B-2 said he spent thirty percent of his school time in supervisory activities. The interviews were able to provide clarification on the issue of time spent (or expected to be spent) in supervisory activities.

Principal B-2 said his supervisory role was negatively affected by having two schools. In addition, he stated that his training to prepare him to deal with the supervisory problems faced by an elementary school principal was very inadequate. Principal B-2 had no experience as a classroom teacher. His only experience was as a physical education teacher. It is likely that principal B-2 needed more support, more assistance, and more in-service training than other principals in
district B due to his lack of classroom experience. District B had one full time reading consultant who provided teacher in-service in B-2's school. If after hiring principals, they (principals) are not provided with training in supervisory skills (commensurate with their background and experience) the superintendent can expect a long period of adjustment wherein the principal becomes more knowledgeable at the possible expense of faculty morale and student learning.

The questionnaire data and interviews revealed that both principal B-1 and B-2, who operated without job descriptions, were unaware of their superintendent's expectations. Superintendent B allowed both principals the flexibility to operate without specifying required performance outcomes. If the superintendent does not communicate his supervisory expectations to his principals then the principals will perform supervisory duties using their own (principals') valuation of the activities, their energy levels, their past experiences, and the ability of the teaching staffs as a guide. When a principal is forced to seek guidance and direction from anyone other than his superior, the chances of meeting the superior's unstated expectations are diminished.

In the interview superintendent B indicated he was concerned about not having a job description for principals. He said a job description was available from the former superintendent but it was not functional. Superintendent B preferred a general job description over a specific one for principals, but he concluded an individualized job description would be the ideal. If superintendent B is sincere in his expressed preference for individualized job descriptions then certainly
it would not be difficult to achieve in a school district with only two principals.

Although district B's policy requires two formal evaluations for non-tenured teachers and one formal evaluation for tenured teachers, superintendent B prefers his principals to visit non-tenured teachers about six times a year and tenured teachers about three times a year. Superintendent B had not communicated his classroom visitation expectations to his principals. Not knowing the superintendent's expectations, principals would tend to comply with written policy but be subject to evaluation based on the superintendent's expectations.

Principal B-1 complied with district policy but he found it difficult to visit the classroom more often. In the interview he revealed that the faculty saw him as an "office person". This comment pointed out again the inconsistency of principal B-1's reporting on the questionnaire that he spent twenty-five percent of his time on classroom visitations. In addition, principal B-1's inability to visit classrooms to his superintendent's expectations (whether known or unknown to principal B-1) could cause the superintendent to lower the principal's (B-1's) performance evaluation.

District B's teacher evaluation form (checklist) covered four areas for tenured teachers: instructional ability, schoolroom atmosphere, class management, and personal qualities. The evaluation form (checklist) for non-tenured teachers covered six areas: personal qualities, teacher-community relationships, classroom control and management, instructional and guidance skills, and professional qualities. Only the evaluation form for non-tenured teachers required the principal to
make comments and recommendations. Both evaluation forms required the
principal's and teacher's signatures. The specificity of district B's
teacher evaluation forms gives structure and purpose to a classroom
visitation. If the principals and superintendent used the evaluation
form as a tool to provide teacher in-service, then the process of eval­
uation could be a positive means of providing for staff development in
district B.

The questionnaire data indicated that teacher in-service was not
a priority with superintendent B (who ranked it sixth) or either prin­
cipal B-1 or B-2 (both ranked it fifth). Although it was clear from the
literature that the purpose of visitations, conferences, and evaluations
was to use the revealed areas of need to develop teacher in-service pro­
grams designed to improve instruction, very little staff development at
the local school level took place in district B. If neither the super­
intendent nor the two principals of a district value teacher in-service
as a means to improve instruction, then it could follow that teachers
would be frustrated by the assumption that they (teachers) can improve
their job performance through the isolated use of visitations, confer­
ences, and evaluations. Teacher frustration, when multiplied over time,
presents the elementary principal with a personnel morale problem that
is easier to prevent than to cure.

District C

District C included two schools. The superintendent served also
as principal of a grade four through eight school with seventeen teachers
and 230 students. The superintendent's office was also at the elementary
school he administered. The other school had kindergarten through grade three with eleven teachers and 196 students.

Superintendent C had thirteen years of experience as a classroom teacher (grades six through eight) and thirteen years of experience as an elementary school principal. Superintendent C had been superintendent/principal in his current district for eleven years. Superintendent C received a masters in educational administration in 1956.

Principal C-1 had twelve years of experience as a classroom teacher (grades three through six), eleven years as an elementary school principal, three of which had been at her present school. Principal C-1 had also been a superintendent for two years. Principal C-1 received a masters degree in educational administration in 1952.

Table 21 indicates that both superintendent C and principal C-1 agreed that the six supervisory activities were of average or major importance. Superintendent C and principal C-1 agreed on the importance of all supervisory activities except curriculum development. Curriculum development was rated of major importance by superintendent C, whereas principal C-1 rated it of average importance.

The rankings of value for the six supervisory activities were similar, though not identical for superintendent C and principal C-1. Both valued classroom visitation most highly. Although a tabulation of time indicated on the questionnaire that superintendent C expected and principal C-1 gave, one hundred percent of their school time to supervisory activities, only principal C-1 maintained during the interview that she spent most of her day in supervisory activities. Superintendent C stated in the interview he expected fifty percent of the
TABLE 21
VALUATION AND FREQUENCY OF TIME SPENT OR EXPECTED TO BE SPENT ON SIX SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES BY SUPERINTENDENT C AND PRINCIPAL C-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Importance Given by C to Activity</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Expected by C</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity by C</th>
<th>Importance Given by C-1 to Activity</th>
<th>Importance Expected of Activity by C-1</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Spent by C-1</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity by C-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Visitation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal-Teacher Conferences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Meetings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher In-Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C = Superintendent in DuPage County, Illinois, without a job description for principals

C-1 = Principal in DuPage County, Illinois, without a job description
principal's time to be spent supervising teachers. The superintendent explained that as the schools in the district become larger, he (superintendent) must acknowledge that proportionately more of the principal's time will be necessarily spent in administrative tasks. The discrepancy between superintendent C's and principal C-1's time spent (or expected to be spent) on supervisory activities possibly resulted from superintendent C's looking forward to next year's anticipated increase in student population and the necessary limitations this would place on a principal's time.

Currently, principal C-1 has eight classroom teachers (kindergarten through grade three). The district policy had always been (and principal C-1 complied) that the principal was to spend one day in each teacher's room for teacher evaluation. In September, 1978, thirteen additional rooms are scheduled to be opened in principal C-1's school and the school is to become a kindergarten through fifth grade building. Since non-tenured teachers are visited twice a year and tenured teachers once a year, most of the principal's working hours could be absorbed in classroom visitations and related activities unless a more realistic time allotment for visitations is established by superintendent C.

Prior to this year, district C did not have a teachers' evaluation form. Superintendent C developed a teachers' performance evaluation instrument independently, then introduced it to the teachers for their input. Principal C-1 was on her way to meet with superintendent C concerning the use of the instrument the day of the interview.

The similarity in values given to supervisory activities by superintendent C and principal C-1 was reflected in their similar
responses to interview questions. The superintendent stressed his excellent rapport with principal C-1. Superintendent C met informally with principal C-1 regarding district policy, plans, and objectives. Superintendent C commented, "Principal C-1 seems to know what I find acceptable." These same good feelings and open communication between principal and superintendent were noted in the interview with principal C-1. She spoke highly of superintendent C saying the lines of communication were open and that he communicated with her frequently.

District C operated without a job description, yet superintendent C and principal C-1 basically agreed on the importance of a principal's supervisory role and how the principal can facilitate instructional improvement. If in a small school district the superintendent interacts often (formally or informally) with principals regarding his supervisory expectations, the need for a job description is minimized, but not obviated.

It is interesting to note that both superintendent C and principal C-1 agreed that if a job description were developed for district C, they would like it to be specific in regard to the principal's supervisory duties. Principal C-1 said, "I would know in a specific job description absolutely what I had to do, then I could make up my own job description to fit." Superintendent C said because his relationship with principal C-1 was excellent he would choose a specific over a general job description.

The preference for a specific job description by superintendent C and principal C-1 might stem from the belief that it could be used as a criterion to evaluate a principal's work performance. With a specific
job description (as principal C-1 noted) a principal would know what duties must be performed; the job description might even specify when the supervisory duties need be performed. Principal evaluation could then be based on known criteria.

Principals might add to their supervisory duties after consideration of the needs and abilities of their staffs but the essential framework of the job description would remain as a basis of evaluation for all principals by superintendents.

The interview with superintendent C took place in the gymnasium. Superintendent C was supervising a class due to the absence of the physical education instructor. In answering questions concerning his role as superintendent, superintendent C found it difficult to separate his role as superintendent from his role as principal. He would constantly refer to how he accomplished supervisory tasks. The addition of principal's responsibilities to superintendent C's role as superintendent provided him with the unique opportunity to initiate policy as a superintendent and to implement policy as a principal. I believe the dual role (superintendent/principal) for superintendent C provided him with understanding and appreciation of principal C-1's performance of supervisory tasks that he might otherwise not have had.

The strong bonds of mutual personal respect between superintendent C and principal C-1 enabled them to communicate as often as needed regarding supervisory activities. Principal C-1 had two years of experience as a superintendent and undoubtedly was empathetic with the work demands of superintendent C. Superintendent C, filling two positions,
superintendent as well as principal, had immediate on-the-job experience which helped him relate to principal C-1's role as a supervisor.

**District D**

District D included two schools (two principals), forty-two teachers and 710 students. Principal D-1 administered a grade four through eight school which had twenty-three teachers and 430 students. Principal D-2 administered a kindergarten through grade three school which had thirteen teachers and 280 students.

Superintendent D had four years of classroom experience (grades one through eight) and eight years of experience as an elementary school principal. Superintendent D had two years of experience as a superintendent, all of which were in the same district. Superintendent D received a doctorate in educational administration in 1971.

Principal D-1 had ten years of experience as a classroom teacher (grades six through eight) and twelve years of experience as an elementary principal. Principal D-1 had been at his present school six years. In addition, principal D-1 had eight years of experience as an assistant superintendent and as a superintendent. Principal D-1 received a certificate of advanced study in 1972.

Principal D-2 had ten years of experience as a classroom teacher (grades four through eight) and two years of experience as an elementary school principal, one of which was at his present school. Principal D-2 received a masters degree in educational administration in 1971.

Table 22 indicates that superintendent D viewed the six supervisory activities of average or major importance. He viewed classroom visitation, teacher evaluation, and principal-teacher conferences of
TABLE 22

VALUATION AND FREQUENCY OF TIME SPENT OR EXPECTED TO BE SPENT ON SIX SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES BY SUPERINTENDENT D AND PRINCIPAL D-1 AND PRINCIPAL D-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Importance Given by D to Activity</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Expected by D</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity by D</th>
<th>Importance Given D-1 to Activity</th>
<th>Importance Expected Activity Expected by D-1 of D</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Spent by D-1</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity by D-1</th>
<th>Importance Given D-2 to Activity</th>
<th>Importance Expected Activity Expected by D-2 of D</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Spent by D-2</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity by D-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Visitation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal-Teacher Conferences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Meetings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher In-Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

major importance and ranked them in that order. Superintendent D's rankings of value were consistent with his ratings of importance.

Principal D-1 agreed with superintendent D's ratings of importance on four out of six supervisory activities. Principal D-1 rated faculty meetings of minor importance while the superintendent rated them of average importance; principal D-1 rated curriculum development of major importance while the superintendent rated it of average importance. Principal D-1 ranked teacher evaluation, classroom visitations, and principal-teacher conferences, as the most valued supervisory activities in that order. There was agreement between superintendent D and principal D-1's ratings of importance and rankings of value which may be attributed to the experience principal D-1 (as a principal and former superintendent) brought to his position.

Principal D-2 agreed with superintendent D's rating of importance on only one supervisory activity, teacher evaluation. In addition, none of his (principal D-2's) rankings of importance for the six supervisory activities correlated with superintendent D's. Principal D-2 was not aware of the superintendent's priorities and valuation in regard to supervisory activities. A possible reason for this lack of awareness was the fact that principal D-2 was completing his first year in district D and he had not been provided with in-service from the superintendent which would clarify and communicate superintendent D's expectations of principals' supervisory performance.

Superintendent D and principals D-1 and D-2 found it difficult to state the percentages of time spent in each supervisory activity because they found the activities overlapping. During interviews,
superintendent D clarified the questionnaire data by stating he expected twenty-five percent of a principal's time to be spent in supervisory activities. Both principal D-1 and D-2 said they spent about twenty-five percent of their time supervising, although principal D-1 viewed superintendent D expecting fifty percent of a principal's time being spent providing supervision. The fact that principal D-1 though superintendent D expected more time devoted to supervision indicated that he (principal D-2) was not informed of his superintendent's expectations regarding principal time spent in supervisory activities. Principal D-1's use of time could be a source of possible conflict with superintendent D.

Questionnaire and interview data revealed that the newer of the two principals (D-2) was uncomfortable in not knowing the superintendent's expectations of principals' performance. Principal D-2's problem was compounded by the fact that he was hired as a principal/administrative assistant in the district. Principal D-2 could interact with principal D-1 on procedural matters involving the principalship but only the superintendent was aware of his (superintendent's) expectations of principal D-2 as an administrative assistant.

Principal D-2's school was in the same building as superintendent D's office and prior to this year the superintendent was also principal of the school. Principal D-2 indicated that some faculty members resented the district spending money for an additional administrator's salary. Besides his duties as principal, Principal D-2 had been given other administrative chores including the development of two district handbooks. Principal D-2 found a great deal of his time was spent on the administrative activities associated with the district office rather
than as principal of the school. Furthermore, since all principal D-2's experiences had been with children in grades four through eight, he did not feel adequately prepared to administer and supervise a kindergarten through grade three building.

If superintendents choose to hire administrators inexperienced in the areas or levels they will be expected to supervise, there would seem to be an obligation on the superintendent's part to provide suitable information and in-service to the principals which could increase their (principals') chances of successful performance of supervisory duties.

Principal D-2 noted that since the former superintendent was released by the board of education two years ago, there had been an increased emphasis on a structured curriculum in the district. The former superintendent had administered the district for twelve years and had advocated open classroom settings, multi-age groupings, flexible scheduling, and child-initiated learning. The former superintendent had also discontinued standardized testing. After the dismissal of the former superintendent, the board of education developed a more traditional curriculum to meet the community's demand for structure. Because information concerning the change in district D's approach to learning and curriculum structure was well known, both principal D-1 and principal D-2 probably rated curriculum development of major and critical importance, respectively. Possibly superintendent D viewed curriculum development of only average importance today because of the changes in curriculum which were effected in the two years of his superintendency.
Superintendent D communicated with his principals by holding administrative team meetings twice a month. Superintendent D also developed a modified Management by Objectives Plan in the district which was used for principal evaluations. Since district D's principals receive merit pay, the results of the Management by Objectives Plan also influenced their salaries.

The Management by Objectives Plan required each principal in district D to develop three performance objectives for the year. Superintendent D developed three optional performance objectives for each principal. A conference was held at mid-year by superintendent D with each principal and again at the end of the year to determine the principal's accomplishments (and his possible salary increase). Superintendent D also visited schools occasionally to confer personally with the principals concerning needs and problems.

The goals and objectives of superintendent D and his principals, although not necessarily mutually developed, were mutually agreed upon. The performance plan for principals, especially in a district not having a job description provided some guidance and direction to principals. Realistically however, six goals cannot (and should not) be all encompassing and could, in fact, even neglect to mention a principal's supervisory duties. Yet, the principal would be held accountable for (and possible salary increases based on) performance of supervisory duties in a manner acceptable to the superintendent whether or not the duties were stated as objectives. Principals are faced with a very tenuous role when they are expected to provide supervision which will improve instructional performance and yet are provided with little information
or few guidelines which will assist them in discerning what the superintendent considers "acceptable" performance.

Summary

Questionnaire data and interview responses of superintendents and principals from districts without job descriptions for principals indicated that principals were not aware of their superintendent's expectations of principals' supervisory performance. Principals in districts A, B, C, and D, already operating without job descriptions, were also not informed as to what supervisory practices were highly valued by the superintendent or how often he (superintendent) expected principals to perform these activities.

Principals in districts without job descriptions for principals were provided with little, if any, in-service directed at enhancing principals' supervisory skills. In addition, no provision was made for in-servicing new principals in the districts. Principals were virtually left on their own to use supervisory techniques and develop supervisory patterns, but lack of information did not obviate principals' accountability to superintendents for their (principals') supervisory performance.

Because principals in districts without job descriptions had the double burden of not being able to refer to a job description for supervisory guidelines, coupled with a lack of direction from their superintendents, they (principals) would be particularly vulnerable to receiving low evaluations from their superintendents. Principals in districts without job descriptions for principals had few sources to
refer for guidance or help in meeting their superintendents' unknown supervisory expectations for principals.

Questi\nonnaire and Interview Responses of Eight Principals and Four Superintendents in Districts With Job Descriptions for Principals

Follow-up interviews were held with four superintendents and eight principals in districts with job descriptions for principals. The superintendents were referred to by letters E, F, G, and H. The two principals reporting to superintendent E were referred to as E-1 and E-2, the two principals reporting to superintendent F were referred to as F-1 and F-2, and so forth. The purpose of the interviews was to probe the reasons for questionnaire responses focusing on similarities, dissimilarities, problems, strengths, weaknesses, and trends.

District E

District E included ten schools (ten principals), 265 teachers and 4737 students. Principal E-1 administered a kindergarten through grade six school which had eighteen teachers and 380 students. Principal E-2 administered a kindergarten through grade six building with twenty-two teachers and 400 students.

Superintendent E had ten years of experience as a classroom teacher (grades two through eight and high school biology) and seventeen years as an elementary school principal prior to becoming superintendent. Superintendent E's three years of experience as a superintendent were confined to her current district. Superintendent E received a doctorate in educational administration in 1963.
Principal E-1 had four years of experience as a classroom teacher (grades seven and eight) and ten years of experience as an elementary school principal. All ten years of principal E-1's experience as an elementary principal were at his present school. Principal E-1 received a doctorate in educational administration in 1975.

Principal E-2 had nine years of experience as a teacher (kindergarten and grades three, six, and eight) and seventeen years of experience as an elementary school principal, eight of which were at her current school. Principal E-2 received a masters in educational administration in 1962.

Table 23 indicates superintendent E rated no supervisory activity higher than major importance; whereas principal E-1 rated four and principal E-2 rated three supervisory activities of critical importance. The superintendent rated faculty meetings of no importance in improving instruction while both principals E-1 and E-2 stated they were of average importance. Superintendent E's ranking of value of the six supervisory activities was consistent with her ratings of importance for each activity and the amount of time she expected principals to spend in each activity.

Principals E-1 and E-2 rated supervisory activities higher than superintendent E. Principal E-1 rated only one activity, teacher in-service, as superintendent E had (average importance). All other activities were rated higher by principal E-1 than by superintendent E. Principal E-2 rated only one activity, teacher evaluation, as superintendent E had (major importance). Principal E-1 agreed with superintendent E on only two rankings of supervisory activities; principal E-2
### TABLE 23

**VALUATION AND FREQUENCY OF TIME SPENT OR EXPECTED TO BE SPENT ON SIX SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES BY SUPERINTENDENT E AND PRINCIPAL E-1 AND PRINCIPAL E-2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Importance Given by E to Activity</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Expected by E</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity by E</th>
<th>Importance of Activity Expected by E-1 of E</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Spent by E-1</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity by E-1</th>
<th>Importance of Activity Expected by E-2 of E</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Spent by E-2</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity by E-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Visitation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal-Teacher Conferences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher In-Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E = Superintendent in DuPage County, Illinois, with a job description for principals E-1 and E-2 = Principals in DuPage County, Illinois, with job descriptions
agreed with superintendent E on four rankings of supervisory activities. It is likely that the superintendent did not communicate her valuation of supervisory activities to the principals. Although the difference in ratings and rankings may not be substantial, even a small difference can be significant when a principal's evaluation is based, at least in part, on the superintendent's expectations of his (principal's) supervisory performance.

Principal E-1's questionnaire data indicated some inconsistency comparing the ratings and rankings of the supervisory activities with the percent of school time spent in each activity. For example, while principal E-1 indicated that classroom visitations were critically important and were ranked first in value, he spent only five percent of his school time engaged in this activity. Curriculum development was rated critically important and ranked fourth but principal E-1 indicated he spent ten percent of his school time in this activity. The inconsistency may be attributed to the fact that superintendent E had made known her preference for curriculum development as a supervisory activity and thus emphasized the need for administrators to spend more time in this supervisory activity.

In the interview with principal E-1 he (principal E-1) said that superintendent E was a competent superintendent. He (principal E-1) said that superintendent E brought stability and consistency to the district. District E had had five superintendents in the last ten years. Principal E-1 reported that superintendent E visited each principal at their school four or five times a year and made suggestions for improvements.
Both principals E-1 and E-2 were enthusiastic about the interest superintendent E took in each school.

Principal E-1's responses in the interview indicated he (principal E-1) contributed most effectively to the improvement of instruction by: (1) hiring the best teachers, (2) allowing the teachers to perform without interference, (3) paying attention to morale--keeping teachers happy, and (4) giving new teachers additional help. Principal E-2 took a more assertive role. Principal E-2 thought she (principal E-2) contributed most effectively to instructional improvement by: (1) being a facilitator, (2) taking a leadership role, (3) working with parents, teachers, and children. Superintendent E said that she thought principals could contribute most effectively to the improvement of instruction by: (1) being a model to teachers, (2) assuming leadership roles, and (3) working at being scholars in the field of education.

If a superintendent does not agree with a principal who views the principal's role as a benevolent administrator without a strong supervision component, then the superintendent is obligated to inform the principal either through a written job description or district policy and/or in-service experiences as to what role the principal is expected to take to improve the instructional program of the school. The responses of principal E-1 gave evidence to his (principal E-1's) lack of understanding of what supervisory role he was expected to play by superintendent E. Some of the uncertainty of principal E-1 might be explained by the frequent change in superintendents over the last ten years in district E. Certainly principals (as well as teachers) are negatively influenced by a lack of continuity in stated district goals.
and supervisor's expectations of their (principals') work performance.

Principal E-2 spoke highly of the increased professionalism in the district since the arrival of superintendent E. Principal E-2 commented on the increased emphasis on curriculum development and how superintendent E took a leadership role in many curriculum projects in the district. It was also interesting to note that superintendent E ranked curriculum development third in importance of the six supervisory activities as did principal E-2. The strong curriculum background of the superintendent, in addition to her purposeful leadership in providing principal in-service in curriculum development probably influenced principal E-2's ranking of curriculum development as an important supervisory activity.

Principal E-2's rankings of importance of supervisory activities agreed with superintendent E's rankings in four of the six supervisory activities. The only exceptions were classroom visitations which superintendent E ranked first (principal E-2, second) and principal-teacher conferences which superintendent E ranked second (principal E-2, first). The similarity in rankings may be attributed to the mutual respect which was expressed by both (superintendent and principal) for each other and to the increase in communication which mutual respect and understanding affords. Principal E-2 stated during the interview that superintendent E would be leaving district E at the end of this school year. Principal E-2 was greatly concerned by superintendent E's leaving because she considered her (superintendent E) an asset to the district. Principal E-2 commented that she (principal E-2) always considered herself a professional person but superintendent E had made principal E-2 aware of
many areas in which her (principal E-2's) service could be improved. Principal E-2 considered superintendent E a curriculum specialist with a real interest in upgrading teachers' and principals' skills.

Table 23 reveals inconsistency in comparing principal E-2's ratings of importance and rankings of value to percentage of time spent in the activity. For example, principal-teacher conferences were rated by principal E-2 as critically important and the most valued supervisory activity being used fifteen percent of principal E-2's school time; whereas, faculty meetings were rated of average importance and least valued supervision activity and were used forty percent of the school time to improve instruction.

During the interview principal E-2 explained that she considered the many small group meetings held weekly (grade meetings or pod meetings) as faculty meetings. Although faculty meetings consumed a good deal of principal E-2's time, principal E-2 did not view them as valued in relation to the other supervisory activities noted. If a principal, interested in improving instruction, chooses to spend a good deal of time in a supervisory activity which neither the principal nor the superintendent views as important, then valuable time is wasted which could be spent on supervisory activities which both principal and superintendent view as important. It is crucial that the elementary school principal critically examine the stated priorities of the superintendent and his (principal's) own priorities to determine if a commensurate amount of time is spent in activities which are viewed as important in improving instruction.

Although the questionnaire data revealed that superintendent E
expected one hundred percent of principals' time devoted to supervisory activities, principal E-1 stated he spent thirty-one percent and principal E-2 stated she spent ninety-five percent of their school time on supervisory activities. Because some administrators found it difficult to separate the time spent in supervisory activities, the question was clarified when addressed to superintendent E and principals E-1 and E-2 during interviews. Superintendent E stated she expected her principals to devote sixty percent of their school time to supervisory activities. Both principal E-1 and E-2 said they spent twenty percent of their school time supervising. Principals E-1 and E-2 said they were never told how much time superintendent E expected them to spend supervising and because nothing had been said to the contrary, they (principals) presumed she (superintendent) found the time spent, acceptable.

A job description is one means that principals can use to examine a superintendent's expectations of principals' supervisory performance. In district E a job description was available, but rarely referred to. The job description of district E noted only three of the six supervisory activities. One general supervisory statement was also included.

Teacher evaluation was noted thusly: "Evaluates and counsels all staff members regarding their individual and group performance."¹ No mention was made of how, when, or how often staff should be evaluated. Faculty meetings and in-service were covered by one statement: "Conducts regular staff meetings and in-service programs, including policy changes,

new programs, and the like.\textsuperscript{1} A general statement of the principal's responsibility to supervise read: "Supervises the certificated, non-certificated, and volunteer persons functioning in the school."\textsuperscript{2}

District E's job description did not cover, even by enumeration, the supervisory activities recommended for elementary principals' use in the literature. The three supervisory activities which superintendent E claimed as most valued, classroom visitations, principal-teacher conferences, and curriculum development were not included. In addition, the job description for district E did not include criteria of acceptable performance for any supervisory activity. Without a specific statement from the superintendent, either in the form of a job description or written policy, it is impossible for principals to be aware of the standard of acceptable performance against which they were being measured. A few isolated visits by the superintendent to individual schools or even the development of yearly goals by principals and superintendents was not enough to ensure a supervisory program intent on improving instruction.

A superintendent who is serious about achieving excellence in principals' supervisory performance must state his (superintendent's) supervisory expectations of principals orally and in writing. In addition, the superintendent must provide a continuous in-service program for principals based on an assessment of their (principals') needs as supervisors. When a principal is aware of the superintendent's expectations and when adequate support through in-service programs for principals is provided, the chances of having a high correlation

\footnotetext{1}{Ibid., p. 15.} \footnotetext{2}{Ibid., p. 14.}
between what is expected of principals by the superintendent and what is actually performed by principals are increased.

District F

District F included three schools (three principals), eighty teachers, and 1331 students. Principal F-1 administered a grade six through eight building with twenty-eight teachers and 415 students. Principal F-2 administered a kindergarten through grade five school with twenty-nine teachers and 575 students.

Superintendent F had seven years of experience as a classroom teacher (grades five through ten) and five years of experience as an elementary school principal. Superintendent F had fifteen years of experience as a superintendent, six of which were in his present district. Superintendent F received a masters in educational administration in 1961.

Principal F-1 had eight years of experience as a classroom teacher (grades six through eight). Principal F-1 had eleven years of experience as an elementary principal, all at his present school. Principal F-1 received a masters in educational administration in 1967.

Principal F-2 had six years of experience as a classroom teacher (grades six through eight). Principal F-2 had eight years of experience as an elementary school principal, all at his present school. Principal F-2 received a masters in educational administration in 1967.

Table 24 indicates that superintendent F viewed five supervisory activities as critically important and one activity, faculty meetings, of no importance. Superintendent F's ranking and rating of the six activities was consistent with how much time he expected principals
**TABLE 24**

VALUATION AND FREQUENCY OF TIME SPENT OR EXPECTED TO BE SPENT ON SIX SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES BY SUPERINTENDENT F AND PRINCIPAL F-1 AND PRINCIPAL F-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Importance Given by F to Activity</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Expected by F</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity</th>
<th>Importance Given by F-1 to Activity</th>
<th>Importance Expected by F-1 of F</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Spent by F-1</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity</th>
<th>Importance Given by F-2 to Activity</th>
<th>Importance Expected by F-2 of F</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Spent by F-2</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Visitations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal-Teacher Conferences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Evaluation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher In-Service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>- 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = Superintendent in DuPage County, Illinois, with a job description for principals

F-1 and F-2 = Principals in DuPage County, Illinois, with job descriptions
to spend in each activity. For example, superintendent F expected principals to spend twenty-five percent of their time on teacher evaluation, which he ranked as most valued and rated as critically important. Superintendent F did not expect any of the principal's time to be spent on faculty meetings which he ranked as the least valued supervisory activity and rated of no importance.

Principal F-1 agreed with only three of superintendent F's ratings of supervisory activities. Principal F-1 agreed with only two of superintendent F's rankings of value of the six supervisory activities. Principal F-1's questionnaire data revealed an inconsistency between the ratings, rankings, and percentage of time spent in supervisory activities. For example, principal F-1 ranked classroom visitations as the most valued supervisory activity and listed twelve percent of his time spent in this activity; whereas principal F-1 ranked teacher evaluation as the third most valued activity, yet principal F-1 spent forty percent of his time in this activity. Principal F-1 explained during the interview that he (principal F-1) had added the time spent in classroom visitations and principal-teacher conferences into teacher evaluation because he (principal F-1) viewed classroom visitation and principal-teacher conferences as part of the evaluation process.

Although principal F-1 agreed with superintendent F that the most valued supervisory activities were classroom visitation, principal-teacher conferences, and teacher evaluation, principal F-1 and superintendent F did not agree on the ordering among the three. Principal F-1 thought classroom visitations were most important, followed by principal-teacher conferences and teacher evaluation. Superintendent F viewed
teacher evaluation as the most important supervisory activity to improve instruction, followed by principal-teacher conferences and classroom visitation. This lack of agreement between superintendent F and principal F-1's rankings was clarified in the interview when superintendent F stated he viewed the three activities as part of one process intended to improve instruction. Superintendent F, principal F-1 and F-2 thought the three activities were equally important, with classroom visitation and principal-teacher conferences as components of teacher evaluation.

Principal F-2 agreed with three out of six of superintendent F's ratings of importance of supervisory activities. The questionnaire data revealed that principal F-2 was aware of superintendent F's valuation of four out of six activities. In addition, principal F-2 agreed with superintendent F on four out of the six supervisory rankings of value. Principal F-2 did not list any percentages of time spent in a supervisory activity. The questionnaire data interpreted independently, indicated a similarity in responses between superintendent F and principal F-2. The interview with principal F-2 indicated that percentages were not listed for time spent in supervisory activities because principal F-2 thought there was a great deal of overlap in the activities. For example, he viewed a principal-teacher conference as providing in-service. It is interesting to note that superintendent F and principal F-1 were not able to separate the time spent in only three supervisory activities, classroom visitation, principal-teacher conferences, and teacher evaluation but principal F-2 saw so much overlap in each supervisory activity, he could not separate the time in any of the activities.

If the quality of supervisory performance is to be enhanced in
a district, then the supervisory activities which the superintendent values and considers important should be reviewed and discussed with the principals in the district. If supervision of teachers is to result in improvement of instruction, (rather than teacher evaluation, only) then the component parts of each supervisory activity need to be examined, styles of leadership need to be explored, and effective means of implementation need to be discussed. Although in district F the superintendent visited each school two or three times a week and met formally with principals two times a month, no in-service on supervisory skills was provided.

Principal F-2 shared an experience during the interview which more clearly revealed the lack of agreement and a possible source of conflict between superintendent F and principal F-2. Principal F-2 stated he did not collect lesson plans from teachers because he did not have time. Principal F-2 said it did not concern him if a teacher did not spend the required amount of time on a subject. Principal F-2 however, had recently discovered that lesson plans did concern superintendent F. When principal F-2 was attending an out-of-state educational conference recently, superintendent F came to principal F-2's school and collected teachers' lesson plans. Principal F-2 returned to his school to hear from superintendent F, negative comments regarding principal F-2's supervision of the curriculum through the lesson plans. Principal F-2 also had to contend with a faculty morale problem caused by superintendent F's visit. Principal F-2 contended he was unaware of superintendent F's lesson plan expectations prior to superintendent F's unannounced visit.
If superintendent F was concerned about the supervisory performance of principal F-2, then he (superintendent F) was obligated to review with principal F-2 what he (superintendent F) considered to be areas of need for principal F-2. The development of yearly goals which include the areas of need perceived by superintendent F for principal F-2 in addition to periodic reporting of steps taken to accomplish the goals, would be a positive way in which a superintendent could approach the problem. Furthermore, the superintendent's concern must be coupled with information and support from the superintendent (or his representative) which would help the principal achieve the desired goal. For a principal to be unaware of the superintendent's expectations or for a principal to be aware of what the superintendent wants but be unaware of how to achieve the goal is a frustrating and overwhelming obstacle in achieving personal satisfaction (and a positive evaluation) from the work done by a principal of an elementary school.

The teachers in district F were on merit pay. Principal F-2 stated he was frustrated by the merit system because in district F a certain percentage of teachers had to be listed in each category of performance. Therefore, principal F-2 thought the merit pay system, as it operated in district F, caused him (principal F-2) to look for, and sometime emphasize, negative aspects of a teachers performance. It was obvious that principal F-2 was not committed to district F's teacher evaluation policy. If superintendents are aware of principals' lack of support of district supervisory policies, they (superintendents) should address themselves to the problem at principal in-service meetings so that district policy might be translated into principal performance.
A philosophical difference was apparent in the responses of principal F-2 as compared to the responses of superintendent F. Principal F-2 thought superintendent F desired him (principal F-2) to be more concerned about the curriculum and to "run a tighter ship". Principal F-2 was aware that his (principal F-2's) lack of personal time management was part of the problem. If this basic difference in outlook is known to the superintendent, there is an obvious need to examine and explore alternative strategies and behaviors which might allow more communication between the superintendent and his principal. Supervisory practices in an elementary school must take into account not only the expectations of the superintendent, but the expertise and personalities of the principals and teachers concerned. Communication of the needs of the individual school in relation to the experience of the faculty and the requirements of the district are crucial to improvement of the instructional program. The relationship between principal and superintendent must remain open to allow for this communication.

Neither principal F-1 nor principal F-2 were devoting as much time to supervision as their superintendent expected. During the interview, principal F-1 indicated he spent ten percent of his time on supervisory activities, although he thought his superintendent wanted him (principal F-1) to devote twenty percent of his time to supervision. Principal F-2 devoted twenty percent of his time to supervisory activities, although he thought his superintendent wanted him (principal F-2) to devote sixty-six percent of his time to supervision. Superintendent F stated he expected fifty percent of the principal's time to be spent on supervisory activities. Since both principals spent less time
supervising than they (principals) anticipated their superintendent expected to be spent, it is likely the principals thought the superintendent had unrealistic supervisory expectations. It is interesting to note that neither principal F-1 or F-2 correctly anticipated the amount of supervisory time the superintendent expected of principals, which indicated that neither principal was accurately informed of superintendent F's supervisory expectations of principals.

One means, other than direct contact, that is used to make principals aware of their supervisory duties is a job description. The job description from district F mentioned only two of the six supervisory activities. It (job description) contained two general supervisory statements and a statement on evaluation and faculty meetings. The general statements read: "The principal shall be responsible for the supervision of all personnel assigned to the school in which he serves,"1 and "Supervises the school's teaching process."2 The statement on evaluation read, "Evaluates and discusses with staff means they may utilize to improve their teaching."3 The statement on faculty meetings read, "Conducts staff meetings to keep all staff members informed of all school activities and problems."4 The job description of district F provided only a general awareness that supervision was a responsibility of an elementary school principal. It (job description) did not mention all the supervisory activities which the literature recommended nor did it state what would be considered acceptable performance. If superintendents were sincerely interested in a strong supervision component in

2Ibid.
3Ibid.
4Ibid., p. 2.
the elementary school principal's job description, then specific guidelines would be available to principals so that they could work toward known goals rather than superintendent's unstated expectations.

**District G**

District G included eleven schools (eleven principals), 204 teachers, and 3850 students. Principal G-1 administered a kindergarten through grade six school which had eleven teachers and 239 students. Principal G-2 administered a kindergarten through grade six school with nineteen teachers and 440 students.

Superintendent G had eight years of experience as a classroom teacher (grades four through twelve), nine years as an elementary principal, ten years as an assistant superintendent, and eleven years as a superintendent. All eleven years as superintendent were in his present district. Superintendent G received a masters in 1948 majoring in industrial arts. Superintendent G had sixty hours beyond a masters in educational administration.

Principal G-1 had thirteen years of experience as a classroom teacher (grades four, seven, and eight). Principal G-1 had nine years of experience as an elementary school principal, three of which were at his present school. Principal G-1 received a masters in educational administration in 1960.

Principal G-2 had five years of experience as a classroom teacher (grades five and six) and twelve years of experience as an elementary school principal. Two of the twelve years experience as an elementary principal were at his present school. Principal G-2 received a masters in supervision and curriculum in 1977.
Table 25 indicates that superintendent G viewed all the supervisory activities of either average or major importance. Superintendent G ranked teacher evaluation as the most valued supervisory activity followed by classroom visitation and principal-teacher conferences. Superintendent G consistently expected only a small percentage of principal's time to be spent on each supervisory activity. In teacher evaluation, the supervisory activity ranked most valued by superintendent G, he expected principals to spend only two percent of their (principals') school time. In the least valued supervisory activity, faculty meetings, principals were expected to spend one percent of their (principals') school time. There was a consistency among superintendent G's rating and ranking data and the percentage of time he (superintendent G) expected principals to spend in each supervisory activity.

If principals are expected to spend a small amount of time performing supervisory tasks (as suggested by superintendent G) then it is imperative that the principals in the district be aware of the superintendent's expectations of their (principals') performance, so that the time spent might be used efficiently and effectively. Without guidelines or directives from the superintendent which specify the supervisory tasks, the principals who would spend only the small amount of time supervising that was expected of them (principals) by superintendent G, might emphasize supervisory activities the superintendent considers non-essential. As a result of lack of information, principals in district G could readily misappropriate supervision time and thus by not achieving the superintendent's unstated goals, receive a low evaluation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Importance Given by G to Activity</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Expected by G</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity</th>
<th>Importance Given by G-1 to Activity</th>
<th>Importance Expected by G-1 of G</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Spent by G-1</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity</th>
<th>Importance Given by G-2 to Activity</th>
<th>Importance Expected by G-2 of G</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Spent by G-2</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Visitation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal-Teacher Conferences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Meetings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher In-Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G = Superintendent in DuPage County, Illinois, with a job description for principals
G-1 and G-2 = Principals in DuPage County, Illinois, with job descriptions
Superintendent G had been in district G for thirty years in different capacities. Superintendent G is only the second superintendent since district G was formed. The questionnaire data indicated he (superintendent G) expected principals to spend seventeen percent of their (principals') school time on supervisory activities. Superintendent G's interview responses agreed with the questionnaire data.

Principal G-1 ranked teacher evaluation the most valued supervisory activity and rated it as critically important. The questionnaire data indicated principal G-1 spent only five percent of his school time on this supervisory activity. Principal G-1 viewed teacher in-service as the least valued supervisory activity, rated it of minor importance, and reported he spent one percent of his school time on this supervisory activity. Principal G-1's rankings, ratings, and percentages of time spent were consistent for all supervisory activities. In addition, principal G-1 agreed with superintendent G that teacher evaluation, classroom visitation, and principal-teacher conferences were the most valued supervisory activities, but his (principal G-1's) rankings among the three were different from superintendent G's rankings.

Principal G-2 ranked teacher evaluation the most valued supervisory activity and rated it of major importance. Principal G-2 viewed faculty in-service as the least valued supervisory activity and rated it of average importance. The percentage of time allotted by principal G-2 to each supervisory activity totaled 275 percent. It was obvious from the questionnaire data that principal G-2 had not interpreted correctly the questions or percent of school time spent on each supervisory activity. Principal G-2 and superintendent G agreed that teacher evaluation
ranked as the most valued supervisory activity and classroom visitation ranked as the second most valuable activity. Both superintendent G and principal G-2 agreed that the least valued supervisory activity was faculty meetings.

During the interview, principal G-1 stated he spent ten percent of his time supervising teachers. Principal G-2 stated he spent fifty percent of his time in supervisory activities. Both principal G-1 and principal G-2 responded that they did not know how much time superintendent G expected them to spend in supervision. Superintendent G stated he expected his principals to spend fifteen percent of their time supervising. If principals are to contribute to the instructional improvement of their local school program, then they (principals) must be able to provide leadership through an awareness of the superintendent's expectations of their (principals') supervisory performance.

The questionnaire data and interview responses indicated that superintendent G did not provide information, either orally or in writing, which delineated his (superintendent G's) supervisory priorities for elementary principals. As a result principal G-1 and principal G-2 used their (principals') own best judgment to assess the value of supervisory activities and the time allotted to the performance of these activities. Superintendent G rationalized his (superintendent G's) lack of specificity in delineating supervisory performance of principals by stating he (superintendent G) was concerned about the quality of performance, not the percent of time the activities took to perform. In reality, principal G-1 and G-2 were not made aware of what constitutes "quality" by the superintendent. If a superintendent holds
principals accountable for a "quality" performance of supervisory activities, then the principals are entitled to know the criteria against which their performance will be judged. It is possible that principals attempting to perform their supervisory responsibilities without specific guidelines could receive a negative evaluation from their superintendent. This low evaluation of principals by superintendents can adversely affect principal morale, increments in salary, and eventually retention as principals in the district.

The job description for district G contained only one general statement on supervisory responsibilities. "Develop, implement, and improve the educational program through cooperative and on-going endeavors in supervision of instruction and evaluation of learning."¹ The job description of district G did not specifically mention any supervisory activity. If a principal is to be evaluated by either the superintendent's expectations or a principal's job description, it is essential to have each supervisory activity specifically stated with performance criteria.

The principals in district G were being evaluated annually by a superintendent who presumed they (principals) were aware of his (superintendent's) expectations. It is likely that principals unaware of their superintendent's supervisory expectations, would develop their (principals') own standards of performance with the hope they (standards) would be acceptable to superintendent G. In so doing, principals run the risk of not performing supervisory tasks to the superintendent's expectations.

Both principal G-1 and G-2 commented that superintendent G met

with them twice a month but the superintendent's opinions regarding supervisory practices were usually shared only in crisis situations. Principals G-1 and G-2 were most likely to be contacted by superintendent G when a complaint had been filed in the district against them (principals). If a superintendent states his expectations only in crisis situations, (after the fact) then principals are forced to learn of the superintendent's expectations through trial and error which is a potentially frustrating and/or demeaning experience for the principal. In addition, when principals must make supervisory decisions based on their best judgment because of the lack of written and/or oral directives from the superintendent, then in turn receive criticism from their superior for doing so, there is a general undermining of principals' authority and role as supervisor.

The data gathered from questionnaires and interviews in district G indicated that the superintendent did not make specific requirements for supervisory performance known to principals nor did superintendent G provide in-service for principals intended to improve their (principals') supervisory skills. The superintendent recently appointed a director of curriculum to assist with principals' needs in the local schools. Although no specific plans had been developed, to date, for principal in-service, the addition of this resource person on the district staff was positively viewed by the superintendent as a possible source of information and assistance to principals. Currently, the director of curriculum was on call to principals to assist with instructional problems of classroom teachers. Neither principal G-1 or G-2 had used the services of the director sufficiently to develop
an opinion of the director's potential effectiveness in instructional improvement.

If superintendent G is sincerely interested in increasing supervisory skills of principals, he (superintendent G) is obligated to establish supervision as a priority item with the principals. Specifically, a job description should be developed specifying desired supervisory behaviors of the principals, as well as in-service programs held based on the individual needs of principals. The director of curriculum, used as a resource at the district office, could be a valuable communication tie between the principals and the superintendent and act as a facilitator in providing for in-service needs of principals. To date, the above situation has not occurred in district G, but with leadership from the superintendent, the potential for increasing principals' supervisory expertise could become a reality.

District H

District H included seven schools (seven principals, 173 teachers, and 3618 students). Principal H-1 administered a kindergarten through grade six school which had nineteen teachers and 520 students. Principal H-2 administered a kindergarten through grade six building with fourteen teachers and 405 students.

Superintendent H had four years of experience as a classroom teacher (grades seven and eight) and one year of experience as an elementary principal prior to becoming superintendent. Superintendent H's sixteen years of experience as a superintendent were confined to district H. Superintendent H received a masters in educational administration in 1961.
Principal H-1 had seven years of experience as a classroom teacher (grade six) and nine years of experience as an elementary school principal. All nine years of principal H-1's experience as an elementary principal were at his present school. Principal H-1 received a masters in educational administration in 1965.

Principal H-2 had nine years of experience as a teacher (grades seven and eight) and nine years of experience as an elementary school principal, five of which were at his current school. Principal H-2 received a masters in educational administration in 1968.

Table 26 indicates that superintendent H rated all supervisory activities of major or critical importance, except faculty meetings, which were of minor importance. Classroom visitation which was ranked most valued and teacher evaluation which was ranked second most valued, were both viewed by superintendent H as critically important. Curriculum development and principal-teacher conferences were third and fourth most valued respectively and both activities were rated of major importance. A discrepancy between the ratings and rankings of superintendent H was observed. While superintendent H ranked faculty meetings as the fifth most valued activity and rated it of minor importance, he (superintendent H) ranked teacher in-service the least valued supervisory activity but ranked it of major importance. Aside from this discrepancy, a comparison of superintendent H's rankings, ratings, and percentages of principal time expected to be spent in supervisory activities showed the data to be consistent.

Principal H-1 ranked principal-teacher conferences and classroom visitation as the first and second most valued supervisory activities,
# Table 26

Valuation and Frequency of Time Spent or Expected to Be Spent on Six Supervisory Activities by Superintendent H and Principal H-1 and Principal H-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Importance Given by H to Activity</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Expected by H</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity</th>
<th>Importance Given by H-1 to Activity</th>
<th>Importance Expected by H-1 of H</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Spent by H-1</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity</th>
<th>Importance Given by H-2 to Activity</th>
<th>Importance Expected by H-2 of H</th>
<th>Percentage of Time Spent by H-2</th>
<th>Ranking of Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Visitation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal-Teacher Conferences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Evaluation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher In-Service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H = Superintendent in DuPage County, Illinois, with a job description for principals

H-1 and H-2 = Principals in DuPage County, Illinois, with job descriptions
respectively, and rated them critically important. Curriculum development and teacher evaluation were ranked by principal H-1 as third and fourth most valued supervisory activities respectively and were rated of major importance. Principal H-2 rated teacher in-service, the fifth most valued supervisory activity, of average importance. Faculty meetings were ranked of least value and of average importance. All of the rankings and ratings of principal H-2 were consistent with the amount of time allocated to each of the supervisory activities.

Principal H-1 agreed with superintendent H's rankings on only one supervisory activity, curriculum development. Principal H-1 agreed with superintendent H on three ratings of supervisory activities, classroom visitations, faculty meetings, and curriculum development. Principal H-1 anticipated the importance superintendent H gave to only two activities, principal-teacher conferences and curriculum development. The questionnaire data indicated there was minimal agreement between superintendent H and principal H-1. It was likely that, although superintendent H stated he valued supervisory activities, he (superintendent H) had not clearly indicated this value to principal H-1.

Principal H-2 did not agree with superintendent H's rankings of supervisory activities. Principal H-2 did agree with superintendent H on the ratings of importance of three supervisory activities, principal-teacher conferences, faculty meetings, and teacher in-service. Principal H-2 anticipated the importance superintendent H gave to only two activities, faculty meetings and teacher in-service. Inconsistency was noted in the time principal H-2 allotted to some activities. The first and second most valued supervisory activities (principal-teacher conferences
and teacher in-service, respectively) were each allotted only five per-
cent of the principal's time. Classroom visitations and teacher evalua-
tion were ranked the third and fourth most valued supervisory activities
and were each allotted twenty percent of the principal's time. This in-
consistency between the rankings and time allotted to supervisory activi-
ties might have been partially caused by the overlap seen by many principals between classroom visitations and teacher evaluation.

Principal H-2's responses on the questionnaire revealed even
less agreement with superintendent H's responses than principal H-1's
had shown. Whereas both principal H-1 and H-2 thought principal-teacher
conferences were the most valued supervisory activity, superintendent H
ranked principal-teacher conferences fourth in value. Whereas principal
H-2 ranked teacher in-service as the second most valued supervisory activ-
ity, superintendent H viewed classroom visitations as the most valued
supervisory activity, principal H-2 ranked it third in value. The lack
of awareness of both principal H-1 and H-2, (but in particular of H-2)
of superintendent H's supervisory expectations becomes clear in analyz-
ing the questionnaire data. The interview responses of superintendent
H and principal H-1 and H-2 confirmed the questionnaire findings.

Both superintendent H and principal H-2 responded that the
training for their supervisory roles had been inadequate. The lack of
agreement between the valuation of supervisory activities by superinten-
dent H and principal H-2 emphasized the lack of communication from the
superintendent of what he (superintendent H) considered important. The
fact that neither superintendent H nor principal H-2 thought of them-
selves as adequately prepared to function in their supervisory roles
explained in part this lack of communication between superintendent and principal.

If a superintendent is to assume leadership in the supervisory program of the district, then he (superintendent) must be able to communicate his expectations to principals. Superintendent H was not able to provide this type of leadership and therefore the principals in the district, especially those who felt they (principals) themselves were inadequately trained, had a difficult, if not impossible task of performing supervisory tasks to meet unknown expectations.

During the interview, superintendent H asked me which of his principals would be interviewed. He was so informed. Superintendent H then indicated that the board of education required that the superintendent to rank each principal, from most effective to least effective, (one through seven), each year. Superintendent H said his most effective principal (principal H-1) and his least effective principal (H-2) would be interviewed.

The contrast between the interview responses of principal H-1 and H-2 was enlightening. Principal H-1 had just adjourned a faculty meeting prior to the interview and each faculty member came from the meeting wearing a "warm fuzzy" button. During the interview, principal H-1 was enthusiastic about supervising teachers and emphasized how important he (principal H-1) thought principal-teacher conferences were in developing teacher goals and assessing progress made during the year. Principal H-1 held five conferences a year with each teacher. The mutually developed goals which were an outgrowth of the conferences served as an evaluative tool for teacher performance. It was likely
that principal H-1's enthusiasm for a quality school program was reflected in the performance of his staff. It was obvious from interacting with principal H-1, that he took a strong leadership role in supervising his staff.

Principal H-1 was viewed by superintendent H as his (superintendent H's) most successful principal. Yet, this success is relative -- relative to every other principal in the district. It was obvious from the questionnaire data and the interview responses of principal H-1 that he (principal H-1) was not fully aware of the superintendent's expectations of his (principal H-1's) performance. In fact, principal H-1 was not able to respond to what percentage of school time superintendent H expected principal H-1 to spend in supervisory activities. Principal H-1 stated he supposed the superintendent supported the amount of time he (principal H-1) was presently spending on supervision. If, even the most successful principals in the district are unaware of the superintendent's supervisory expectations of performance for principals, then one must wonder how successful principals could be, if they were aware of the undisclosed criteria against which their performance was being judged. Surely, if it takes seventy-five percent of principal H-1's school time to do the kind of supervision which superintendent H thinks can be done by using fifteen percent of school time, then a serious conflict could arise between what the superintendent might envision as inefficient use of time and the principal might perceive as unrealistic time demands.

Principal H-2 was two hours late for our interview; he was delayed by a meeting at the district office which had been carried
over from the prior day. Principal H-2's interview information proved to be inconsistent with the data gathered from the questionnaire. During the interview, principal H-2 indicated he did visit classrooms but he did not necessarily confer with the teachers regarding his observations. Teacher conferences, principal H-2 said, were typically problem oriented and not directed toward individual goal setting. On the questionnaire, principal H-2 indicated that principal-teacher conferences were the most valued supervisory activity. It is likely that principal H-2 responded on the questionnaire in a manner he thought expected of him.

Principal H-2 did not appear to be enthusiastic about any phase of his supervisory responsibilities. Principal H-2's response to whether or not lesson plans were required appeared to be typical of his supervisory style. Principal H-2 responded that lesson plans were not required because he (principal H-2) considered teachers to be professionals and they (teachers) should know how to write lesson plans. It is likely that principal H-2's lack of concern about his supervisory responsibilities reflected his lack of knowledge of what the superintendent expected of his (principal H-2's) supervisory performance.

A basic step in providing for increased supervisory performance of principals is the ability of the superintendent to define clearly what kind of (how often) performance is expected and how performance will be measured. If this information is lacking, then principals may develop their own standards (principal H-1) or assume a non-leadership role by expecting the teachers to do a good job, because they are professionals (principal H-2). Without a definitive statement of expected
principal behavior from the superintendent, principals constantly run the risk of not fulfilling the superintendent's expectations and thereby eliciting a low evaluation from the superintendent.

District H's job description noted only two of the six supervisory activities recommended in the literature. The statement on curriculum development read, "To work with the administrative staff to revise and improve the curriculum." The statement on evaluation read, "To evaluate all certified employees in an attempt to raise the quality of instructional and educational services to children of the school district, and to aid the growth of the individual teacher." District H's job description contained one general supervisory statement. It read, "To assist individual teachers in their endeavors to improve instruction." District H's job description was very general and provided principals with no clear definition of their supervisory responsibilities.

District H uses a merit pay system for principals. Because a principal's salary is based on achievement of objectives and performance of responsibilities noted on the job description, it is crucial that the expectations of the superintendent be clearly and definitively stated. Without knowing specifically what supervisory activities will be evaluated, or knowing only that one must supervise his staff, the principal plays a kind of Russian roulette with his evaluation and thus his salary.

---

2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
Summary

Review and analysis of job descriptions in districts E, F, G, and H revealed that the job descriptions specified only in general terms principals' supervisory duties. The job descriptions in districts E, F, G, and H, because of their general nature, did not provide elementary school principals with guidance and direction in performing supervisory duties.

Principals in districts E, F, G, and H met with their respective superintendents for monthly or bi-monthly meetings, but the focus of these meetings was almost purely administrative. Superintendents also made occasional visits to schools, but it was rare that superintendents had the expertise, background, and/or inclination to effectively in-service principals on supervisory skills intended to improve instruction.

In-servicing of principals on supervisory skills was not provided in districts F, G, and H. The superintendent of district E provided in-service to principals in only one supervisory area, curriculum development. The fact that in-service on supervisory skills was not available for principals and the fact that job descriptions lacked specificity did not obviate the fact that all principals were held accountable for performance of supervisory activities by their superintendents. Without information and in-service, principals were expected to match their superintendents' expectations of principals' supervisory performance. It is likely that principals who develop their own supervisory model for use in local schools, will not fulfill superintendents' expectations and as a result will be evaluated in a negative manner by superintendents.
Analysis Of Interviews

Much of the information gathered during the interviews was noted in prior sections of Chapter IV. There was often a commonality of responses from principals and superintendents both with and without job descriptions for principals. A summary and analysis of such responses follows:

Policy in most school districts mandated that principals make two classroom visits to non-tenured teachers and one to tenured teachers each year. All principals claimed that they (principals) visited classrooms at least twice the time required. Even if the quantity of these visits went unchallenged, the quality of the visits would be in question. The time principals spend in the classroom during a visitation should be examined. Other than for the purpose of evaluation, most supervisory visits of principals were five to ten minutes in duration. Most principals did not use an observation form or write up classroom visits unless the visits were for the purpose of evaluation. Rarely was a teacher conference held after a classroom visitation, unless the visit was for the purpose of evaluation. If classroom visits (other than for the purpose of evaluation) were short in duration, eliciting no observations from the principal and no conference as a follow-up, then it became obvious why most principals and some superintendents equated classroom visitations with teacher evaluations.

Classroom visitation was a supervisory activity highly recommended by authors in the field of educational supervision, not only for the purpose of evaluation, but on a regular basis focusing on instructional improvement. Although teacher involvement in goal setting,
analysis of observations and development of observation and/or evaluation forms was suggested in the literature, few if any principals and superintendents had more than perfunctory interest in involving teachers in planning and developing classroom visitations, principal-teacher conferences and teacher evaluations. Lack of teacher involvement in pivotal supervisory activities by principals can cause teachers to have negative attitudes toward the standards, forms and expectations which they (teachers) did not help formulate. It is ironic that the very activities and instruments which were designed to improve the quality of instruction often create animosity or disinterest on the part of the teachers because they had no input into the design or organization of the activities.

Although most superintendents expected principals to visit teachers more often than the district policy required, this expectation was not clearly communicated to the principals. For example, the only time classroom visitation was emphasized by the superintendent was in relation to teacher evaluation. This lack of communication was common in districts both with and without job descriptions for principals. If superintendents honestly value classroom visitation by principals as a supervisory activity, then principals should know what superintendents' expectations are in regards to principals' performance of this activity.

Interview responses indicated that little, if any, in-service was provided for principals by the superintendent on supervisory skills. One district without a job description for principals had a resource person on staff, and two districts with job descriptions for principals had a resource person who could have assisted in providing inservice to
principals. To date, in the three districts noted, the resource person does not function in that capacity.

Questionnaire and interview responses indicated a lack of desire, time, and/or expertise on the part of some superintendents to provide leadership to the supervisory program in the elementary schools. If superintendents were unable to provide direction and guidance to elementary principals, regardless of the reason, it was incumbent upon them (superintendents) to secure the necessary resource staff and supply the leadership to compensate for this deficiency.

Faculty meetings and local in-service meetings for the purpose of instructional improvement were rare in both districts with and without job descriptions for principals. Most faculty meetings were procedural in nature. Almost all in-service was provided by the district and the topics were generally broad in nature. Instructional needs can be different in each school in a district, based on the needs of the student body, experience of the faculty, and program development. If principals and superintendents were desirous of meeting the instructional needs of the individual school, then a planned program of staff development should have been initiated and implemented by the administrator and faculty in each school. In-service meetings held at a district level focused on general appeal and by their very nature did not provide for the peculiar needs of a specific school.

Questionnaire data indicated a higher interest level in curriculum development than could be substantiated by interview responses. Curriculum development in almost all districts was synonymous with textbook selection. Only a few districts had developed curriculum
guides to establish the content and sequencing of skills to be taught. It is likely that curriculum development is one of the most fertile areas for the common interests of students, parents, teachers, and administrators in the district to be expressed and merged. Leadership in curriculum development for a district is dependent on the initiative of the superintendent. Interviews revealed that, with the exception of superintendent E, little was being done in any of the districts to promote curriculum development. If superintendents are sincerely interested in defining and promoting curriculum programs in their districts, then this priority should be expressed and a framework should be established wherein curriculum development might be accomplished.

Interviews revealed a general disinterest on the part of principals and some superintendents to monitor or review teachers' lesson plans. Although teachers were expected to maintain lesson plans, in most schools the plans were not reviewed by the principal. Some principals and superintendents commented that the plans were reviewed and evaluated by the substitute teacher, after a teacher was absent. Five of the eight superintendents interviewed expected principals to review lesson plans of teachers once a week. Only three principals out of fifteen reviewed lesson plans once a week. Some principals commented they never reviewed teachers' lesson plans because they (principals) think teachers consider it demeaning. Other principals admitted to reviewing them two or three times a year.

If superintendents are aware of the need for regular monitoring of teachers' lesson plans, then it would follow that they (superintendents) would establish a district plan which might: (1) provide the
teachers with a plan book, (2) establish a format to be used in writing plans, and (3) make known how often principals are expected to collect and review teachers' plan books. If superintendents believe that lesson plans are as essential to teachers as road maps are to navigators, then they (superintendents) are obligated to make their expectations known to the principals and teachers in the district.

All principals interviewed agreed that little, if any, direct in-service was provided by the superintendent to increase principals' supervisory skills. Superintendents communicated with principals during informal conferences, general principal meetings, at the beginning of the year to establish goals, at the end of the year to evaluate goal achievement, and at social gatherings. Rarely were supervisory skills a focus for superintendent-principal interaction, unless it was a crisis situation.

When asked what factors negatively influenced their supervisory performance, there was a commonality of responses between principals with and without job descriptions. The most frequently mentioned factors which principals noted were: (1) paperwork, (2) meetings, (3) discipline problems, (4) frequent interruptions and administrivia. Superintendents were aware of these factors but contended principals had adequate time to supervise.

The lack of information flow between superintendent and principal concerning supervisory tasks of the principal was emphasized during interviews. It is likely that principal's supervisory performance would have been more highly correlated to superintendent's expectations if principals had been made aware of what superintendents expected. If a
principal was not performing well in his supervisory capacity, then one should explore what guidelines were established to delineate his (principal's) responsibilities and what in-service was provided to help him (principal) meet district requirements. More often than not, supervisory expectations for principals were not defined, nor was in-service provided. The result of this lack of information caused the principal to be potentially less effective because he (principal) had to develop his own standards of performance and hoped they coincided with the superintendent's expectations.

Analysis Of Job Descriptions

The job descriptions of principals in twenty-six districts in DuPage County were reviewed for this study.

Only one of the twenty-six job descriptions noted the six supervisory activities recommended in the literature. Five job descriptions mentioned five out of the six supervisory activities. Three job descriptions specified four of the six supervisory activities. Four job descriptions noted three supervisory activities as an elementary principal's responsibility. Five job descriptions mentioned two supervisory activities and eight job descriptions specified only one supervisory activity, thirteen job descriptions included a general statement of the elementary principal's responsibility to supervise the school faculty and staff.

The wording of most job descriptions was general. Little, if any, explanation of performance criteria was given.

Classroom visitation, which was generally ranked as the most
valued supervisory activity was mentioned in only five or nineteen percent of the job descriptions. Whereas faculty meetings, which were generally ranked as the least valued supervisory activity were mentioned in twelve (or forty-six percent) of the job descriptions. This lack of consistency between value given to the supervisory activity and enumeration in a job description was undoubtedly confusing to elementary school principals.

It was apparent from analysis of items covered in the job descriptions that supervisory activities were not emphasized. Yet, this lack of emphasis of the principal's supervisory role in the job descriptions did not alleviate the need for the principal to perform the supervisory activities. When a principal is evaluated by the superintendent on the performance of activities not specified in a job description, the principal is in the precarious position of trying to meet unknown expectations.

Without specific guidelines on what supervisory duties are expected of principals by superintendents, a principal tends to examine the needs of his faculty in relation to his (principal's) supervisory abilities and establishes personalized supervisory guidelines. This strategy can be worthwhile when the principal's personal guidelines correlate to the superintendent's (unknown) expectations. The neophyte principal and the principal not skilled in supervisory techniques have a difficult time adjusting to the lack of guidance in supervisory activities which is inherent in most job descriptions. As a result of this lack of direction, principals can suffer low evaluations, low salary increments and possibly the loss of their positions.
It was interesting to note that most principals responded in the interview that they would prefer a general job description, rather than specific. It is likely that the principals thought that with a general job description, they (principals) could maintain flexibility in performance of supervisory tasks. Yet, this flexibility is rarely present for principals (with or without a job description) because principals' supervisory performances are evaluated generally on superintendents' expectations.

A few principals commented that if the job description would be used as a basis of principal evaluation, then they (principals) would like the job description to state specifically the supervisory duties required of principals. With a specific job description, a principal would have a better opportunity of being evaluated in a consistent manner. With a specific job description, principals would be able to perform periodic self evaluations and thereby critically examine and remediate supervisory areas of need prior to the annual evaluation by the superintendent.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to determine if a relationship existed between superintendents' expectations and elementary principals' supervisory performance in districts with and without job descriptions for principals. The relationship, if found, would be studied focusing on similarities, dissimilarities, strengths, weaknesses, problems, and trends.

Methods and procedures used in the study included: (1) review of the literature determined the most commonly recommended supervisory activities, (2) professors of educational administration and supervision ranked the value of the supervisory activities, (3) development of questionnaires asked respondents to rate the importance, note the frequency of use (or expected use) and rank the value of the supervisory activities, (4) validation of the questionnaires by submission to superintendents and principals not in the study who supervise elementary schools, (5) modification of questionnaires based on criticisms and comments received, (6) submission of the questionnaires to 139 principals and thirty superintendents in DuPage County, Illinois, (7) follow-up interviews of randomly sampled superintendents with job descriptions for principals, (8) follow-up interviews of two randomly sampled principals of each superintendent chosen in number seven, (9) follow-up
interviews of all superintendents (four) without job descriptions for principals, (10) follow-up interviews of two principals randomly sampled (where possible) of superintendents chosen in number nine, (11) tabulation and analysis of questionnaire responses and interview data, (12) conclusions and recommendations.

Chapter I developed the design of the study by presenting an historical overview of supervision in schools, by stating the rationale for the study, by enumerating the methods and procedures that would be followed, by noting the significance and potential usefulness of the study to those concerned with the improvement of instruction in elementary schools.

Chapter II reviewed related literature of most commonly recommended supervisory activities: classroom visitation, principal-teacher conferences, teacher evaluation, in-service education, curriculum development, and faculty meetings. The review of each supervisory activity included the purpose and importance of the practice, the role of the principal, recommendations for teacher involvement and guidelines for successful use.

Chapter III presented and analyzed the data from three sources: questionnaires, job descriptions, and interviews. The questionnaire responses from principals and superintendents from DuPage County were divided into the following categories:

1. Responses of principals with job descriptions compared to responses of principals without job descriptions.

2. Responses of superintendents with job descriptions for principals compared to responses of superintendents without job descriptions for principals.
3. Responses of principals with job descriptions compared to responses of superintendents with job descriptions for principals.
4. Responses of principals without job descriptions compared to responses of superintendents without job descriptions for principals.

In addition, Chapter III contained an analysis of principals' job descriptions in DuPage focusing on the six supervisory skills which were commonly recommended in the literature.

Finally, Chapter III analyzed questionnaire and interview responses of (1) seven principals and four superintendents without job descriptions for principals, and (2) eight principals and four superintendents with job descriptions for principals.

Chapter IV presents the conclusions and recommendations of the study resulting from the review of the literature as applied to the questions addressed in the study and analysis of questionnaire responses and interview data.

Conclusions

The conclusions of the study were as follows:

1. When principals and superintendents were asked to rate the importance of the six supervisory activities, there was no significant difference in the importance given to five out of six supervisory activities. Classroom visitation received a significantly higher rating of importance by the superintendents.

2. When principals' ratings of importance were compared to the
ratings of importance the principals expected their superintendents to give the six supervisory activities, a significant difference was noted for four supervisory activities. On principal-teacher conferences, teacher in-service and curriculum development, principals expected a significantly lower rating of importance by superintendents; on faculty meetings principals expected a significantly higher rating of importance by superintendents.

3. When the ratings of importance principals expected superintendents to give the six supervisory activities were compared to the ratings of importance superintendents actually gave the activities, a significant difference was noted in two activities. In classroom visitation and principal-teacher conferences principals expected a significantly lower rating of importance by superintendents compared to superintendents' actual ratings of the two activities.

4. When professors, superintendents, and principals were asked to rank the value of six supervisory activities, the activities were ranked similarly.

5. The time spent in supervisory activities by principals when compared to the time superintendents expected principals to spend in the activities was similar in five of the six activities. In one activity, classroom visitation, time spent and time expected to be spent, was not similar. Superintendents expected twenty percent of principals' time to be spent in this activity, while principals were spending ten percent.

6. The presence or absence of principals' job descriptions did not affect the ratings of importance, rankings of value, or time spent,
or expected to be spent, in supervisory activities by principals and superintendents.

7. The following specific conclusions resulted from an analysis of questionnaire and interview data:

a) **Classroom Visitation**

   (1) Ratings of importance of principals with job descriptions compared to ratings of importance of principals without job descriptions were similar.

   (2) Ratings of importance of superintendents with job descriptions for principals compared to the ratings of importance of superintendents without job descriptions for principals were similar.

   (3) Principals with job descriptions gave significantly lower ratings of importance compared to superintendents with job descriptions for principals.

   (4) Ratings of importance of principals without job descriptions compared to ratings of importance of superintendents without job descriptions for principals were similar.

   (5) Time spent, or expected to be spent, in classroom visitation was similar (ten percent) for principals with job descriptions, principals without job descriptions and superintendents without job descriptions for principals. Superintendents with job descriptions for principals expected twenty percent of principals' time to be spent in classroom visitation.
(6) In ranking the value of classroom visitation, principals and superintendents without job descriptions for principals, superintendents with job descriptions for principals, and professors ranked the activity as most valued. Principals without job descriptions ranked classroom visitation as second most valued supervisory activity.

b) Principal-Teacher Conferences

(1) Ratings of importance of principals with job descriptions compared to ratings of importance of principals without job descriptions were similar.

(2) Superintendents with job descriptions for principals gave significantly higher ratings of importance compared to the ratings of importance given by superintendents without job descriptions for principals.

(3) Ratings of importance of principals with job descriptions compared to the ratings of importance given by superintendents with job descriptions for principals were similar.

(4) Principals without job descriptions gave significantly higher ratings of importance compared to the ratings of importance given by superintendents without job descriptions for principals.

(5) Time spent or expected to be spent in principal-teacher conferences was similar (ten percent) for principals and superintendents with job descriptions, and for
superintendents without job descriptions for principals. Principals without job descriptions spent fifteen percent of their time on principal-teacher conferences.

(6) In ranking the value of principal-teacher conferences, principals with job descriptions ranked the activity, most valued. Superintendents with job descriptions for principals and professors ranked principal-teacher conferences as second most valued activity. Principals and superintendents without job descriptions ranked principal-teacher conferences as third most valued. All groups viewed principal-teacher conferences as one of the three most valued supervisory activities.

c) Faculty Meetings

(1) Ratings of importance of principals with job descriptions compared to ratings of importance of principals without job descriptions were similar.

(2) Ratings of importance of superintendents with job descriptions for principals compared to the ratings of importance of superintendents without job descriptions for principals were similar.

(3) Ratings of importance of principals with job descriptions compared to ratings of importance of superintendents with job descriptions for principals were similar.

(4) Ratings of importance of principals without job descriptions compared to ratings of importance of superintendents without job descriptions for principals were similar.
(5) Time spent and time expected to be spent in faculty meetings were similar.

(6) In ranking the value of faculty meetings, principals and superintendents without job descriptions for principals ranked the activity, fifth. Principals and superintendents with job descriptions for principals and professors ranked faculty meetings, sixth or least valued supervisory activity.

d) Teacher Evaluation

(1) Ratings of importance of principals with job descriptions compared to the ratings of importance of principals without job descriptions were similar.

(2) Superintendents with job descriptions for principals gave significantly higher ratings of importance compared to ratings of importance given by superintendents without job descriptions for principals.

(3) Principals with job descriptions gave significantly lower ratings of importance compared to the ratings of importance given by superintendents with job descriptions for principals.

(4) Ratings of importance of principals without job descriptions compared to ratings of importance given by superintendents without job descriptions for principals were similar.

(5) Time spent or expected to be spent in teacher evaluation by principals and superintendents was similar.
(6) In ranking the value of teacher evaluation, principals
and superintendents without job descriptions for prin­
cipals ranked teacher evaluation, second, principals
with and superintendents with job descriptions for
principals ranked teacher evaluation, third and pro­
fessors ranked teacher evaluation, fourth and most
valued supervisory activity.

e) Teacher In-Service

(1) Ratings of importance of principals with job descrip­
tions compared to the ratings of importance of princi­
pals without job descriptions were similar.

(2) Ratings of importance of superintendents with job
descriptions for principals compared to the ratings of
importance of superintendents without job descriptions
for principals were similar.

(3) Ratings of importance of principals with job descrip­
tions compared to the ratings of importance of super­
intendents with job descriptions for principals were
similar.

(4) Principals without job descriptions gave a signifi­
cantly higher rating of importance compared to the
ratings of importance given by superintendents with­
out job descriptions for principals.

(5) Time spent or expected to be spent in teacher in­
service was similar.

(6) In ranking the value of teacher in-service, professors
ranked the activity, third, principals and superinten-
dents with job descriptions for principals ranked teacher
in-service, fifth, principals and superintendents with-
out job descriptions for principals ranked the activity,
sixth (or least) valued supervisory activity.

f) Curriculum Development

(1) Ratings of importance of principals with job descrip-
tions compared to the ratings of importance of principals without job descriptions were similar.

(2) Ratings of importance of superintendents with job de-
scriptions compared to the ratings of importance of superintendents without job descriptions were similar.

(3) Ratings of importance of principals with job descrip-
tions compared to the ratings of importance of superin-
tendents with job descriptions were similar.

(4) Ratings of importance of principals without job descrip-
tions compared to the ratings of importance of superin-
tendents without job descriptions were similar.

(5) Time spent or expected to be spent in curriculum develop-
ment by principals and superintendents was similar.

(6) Principals with and without job descriptions and superin-
tendents with and without job descriptions for prin-
cipals ranked curriculum development as fourth most
valued supervisory activity. Professors ranked curricu-
bum development as fifth most valued supervisory activity.
Summary

The data presented in Chapter III and the conclusions stated above indicate that only three of the six supervisory activities recommended in the literature for elementary school principals are highly valued and used. Since principals' supervisory activities are intended to improve instruction, it is disconcerting to note that of the three activities (classroom visitation, principal-teacher conferences, and teacher evaluation) only one, principal-teacher conferences, consistently gives principals and teachers an opportunity for exchange of ideas and direct interface.

Most superintendents and principals undervalue the principals' responsibilities in providing for teacher in-service, curriculum development, and faculty meetings. The central office staff, in cooperation with teacher representatives from each school arrange for district in-services. Because of their very nature, centralized staff development programs demand that the topics have broad appeal, therefore the value of centralized staff development programs to local schools having peculiar instructional needs is questionable.

Curriculum development also is accomplished at the district level. Curriculum development consists of a joint committee of administrators and teachers choosing textbooks each year. Therefore, textbook selection is synonymous with curriculum development in most districts. The role of the individual school and all the persons associated with it in developing a tailor-made curriculum for that school center is not explored by superintendents and principals alike.

Faculty meetings are rarely used as a supervisory activity to
improve instruction, yet they (faculty meetings) provide an unduplicated opportunity for the individual principal to meet, receive input and feedback from all faculty members.

Although there is a valuing of classroom visitation, principal-teacher conferences and teacher evaluation in all districts, there is little back-up by way of personalized (local school) staff development or curriculum development programs to resolve problems and address needs which are not shared with other schools.

In addition, the value given to classroom visitation and principal-teacher conferences seems to center on compliance with district teacher evaluation policies and due process rather than instructional improvement. In only a few districts are classroom visitations held, other than for the purpose of evaluation. Principals who claim they (principals) visit the classrooms daily, are performing a social act more than providing for instructional improvement. In only one school in which interviews were conducted does the principal use principal-teacher conferences throughout the school year to develop and assess the attainment of mutually set teacher goals. Most conferences consist of the principal reviewing the observations of the classroom visitation using a teacher evaluation form.

Teacher evaluation thus is often a perfunctory duty which principals are obligated to discharge. The instructional needs of the teachers uncovered by classroom observations and principal-teacher conferences are seldom addressed by principals at faculty or in-service meetings.

Principals, desirous of improving their supervisory skills, might look at the district's job description (when available) to note what
supervisory skills are expected of principals. Job descriptions on the whole state only in general terms the manner in which the principal is responsible for supervising the staff. Although some of the six supervisory activities recommended in the literature are noted in job descriptions, the statements provided little direction or guidance on the performance of these activities.

The lack of specificity in job descriptions fosters the use of supervisory plans developed by individual principals (with and without job descriptions). In addition, principals with and without job descriptions are encouraged to act independently due to the lack of in-service on supervisory skills provided by superintendents. The problems which result from individual supervisory plans developed by principals leave them (principals) vulnerable to evaluation by superintendents based on their (superintendents') unknown expectations of principals' supervisory performance.

When principals' supervisory performance does not correlate highly to superintendents' expectations, (in the eyes of the superintendents) principals have nothing to refer back to for sanction, no specific job description, no supervisory in-service bulletins, etc. Therefore, principals with and without job descriptions are forced to learn of superintendents' expectations of principals' supervisory performance either through the grapevine or through trial and error. Both of the aforementioned methods bears inherent danger to principals. They (principals) could easily receive and follow misinformation that would result in what superintendents consider to be inadequate performance. Superintendents' interpretation of principals' supervisory performance could then
be translated into low evaluations, less salary, and dismissal of principals.

The data in Chapter III revealed that there is no significant difference in the valuation of the six supervisory activities by principals and superintendents (except for classroom visitation, which superintendents valued higher than principals). Yet on four of the six supervisory activities there is a significant difference between the valuation given the supervisory activity by the principal and the value the principal attributed the superintendent giving the activity. Principals are, in general, unaware of superintendents' expectations of principals' supervisory performance.

The lack of communication between superintendents and principals concerning principals' supervisory responsibilities is similar in districts with and without job descriptions for principals. Superintendents are admittedly uncomfortable dealing with instructional or curriculum matters. Some superintendents frankly revealed their inadequacy to provide leadership to principals in the area of supervisory skills. Not having the personal expertise in the area of supervision, in addition to not having a resource staff at the central office, many superintendents neglect communicating to principals their (superintendents') supervisory expectations.

Principals also expressed concern about their (principals') ability to perform supervisory tasks. Some principals admitted that their training had not provided an adequate background for performance of supervisory tasks; for example, some principals had received principalships which were outside of their (principals') teaching experience.
A neophyte principal whose teaching experience was limited to junior high school, needs a great deal of support, information, and in-service when assigned to a principalship of a primary building. The support, information, and in-service which could be available through the superintendent is rarely provided.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations are based on research data and the conclusions noted above:

1. In order to secure greater awareness of and compliance with supervisory activities favored in the literature, it is recommended that principals' supervisory responsibilities be specifically enumerated in principals' job descriptions and that the job description also state superintendents' minimum job expectations of principals' performance of each supervisory activity.

2. In order to secure greater awareness of and compliance with superintendents' expectations of principals' supervisory performance, it is recommended that superintendents provide or secure resource to inservice principals on:
   a. superintendents' valuation of principals' supervisory activities
   b. superintendents' expectations of principals' supervisory performance
   c. suggested strategies to effectively use supervisory activities
d. time management, so superintendents and principals may more readily agree on the frequency of use of supervisory activities.

3. In order that principals' performance of supervisory activities correlate to a greater degree with principals' job descriptions, it is recommended that:

a. all the favored supervisory activities from the literature be noted in principals' job descriptions so that job descriptions might be used as a basis of annual goal development.

b. yearly supervisory goals and objectives based on the job description be mutually agreed upon by principal and superintendent early in the school year.

c. superintendents periodically monitor principals' supervisory performance, making suggestions for improvement.

d. final evaluation of principals' supervisory performance be based on achievement of annual goals reflecting criteria noted in principals' job description.

4. In order to acquaint neophyte principals, principals new to the district and/or principals who will administer educational programs (levels) in which they (principals) have little or no experience, it is recommended that the superintendents provide special in-service sessions to review district policies, principals' job descriptions and superintendents' expectations of principals' supervisory performance.
Recommendations for further study include addressing the following questions:

1. How do union and master contracts affect the kind/quality of principals' supervisory performance?

2. Is there a relationship between the demographics of a district, i.e., size, wealth, etc., and the kind/quality of principals' supervisory performance?

3. How does the experience of the faculty and experience of the principal affect the kind/quality of principals' supervisory performance?

4. What is the relationship between supervision and student discipline?

5. What is the relationship between supervision and student achievement?

6. What is the history of educational supervision?
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Dr. Ray Nystrand
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Dr. Vernon Pace
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana
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Please complete the identifying information:

Name

Title - Department

University

City, State

Below are listed six (6) supervisory activities which are commonly used by elementary school principals in providing supervision for instructional improvement. Based on your reading in the field and your experience, please rank the supervisory activities in order of value, 1 through 6, 1 being the most valued and 6 being the least valued supervisory activity.

_____PRINCIPAL-TEACHER CONFERENCES
_____FACULTY MEETINGS
_____CLASSROOM VISITATIONS
_____TEACHER EVALUATION
_____TEACHER IN-SERVICE
_____CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Please return this instrument in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope by Wednesday, February 15, 1978.

Dolores M. Eder
APPENDIX B

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS
Dear

I am a graduate student at Loyola University of Chicago working on my doctoral dissertation. Part of my research design requires me to secure from each superintendent in DuPage County the district's job description for elementary principals (if available).

If a job description for the elementary principal is available in your district, would you please forward a copy to me in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope.

If a job description is not available, would you please so indicate at the bottom of this letter and return it to me in the self-addressed envelope.

Your response would be appreciated by November 1, 1977.

Thank you in advance for your consideration and attention to this request.

Sincerely,

Dolores M. Eder

I am attaching a copy of the district's job description for elementary principals.

A job description for the elementary principals in my district is not available.

Comments (optional) __________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________
Dear

Have you ever noticed that when someone asks, "What does a principal do?" he receives as many different answers as there are respondents. In 1975, Paul Houts wrote, "the principalship is just varied enough that like India, almost anything one says about it might be true."

As a doctoral student at Loyola University in Chicago, Illinois, I am interested in determining what superintendents and principals are saying about supervisory practices in elementary districts.

I invite you to respond to the enclosed fact sheet and questionnaire. The questionnaire is a structured one, consequently, it takes no longer than five minutes of your time to complete. A similar questionnaire has been sent to the principals in your district.

A limited number of respondents to the questionnaire will be asked to participate in a short follow-up interview in the near future.

I would appreciate your response to the questionnaire by Friday, March 10, 1978.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Dolores M. Eder
Dear

Have you ever noticed that when someone asks, "What does a principal do?" he receives as many different answers as there are respondents. In 1975, Paul Houts wrote, "the principalship is just varied enough that like India, almost anything one says about it might be true."

As a doctoral student at Loyola University in Chicago, Illinois, I am interested in determining what superintendents and principals are saying about supervisory practices in elementary school districts.

I invite you to respond to the enclosed fact sheet and questionnaire. The questionnaire is a structured one, consequently, it takes no longer than five minutes of your time to complete. A similar questionnaire has been sent to the superintendent of your district.

A limited number of respondents to the questionnaire will be asked to participate in a short follow-up interview in the near future.

I would appreciate your response to the questionnaire by Friday, March 10, 1978.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Dolores M. Eder
Dear

I am most appreciative of the time and courtesy you recently extended me.

The information I gathered as a result of the interview will be very helpful in my analysis of supervisory activities used by elementary principals.

I would like to thank you again for your assistance and look forward to meeting you in the future.

Sincerely,

Dolores M. Eder
PRINCIPAL -- FACT SHEET

Name_________________________ Age 56-65_____ Sex M____ F____

Elementary District #___________ City____________________, Illinois

Name of School__________________ Enrollment______ Grades______ Full-time Assistants______
Number of Teachers________

Name of School (if two schools) (are supervised)____________________
Enrollment______ Grades______ Full-time Assistants______
Number of Teachers________

Experience:

Years of experience as a classroom teacher______ Grades________

Years of experience as an administrator (other than principal)________
In what capacity? (title)_____________________________________

Years of experience as a principal (other than elementary)________

Years of experience as an elementary school principal________

Years of experience as principal of your present school(s)________

Do you have teaching responsibilities at your school(s)?________
If yes, explain._____________________________________________

Training:

Highest educational degree__________ Year awarded__________
Major(s)________________________ Minor(s)________________

Hours beyond this degree_______ Field(s) of study_____________

How adequate was your training in preparing you to deal with the supervisory problems you face as an elementary school principal?
(Please circle appropriate number to indicate your response)

1 Extremely Inadequate
2 Very Inadequate
3 Inadequate
4 Adequate
5 Very Adequate
6 Extremely Adequate
ELEMEN TARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL'S QUESTIONNAIRE

As an elementary school principal you perform many supervisory activities to improve instruction within your school(s). Please answer the following questions by circling the number which best indicates the importance you give to each supervisory activity.

1 - no importance
2 - minor importance
3 - average importance
4 - major importance
5 - critical importance

CLASSROOM VISITATION

P1-a How much importance do you, as principal, place on classroom visitation as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

no importance 1 2 3 4 5 critical importance

P1-b What percent of your school time is spent on classroom visitations to improve instruction? _____ %

P1-c How much importance do you think your superintendent places on classroom visitation as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

no importance 1 2 3 4 5 critical importance

PRINCIPAL-TEACHER CONFERENCES

P2-a How much importance do you, as principal, place on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

no importance 1 2 3 4 5 critical importance

P2-b What percent of your school time is spent on principal-teacher conferences to improve instruction? _____ %

P2-c How much importance do you think your superintendent places on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

no importance 1 2 3 4 5 critical importance
1 - no importance
2 - minor importance
3 - average importance
4 - major importance
5 - critical importance

FACULTY MEETINGS

P3-a How much importance do you, as principal, place on general faculty meetings as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

no importance  1  2  3  4  5  critical importance

P3-b What percent of your school time is spent on general faculty meetings for the purpose of instructional improvement?

___%

P3-c How much importance do you think your superintendent places on general faculty meetings as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

no importance  1  2  3  4  5  critical importance

TEACHER EVALUATION

P4-a How much importance do you, as principal, place on evaluation of teachers as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

no importance  1  2  3  4  5  critical importance

P4-b What percent of your school time is spent on teacher evaluations to improve instruction?

___%

P4-c How much importance do you think your superintendent places on evaluation of teachers as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

no importance  1  2  3  4  5  critical importance

TEACHER IN-SERVICE

P5-a How much importance do you, as principal, place on teacher in-service as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

no importance  1  2  3  4  5  critical importance
1 - no importance
2 - minor importance
3 - average importance
4 - major importance
5 - critical importance

**TEACHER IN-SERVICE**

Continued

P5-b What percent of your school time is spent on teacher in-service (outside of general faculty meetings)?

---

P5-c How much importance do you think your superintendent places on teacher in-service as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no importance</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>critical importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT**

P6-a How much importance do you, as principal, place on faculty involvement in curriculum development as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no importance</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>critical importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

P6-b What percent of your school time is spent on curriculum development?

---

P6-c How much importance do you think your superintendent places on curriculum development as one of your supervisory activities to improve instruction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no importance</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>critical importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The six supervisory activities are again listed below. As principal, please rank them in order of value, 1 through 6, 1 being the most valued and 6 being the least valued supervisory activity.

- principal-teacher conferences
- faculty meetings
- classroom visitation
- teacher evaluation
- teacher in-service
- curriculum development

Thank you for your cooperation in answering this questionnaire. I would appreciate having the questionnaire returned in the enclosed envelope by Friday, March 10, 1978.
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PRINCIPALS

CLASSROOM VISITATION

1. How many classroom visitations (per teacher) do you make each year to non-tenured teachers? _________

2. How many classroom visitations (per teacher) do you make each year to tenured teachers? _________

3. What is the average time spent in a classroom visitation? _________

4. What are three things you look for in your classroom visitations?
   ( )
   ( )
   ( )
   Rank them in importance.

5. What steps do you take to prepare for classroom visitations?
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

6. Are classroom visitations announced in advance? ________________

   Why/why not? __________________________________________

7. What kind of record do you keep of your observations during classroom visitations?
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

8. Do you use a classroom observation form for classroom visitations? ________ Local use only? _________ District use? _________ Secure copy if available.

9. Are your observations shared with the classroom teacher? _________

   If yes, how? __________________________________________

10. Are subject area supervisors or consultants available? _________

    If yes, in what areas? ________, ________, _________. What is their function in relation to the supervision of teachers?
    ______________________________________________________
    ______________________________________________________
PRINCIPAL-TEACHER CONFERENCES

11. Are teachers given a written copy summarizing your observations after a classroom visitation? 

12. Where do you hold principal-teacher conferences? 
   Why? 

13. Describe the format you follow during principal-teacher conferences. 

14. Do you attempt to minimize formality during principal-teacher conferences? 
   'If yes, how? 

15. How is scheduling for individual principal-teacher conferences determined? 

FACULTY MEETINGS

16. What type of activities are presented at faculty meetings intended to improve instruction? 

17. Who presents these activities? 

18. Does the faculty give input into their instructional needs to be addressed at faculty meetings? 
   If yes, how? 

19. What time are faculty meetings held? 
   Average length of time for a meeting? 

20. Average number of faculty meetings held per month to improve instruction? 

21. Do you share the agenda with the faculty prior to a faculty meeting? 
   If yes, how? 

TEACHER EVALUATION

22. Does the district have established criteria by which to evaluate teachers? 
   (If available, secure a copy.) 
   If yes, what role did teachers have in developing the criteria?
23. What other factors are considered for teacher evaluation besides instruction?

24. Do you, as principal, distinguish between classroom visitations for improvement of instruction and classroom visitations for the purpose of evaluation?

If a distinction is made, of the _______ average classroom visitations you make per teacher, per year, _______% are for the purpose of evaluation and _______% are for the improvement of instruction?

**IN-SERVICE**

25. What activities, other than principal class visitations and general faculty meetings are utilized in your school to assist teachers in improving their teaching skills?

26. How do you secure information on topics teachers would like addressed at in-service meetings?

27. What types of in-service are provided at the district level to improve teaching skills?

28. Is teacher input secured? _______ If yes, how? _______

29. List the topics of two recent in-services attended by your teachers.

30. Is provision made to allow teachers to visit other classrooms in your school? _______ In the district? _______

31. Are demonstration teaching lessons given at your school? _______
   How often? _______
   By whom? _______

32. Do teachers new to the district receive special kind/amount of in-service? _______ If yes, explain. _______

33. Are provisions made to orient teachers prior to school opening each September? _______ Describe _______

34. How many institute days are planned per school year? _______
35. How is the agenda developed for these institute days? ____________

36. Are provisions made for teachers to attend conferences and conventions? ___________ On what basis? ________________

37. Do you have a professional library in your building? ____________ If yes, approximately how many books/journals/magazines does it include? __________ Does the faculty make use of the professional library? __________

38. Do you inform your faculty about the kinds of courses offered at the local universities/colleges to increase their teaching effectiveness? __________ If yes, how? ______________

39. How is curriculum revision accomplished? (Who initiates it, who is involved...) ________________

40. How are instructional materials chosen? (Who is involved) ________________

41. What is your part in shaping the content of studies and general program of your school? ________________

42. How do you contribute most effectively to the improvement of instruction? ________________

43. What is the main source of ideas for innovations which result in changes of practice in the school? ________________

44. Are lesson plans required? __________ If yes, is a specific format required? __________ If yes, describe. ________________

45. How often are lesson plans reviewed by the principal? ________________
46. What percentage of your average school week is spent in supervisory activities? ________% 

47. Would you like to spend more time supervising? ___________________________ 

48. What are three (3) factors which negatively affect your role as a supervisor of instruction in your school? 

( ) 

( ) 

( ) 

JOB DESCRIPTION 

49. Does your district have a job description for principals? ____________ 
If yes, to what degree does your job description delineate your responsibilities as a supervisor of instruction? ___________________________ 

If no, would you prefer one? _______ Why/why not? ___________________________ 

50. Would you prefer less/greater specificity of your supervisory duties in the job description? ___________________________ 

Why? ________________________________________________________________ 

SUPERINTENDENT'S EXPECTATIONS 

51. How are you made aware of your superintendent's expectations of elementary principals' supervisory performance? ___________________________ 

______________________________ 

______________________________ 

52. List three (3) supervisory activities your superintendent considers important. ( ) ___________________________ 

( ) ___________________________ 

( ) ___________________________ 

Rank them. 

53. What percentage of your school time do you think your superintendent expects you to spend in supervisory activities? ____________%
SUPERINTENDENT -- FACT SHEET

Name ___________________________ Age 56-65_______ Sex M __ F ___

Elementary District # _________ City _____________________, Illinois

Enrollment _____ Number of Schools _____ Number of Principals _____

Number of Teachers _____

Experience:

Years of experience as a classroom teacher ______ Grades __________

Years of experience as principal other than elementary level ____________

Years of experience as principal in elementary school ________________

Years of experience as administrator other than principal or superintendent ______ In what capacity? (title) ________________________________

Years of experience as superintendent __________

Years of experience as superintendent in your present district __________

Training:

Highest educational degree __________ Year awarded __________

Major(s) __________________________ Minor(s) ______________________

Hours beyond this degree _______ Field(s) of study __________________

How adequate was your training in preparing you to direct elementary school principals in their supervisory roles?

(Please circle appropriate number to indicate your response)

1 2 3 4 5 6
Extremely Very Inadequate Adequate Very Extremely
Inadequate Inadequate Adequate Adequate
ELEMENTARY DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT'S QUESTIONNAIRE

As superintendent of an elementary school district you provide leadership to elementary school principals in the area of supervision to improve instruction. Please answer the following questions by circling the number which best indicates the importance you give to each supervisory activity performed by elementary school principals.

1 - no importance
2 - minor importance
3 - average importance
4 - major importance
5 - critical importance

CLASSROOM VISITATION

S1-a How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on classroom visitation as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

no
importance
1 2 3 4 5 critical
importance

S1-b What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on classroom visitations for the purpose of instructional improvement?

% 

PRINCIPAL-TEACHER CONFERENCES

S2-a How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on principal-teacher conferences as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

no
importance
1 2 3 4 5 critical
importance

S2-b What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on principal-teacher conferences for the purpose of instructional improvement?

% 

FACULTY MEETINGS

S3-a How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on general faculty meetings as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

no
importance
1 2 3 4 5 critical
importance
FACULTY MEETINGS  continued

S3-b  What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on general faculty meetings for the purpose of instructional improvement?

_______ %

TEACHER EVALUATION

S4-a  How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on evaluation of teachers as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

no importance  1  2  3  4  5  critical importance

S4-b  What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on teacher evaluations for the purpose of instructional improvement?

_______ %

TEACHER IN-SERVICE

S5-a  How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on teacher in-service as a supervisory activity to improve instruction?

no importance  1  2  3  4  5  critical importance

S5-b  What percent of an elementary principal's school time do you expect to be spent on teacher in-service (outside of general faculty meetings)?

_______ %

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

S6-a  How much importance do you, as superintendent, place on faculty involvement in curriculum development as a supervisory activity for the improvement of instruction?

no importance  1  2  3  4  5  critical importance
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT  continued

S6-b What percent of an elementary principal’s school time do you expect
to be spent on curriculum development?

%  

The six supervisory activities are again listed below. As superintendent, please rank them in order of value, 1 through 6, 1 being the most
valued and 6 being the least valued supervisory activity performed by ele­
mentary school principals.

##### principal-teacher conferences
##### faculty meetings
##### classroom visitation
##### teacher evaluation
##### teacher in-service
##### curriculum development

Thank you for your cooperation in answering this questionnaire.
I would appreciate having the questionnaire returned in the enclosed
envelope by Friday, March 10, 1978.
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR SUPERINTENDENTS

CLASSROOM VISITATION

1. How many classroom visitations (per teacher) do you expect an elementary principal to make each year to a non-tenured teacher? __________

2. How many classroom visitations (per teacher) do you expect an elementary principal to make each year to a tenured teacher? ______________

3. What would you expect to be the average time spent by a principal in a classroom visitation? ____________________________________________

4. What are three things you expect an elementary principal to look for in classroom visitations?

   () ___________________________________________________________________

   () ___________________________________________________________________

   () ___________________________________________________________________

5. What steps do you expect an elementary principal to take to prepare for classroom visitations?

   ______________________________________________________________________

   ______________________________________________________________________

6. Do you expect elementary principals to announce classroom visitations in advance? __________ Why/why not? ________________________________

7. What kind of record do you expect an elementary principal to keep of observations made during classroom visitations? ________________________________________

8. Is this record available to you? ________________________________

   Do you receive a copy? ________________________________

9. Do you expect a classroom observation form to be used for classroom visits? __________ Locally developed? __________ Developed by district? __________ (Secure a copy of district classroom observation form, if available.)

10. Do you expect observations made by the elementary principal during a classroom visitation to be shared with the classroom teacher? ______

    If yes, how? ______________________________________________________________________

11. Are subject area supervisors or consultants available to principals? ______ If yes, in what areas? ____________________________

    What is their function in relation to the supervision of teachers? ______________________________________________________________________
PRINCIPAL-TEACHER CONFERENCES

12. Do you expect teachers to be given a written copy summarizing the elementary principal's observations after a classroom visitation? ______

13. Is there an appeal procedure? _______________________

14. Where do you expect a principal-teacher conference to be held? ______
   Why? ____________________________________________

15. Describe the format you expect to be followed during principal-teacher conferences. ____________________________________________

16. Do you expect the elementary principal to attempt to minimize formality during principal-teacher conferences? ______________________
   If yes, how? ______________________________________

17. How do you expect scheduling for individual principal-teacher conferences to be determined? ____________________________

FACULTY MEETINGS

18. What type of activities do you expect an elementary principal to present at faculty meetings intended to improve instruction? ______
   ____________________________________________

19. Who do you expect to present these activities? ____________________________

20. Do you expect a faculty to give input into their instructional needs to be addressed at faculty meetings? _______ If yes, how? ______
   ____________________________________________

21. What time do you expect faculty meetings to be held? ______
   Average length of time for a meeting? __________________

22. What is the average number of faculty meetings you expect to be held per month to improve instruction? ______

23. Do you expect an elementary principal to share the agenda with the faculty prior to a faculty meeting? _______ If yes, how? ______
   ____________________________________________
TEACHER EVALUATION

24. Does the district have established criteria by which to evaluate teachers? ________ (If available, secure a copy.)

25. If yes, what role did teachers have in developing the criteria?

26. Do you, as superintendent, distinguish between classroom visitations for improvement of instruction and classroom visitations for the purpose of evaluation? ________

If a distinction is made, what is the average number of classroom visitations you expect an elementary principal to make per teacher, per year? ________ What percent would be for the purpose of evaluation? ________ What percent would be for the purpose of the improvement of instruction? ________

27. What activities, other than class visitations and general faculty meetings, do you expect to be utilized by elementary principals to assist teachers in improving their teaching skills?

28. How do you expect elementary principals to secure information on topics teachers would like addressed at in-service meetings? ________

29. What types of in-service are provided at the district level to improve teaching skills?

30. Is teacher input secured? ________ If yes, how? ________

31. List topics of two district in-services for teachers (if applicable).

32. Is provision made to allow teachers to visit other classrooms in the district? ________ Do you expect provision to be made by the elementary principal to allow teachers to visit other classrooms in the local school? ________

33. Do you expect demonstration teaching lessons to be given in the elementary schools in your district? ________

How often?

By whom?
34. Do you expect teachers new to the district to receive special kind/amount of in-service? ________ If yes, explain. __________

35. What provisions do you expect elementary principals to make to orient teachers prior to school opening each September? Describe. ________________________________________________________________

36. How many institute days are planned per school year? __________

37. How is the agenda developed for these institute days? __________

38. Are provisions made for teachers to attend conferences and conventions? ________ On what basis? ________________________________

39. Do you expect every elementary school in your district to have a professional library? ________

40. Do you expect the elementary principal to inform the faculty about the kinds of courses offered at the local universities/colleges so as to increase teaching effectiveness? ________ If yes, how? ________________________________________________________________

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

41. How is curriculum revision to be accomplished? (Who initiates it, who is involved?...) ________________________________

42. How are instructional materials chosen? (Who is involved?) ______

43. What part do you expect your principals to play in shaping the content of studies and general program in the local school? ________

GENERAL SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES

44. How do you think a principal can contribute most effectively to the improvement of instruction in his school? ____________________________
45. What would you suggest to elementary principals as a main source of ideas for innovations? __________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

46. Do you expect elementary principals to require lesson plans? ______
   If yes, do you expect a specific format to be required? ______
   If yes, describe. ___________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

47. How often do you expect lesson plans to be reviewed by the elementary principal? __________________________________________

48. What percentage of his average school week do you expect an elementary principal to spend in supervisory activities? ___________

49. What three factors do you perceive as negatively affecting an elementary principal's role as a supervisor of instruction?
   ( ) _______________________________________________________
   ( ) _______________________________________________________
   ( ) _______________________________________________________
   Rank them.

JOB DESCRIPTION

50. (If the district does not have a job description for principals.) Has your district contemplated formulating a job description for principals? ______ If yes, why hasn't it been accomplished?
   If no, why not? ___________________________________________

51. (For districts with a job description.) Would you prefer less/greater specificity of an elementary principal's supervisory duties in the job description? ___________________________________________
   Why? ___________________________________________________

SUPERINTENDENT'S EXPECTATIONS

52. How do you make elementary principals aware of your supervisory expectations of them? __________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________
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